



3 1761 06891521 4

Toronto University Library.

PRESENTED BY

The University of Cambridge

through the Committee formed in

the Old Country

*to aid in replacing the loss caused by the Disastrous Fire
of February the 14th, 1890.*

Relig.
of Theol.

LECTURES IN DIVINITY

DELIVERED

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

BY

JOHN HEY, D.D.,

AS NORRISIAN PROFESSOR,

FROM 1780 TO 1795.

THE THIRD EDITION REVISED,

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME II.

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED AT THE PITT PRESS,

BY JOHN W. PARKER, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY.

M.DCCC.XLI.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

TABLE

4-7-11
3-7-10/100
6

BOOK IV.
ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

ARTICLE VII.

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE Old Testament is not contrary to the New ; for both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

1. Under the preceding Article, the authority of the Books of the Old Testament appeared ; but it is natural to ask, do they oblige *Christians*? It was to *Jews* that they were addressed. To answer this question properly, requires such an extensive knowledge of circumstances, and so much judgment in allowing for different situations, that it has occasioned disputes in a variety of ways.

In order to lead to some conception of these disputes, we may ask ourselves the five following questions:—

1. By whom has it been said that the Old Testament is *contrary* to the New ?
- 37 2. By whom has it been said that “ the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises ? ”
3. Have any Christians ever affirmed that “ the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, ” does “ bind Christian men ? ”—or, that the *ceremonial* law of the Jews is obligatory upon Christians ?
4. Have any ever affirmed that the *civil* and *political* law of Moses is binding upon Christians ?
5. Have any considered Christians as free from the *moral* part of the Mosaic Law ?

2. That the Old Testament is *contrary* to the New, has III. been affirmed. We have already seen instances in the *Manicheans*¹, and the followers of *Marcion*². We may add the *Catharists*³ of the twelfth century, who imitated the Manicheans. The nature of this will scarcely be conceived, without a few *instances*; which I will therefore read to you from Augustin's work against *Adimantus*, the Manichean⁴ writer⁵.

But let us come nearer the time of the *Reformation*⁶. When we do that we get amongst low and *illiterate sects*. Before we say any thing of them separately, let us offer a general remark.

Low and illiterate sects interpret Scripture without regard to the *circumstances* of those for whom it was most immediately intended; for it is learning which lets us into those circumstances⁷. Now whenever any ancient writing is so interpreted, it must be interpreted too literally; without any of those limitations or additions, which, in things familiar to us, we make by means of our feelings and common sense. The Scripture, thus interpreted, contradicts itself frequently, and so must the doctrines of literal interpreters: we may, on this account, always expect to find great *confusion* and inconsistency amongst them. And, as they have no precise ideas, and therefore no creeds, catechisms, confessions of faith, nor any ecclesiastical history, their doctrines will be unsteady; and sects will ramify and mix imperceptibly, keeping the same *names*, in such a manner as to elude all regular and systematical investigation⁸. Without such a previous remark as this, the thinking man might be disappointed with the best accounts that can be given of *Antinomians*, *Anabaptists*, &c. 38

3. The *Antinomians* present us with an instance of what I am saying. It is certain that *Luther* writes very sharply against Antinomians: it is equally certain that Luther is esteemed⁹ an Antinomian himself. And yet those whom Luther rebuked were really very different from himself. A solution

¹ Append. to Book I. sect. 3.

² Ib. sect. 19.

³ Mosheim, cent. XII. part 2. chap. v. sect. 4.

⁴ Augustin's Works, Tom. VIII; and IX. p. 82.

⁵ See Lard. vol. II. p. 413; and vol. IX. p. 187.

⁶ John Fox, in his "Acts and Monuments," (or Martyrology), speaks first of some errors of the *Romanists*: one topic

is, "Difference between the *Law and the Gospel*," see p. 34.

⁷ See Book I. chap. x. and xi.

⁸ Fuller, wittily enough, compares low sects to confluent small-pox. Church History, Book IX. 113: they rise separately, but soon run together so as to be no longer discernible from each other. Some might add, they become only one mass of corruption.

⁹ See Bp. Hallifax on Prophecy, Serm. vii. p. 212.

III. of this difficulty might give us all the idea of Antinomians that we should want.

The etymology of *Antinomi*, or Antinomians, is plain enough: a word compounded of *ἀντι* and *νόμος* will imply adversaries of *law*; and what law is particularly meant in any case, must be determined by circumstances.

I do not conceive that any sect of Christians ever called
39 *themselves* Antinomians: it is a term of opprobrium or reproach. *Quakers* is also a name imposed, not assumed; but it is rather expressive of facts. It may not be clear who first used the term Antinomians; but I should conjecture that it might be Martin Luther, intending to disgrace the notions of *Agricola*, and make even *him* ashamed of them. I conclude this from different expressions in Luther's writings¹⁰. Antinomus does not seem so descriptive and confined as *Quaker*—rather more vague like “*lawless* ;” but his bold asperity might naturally use it. John *Agricola*, against whom he applies it, thought he paid a proper compliment to the perfection of the *Gospel*¹¹, by depreciating every thing that could any way stand in competition with it. Accordingly, he set aside the *Law*, meaning thereby the whole religion of *Moses*; to which the strong things said in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, against the Law, might not a little contribute. Of his followers Luther says, “*qui Legem ab ecclesiâ tollere volunt*¹² ;” and in another place he affirms that they teach, “*Legem in ecclesiâ non predicandam*¹³.”

This term or appellation, of Antinomians, got to be used, not only amongst the reformed, but also on both sides, in the controversy between Luther and the Papists. The Polish
40 Cardinal *Hosius*¹⁴ lays the blame of Antinomianism on Luther himself; and indeed, though Luther had made *Agricola* recant his errors, yet *Agricola* had certainly been his disciple. Luther, in answer to *Hosius*, says¹⁵, that some Popish monks had such contemptible notions of all *Jews*, that they thought

¹⁰ Ἀντινομία, in the Greek classics, seems only to mean a contrariety of laws, as when one law contradicts another, or is inconsistent with it: but Luther might borrow the word, and twist its meaning a little on one side.

¹¹ Antinomians, and others like in this, were called *Gospellers* in England, at the Reformation.

¹² Luther's Works, fol. 7 vols. Witt-

bergæ, 1583, vol. i. p. 405—like *repudiandum* in Art. of 1552.

¹³ Vol. VI. p. 222. See Also vol. I. p. 400. “*Antinomi cujusdam positiones* ;” and vol. III. 8, a sensible dissertation on reading the Law of *Moses*.

¹⁴ See his Works, vol. I. p. 442. Lib. I. de *Heresibus*.

¹⁵ Works, vol. VII. Pref. to Letter contra *Sabbatarios*.

the ancient patriarchs like the modern Jewish usurers; and III. that one of these monks had said, that, so long as he had any brains, he never could believe that Christians received their religion from *Jews*.

*Paul Crellius*¹ and John *Maclaurin*² seem to have been in the same way of thinking with John Agricola.

But, when Martin Luther himself is called an Antinomian, the *Law*, that is, the Law of *Moses*, has properly no concern in the matter; so, at least, I conceive: he is called so because he depreciated “the *works of the law*”³, in order to give greater authority to his favourite doctrine of justification by *faith*. Now, though in the expression, “the works of the law,” the word law may sometimes signify the law of nature, and sometimes the Law of Moses, yet that makes no difference in the present case. It is merely as *works* that Luther depreciates the works of the law—as opposed to *faith*. And indeed that may be St. Paul’s sense of “law,” when he⁴ says, that no flesh 41 justified by the works of the law. If he spoke to *Jews*, he must mean *their* works, if to *Gentiles*, theirs—their obedience to their laws, respectively. But, as the eleventh Article is upon justification, we need only observe here, that, when Luther rebukes men as Antinomians, they are of that sort which belongs to this Article; when he himself is ranked amongst Antinomians, they are of the sort which is to be considered under the eleventh⁵ Article.

The next of the illiterate sects, which we shall have occasion to take notice of, is that of the *Anabaptists*. That the compilers of this Article had them in view, appears from the 4th chap. *de Hæresibus* in the *Reformatio Legum*. Those here meant sprung up, probably, in Germany, in the heat of reformation. They were ignorant and furious; indulged any fancy that happened to arise in their minds from a literal and barbarous interpretation of Scripture; and by that means were a great disgrace to the reformers, and occasioned them very great

¹ Nicholls on this Article refers to Paul Crellius’s *Book de Libertate Christianâ*; but I do not find it any where. A *speech* of his is in the Bodleian Catalogue, but not this work.

² I have, in some old papers, a remark, that this author, John Maclaurin, in a Sermon on Gal. vi. 14, (vol. II. p. 97,) has a notion like that of Marcion, that the Gospel could not come from that

Being who made this world. But I do not remember where I saw the book; and now I cannot find it (1790). However, I have no doubt but there is such a book.

³ Rom. ii. 20, and ix. 32. Gal. ii. 16.

⁴ Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16.

⁵ These sorts of Antinomianism approach nearer to each other, when seen in one point of view. See afterwards, sect. 7.

III. trouble. We shall often have to mention their weak notions in treating of our Articles. Whether Pacimontanus was the first of them, as Hosius⁶ says—or Stork, Stubner, and Muncer⁷, should be considered as their founders, is a matter of no consequence. The source is too obscure and foul for us to take much pains in tracing it out. *Sleidan* has written an history
 42 of them, which is translated into English by Bohun⁸. But we must not be surprised if we meet with some inconsistencies; nor must we think accounts false for that reason. Those who declared against all war, engaged in a war particularly furious and bloody, which was called the rustic war⁹, or the war of the peasants. They might indeed be oppressed; but who, even amongst those that allow the lawfulness of war, justifies it except on principles of self-defence? Neither must we be surprised if we find some writers speaking of them as of *two* sorts¹⁰; others¹¹, as of twelve or thirteen, or still more. The name of Anabaptists came from baptizing adults, or from baptizing *àvâ*, over again, those who were converts to their sect, and had only been baptized in infancy: yet, what would be more striking, was their notion of Christian *liberty*—of that liberty with which Christ had made them free; and their idea of that “yoke of bondage¹²,” with which they ought not again to be entangled. They not only thought that they ought to throw off the yoke of *Mosaic* bondage, but of all *civil* government, and *law*: yet, as they could not act together without some sort of government, they got possession of the city of *Munster*, and called it the *New Jerusalem*. Some of them did, moreover, indulge fancies
 43 concerning the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation¹³. Those who came over to England were all cruelly used, though perhaps lawfully; and two were actually burnt in 1575. Indeed, Joan¹⁴ of Kent also, who had suffered before, in 1549, might perhaps rightly be called an Anabaptist. Their notions concerning *magistrates, war, property, oaths, law-suits*, will

⁶ Hosii Opera, vol. i. p. 431.

⁷ Mosheim says, these were leaders of the *factious* Anabaptists: cent. xvi. 3. ii. 3, 4; but he conceives a sort of embryo Anabaptists before the Reformation.

⁸ A good short account of the German Anabaptists—in Wall’s Inf. Bapt. p. 414, Quarto; or Part II. chap. viii. sect. 4.

⁹ In 1525.

¹⁰ Neal’s Hist. Pur. Index, Anabaptists.

¹¹ Bullinger *contra Anabaptistas*, L. ii. cap. 12. (Bullinger died in 1575.) See

a treatise against Socinianism by Dr. *Cheynell*, p. 56; Dr. Cheynell was a Presbyterian Bigot, preferred by Parliament in 1647: Lady Margaret’s Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Head of St. John’s College there. Some mention of him may be found by the Index, in Neal’s History of the Puritans.

¹² Gal. v. l.

¹³ Art. ii. sect. 13.

¹⁴ Hume, Edw. VI. chap. i. end. Fuller, in the Diurnal of Edw. VI. Book VII. p. 398.

occur hereafter¹. In some things they revived *Pelagian*² III. notions.

The modern *Baptists* wish to be considered as perfectly distinct from these Anabaptists: no wonder.

It may not be improper here to mention that sect who called themselves the *Family of Love*; and who were, by others, sometimes called *Familists*. They were *Mystics*³, (I call every one a *mystic* who professes to know how he is inwardly taught of God); their founder, *Henry Nicolas*, a Dutchman, who taught in his own country about 1550⁴, and afterwards came over into England. That mystics in general were considerable, about the time of the Reformation, appears from the 19th Article of Edward VI., and from the *Reformatio Legum*⁵. And in 1579 the Family of Love were important enough to produce a proclamation⁶; and a test tendered by privy counsellors. They were persecuted in a very inquisitorial manner; but such was the custom of the times. This persecution was the reason 44 why the writings of Henry Nicolas are published as the works of H. N. They thought H. N. a personage not indictable. Some mention this sect as the source of English *Quakers* and French *Quietists*; some make them the same with the *Philadelphians*, whom others state to have risen from *Jane Leadley*. But it seems to me that there have been mystics in *all ages*; and that, when people assign a source of known sects, they only look back till they can see no farther, and then fancy they see to the *source*. How such sects spawn, it seems impossible to discern minutely. Most sects of mystics seem to have had leaders of weak intellects. *Fuller* gives⁷ an humorous account of the weakness of Henry Nicolas; and *Anthony Randall* shews his own weakness in that declaration for which he was deprived of his preferment⁸. The vicious perversions of the doctrine of *grace*, which this sect ran into, must be mentioned hereafter: we observe now only what relates to setting aside the Law of Moses; they do not reason, like the Manicheans, on the contrariety of the Old to the New Testament, but they effect the same end—they *repudiate*⁹ the Old by *spiritualizing* and alle-

¹ Under Articles xxxvii, xxxviii, and xxxix.

² Ridley's Life, p. 344. Compare Wall's Infant Baptism, chap. xix.

³ See Book III. chap. xv. sect. 11.

⁴ Fuller, Book IX. p. 112.

⁵ *De Hæresibus*, cap. iii.

⁶ See Sparrow's Collection, p. 171.

Fuller's Hist. p. 113, Book IX.

⁷ Book IX. p. 112.

⁸ Strype's Whitgift, Append. p. 93. He would own no *sacraments of divine authority*, because the *word sacrament* is not in Scripture.

⁹ *Non est repudiandum (vetus Test.) sed retinendum*, &c. Art. vi. of 1552.

III. gorizing¹⁰. *Woolston* used to do the same, but with more learning and ingenuity¹¹. This is not to leave what *we* call the *Law*; though we shall have to make a remark¹² seemingly contradictory, with regard to the ceremonial part of the Law of
 45 *Moses*. But whoever allegorized away the part which we think is still of importance, and established that part which we think ought to “vanish away¹³,” might be properly enough said to repudiate what we conceive to be the *Old Law*. And such persons seem to require some mention in this place. The *Doctrina*¹⁴, &c. published in 1617, mentions the *Mennonites* as troublesome at the time of the Reformation: they are not so remote from these Familists, as to require a separate consideration. The *Libertini* seem to have been of the wilder sort of Antinomians.

We may here, by the way, observe, that Bishop *Burnet* seems scarcely accurate in saying¹⁵, that this whole Article was formed against the *Antinomians*. It can certainly affect no sort of Antinomians but those who reject the Law of *Moses*—not those who only have too high notions of the efficacy of *faith*: and how can that part be against them which blames the *retaining* a portion of the Mosaic Law; I mean the ceremonial part? Then, it seems clear, from the *Reformatio Legum*, that the Article was made against *Anabaptists*, in some measure: perhaps Bishop *Burnet* might say that *Anabaptists* were Antinomians; and *Fuller*¹⁶ owns, that it is hard to “banke, and bound their several absurdities.” Yet I think Bishop *Burnet* mentions, in the body of his Exposition¹⁷, some enthusiasts as aimed at, whom he would not call Antinomians in any sense relating to the *Jewish Law*. But in truth it is a matter of consequence
 46 *in itself*, to point out both the *connection* and the *difference* between the Old and New Testament; and not only a matter of consequence, but of nicety; and one which a variety of notions has given occasion to explain. *Martin Luther* is very careful to explain it¹⁸.

This nicety might perhaps be the reason why some illiterate sects might reject the old Law totally. That would be the

¹⁰ See *Luther's Works*, vol. III. beginning of Preface.

¹¹ See Book I. chap. xvi. sect. 7.

¹² Sect. 5 of this Article.

¹³ Heb. viii. 13.

¹⁴ P. 19. *Jewel's Apology*. Also Book IV. *Introd.* sect. 6.

¹⁵ *Burnet*, Art. vii. opening. *Nicholls* commends *Burnet's* notion.

¹⁶ *Fuller*, Book IX. p. 113.

¹⁷ Pp. 96, 97, fol.; p. 120, octavo.

¹⁸ Vol. III. fol. beginning. *Quomodo Libri Mosis legendi sunt*.

natural consequence, if they thought rejecting it wholly was a III. less evil than retaining it wholly; and were unable to adjust the degree and manner in which part of it might vanish away, whilst the rest remained in force. Such persons would find the Epistle to the *Galatians* very obscure; (if it did not seem to require the rejecting of the Law:) so indeed might the generality of us, if we had not had it explained by a great philosopher¹.

4. By whom has it been said "that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises?" *Promises* there certainly are in the Old Testament: some relating to *temporal* benefits, to a land flowing with milk and honey, &c.; some, which may be in a degree *ambiguous*, or which may denote worldly prosperity in a *primary* sense, and spiritual and eternal blessings in a *secondary* sense. (See Gal. iii. 14, &c. to the end. Luther, vol. III. fol. 8.) And any thing in the divine *dispensations* may be deemed a *promise* which excites a reasonable *expectation*. How have these promises been understood? by some, we hold, in a sense too confined and *worldly*. The framers of our Article might have in view the *Jews*, many of whom, even though they expected a *Messiah*, expected him not as the Lord of an *eternal* life—especially the *Sadducees*; but, in composing the Article, attention would be chiefly fixed on *Christians*. *Calvin*, in his *Institutes*, has three chapters on this subject²; and he expressly mentions the *Anabaptists*³ as his adversaries, and *Servede* in particular;—and as making it *necessary* for him to write upon it. 47

If I understand their notion rightly, they tried to magnify the goodness of God by saying, that though he would freely give us an heaven through Christ, yet that he still *need* not—he was not *bound* to do so by any *promise*. Promises he had *made*, to be sure, but they were *fulfilled* by the *coming* of Christ. He had promised us *Christianity*, and he had given us it; so there was an end of that matter: what remained would come from gratuitous goodness, not from mere justice—it would be a free *gift*, not a payment of a *debt*. Thus, according to the notion of these men, the *promises* made by

¹ Mr. Locke.

² Calvin, Inst. Lib. II. cap. ix, x, xi.

³ Vide cap. ix. sect. 3; cap. x. sect. 1,

7. "Magnitudinem gratiæ Christi ex-

tollere vult." Cap. ix. sect. 3—(all in Lib. II.) The *Servetiani* are one set of Christians against whom our Articles are said to have been compiled. See *Doctrina, &c. Ecclesiæ Angl.* Lond. 1617.

III. God to the patriarchs were only *transitory* promises: they did not include *eternity*.

Calvin supported his opinion, that the promises were more than transitory, that they were *endless* in their effects, by John v. 24, or 1 John iii. 14; which made it look like the doctrine of *assurance* of future happiness, or as if it were thought that the heavenly state was already *begun*: but he says also, that the same persons held that God blessed the *Israelites* only as *animals*⁴. One would think the error described was *recent* at the time of the Reformation, because Calvin speaks of it⁵ as
48 arising from what he himself had said, that Christ had finished all his work. It is wrong, he says, to conclude, from what I said, that we are not to live in *hope*; that, because an offer is completed, the benefit of that offer is immediately enjoyed.

It seems as if those, whom Calvin opposes, had dwelt *generally* upon the opinion, that the promises of the Old Testament were temporary, and that the purpose of such promises was to make the Jews expect *temporal* rewards; and it is not improbable that Calvin's opponents set up the notion just now mentioned, by way of *persisting*, when they were pressed with arguments proving that Christianity had been promised. On all accounts, it became proper for Calvin to shew that a future state appears from the *Old Testament*. As *Patres*, he mentions *Adam*, *Abel*, *Noe*; and he says, that a future state might be collected from the death of *Abel*. *Abraham* was always panting after a future state. He mentions *Isaac* and *Jacob* with a reference to Heb. xi. 9⁶. He says *Balaam* foresaw a future state, as did *David*; *Job* also, and the later prophets. *Luther* also enumerates⁷ *promises* made to *Adam*, *Abraham*, and *Moses*.

*Acontius*⁸ was in England about the time when our Articles were published, and dedicated a book to Queen Elizabeth. He came from Trent, and was looked upon as a favourer of Socinianism, and as coming between *Lælius Socinus* and his nephew *Faustus*. He is represented⁹ as leaving it doubtful whether *Abraham* believed in Christ.

⁴ As hogs—fatted them well. Cap. x. sect. 1. In sect. 23, there is mention of wealth, power, a number of children, as well as of the belly and the flesh.

⁵ Lib. II. cap. ix. sect. 3.

⁶ See Clem. Rom. 1st Ep. sect. 31; in Wake's transl. p. 24.

⁷ Vol. III. beginning.

⁸ I do not see *Acontius* in Strype's Parker, or Grindal: he is in Ladvoat. His book seems uninteresting. I suppose, as Cheynell says, he was afraid of speaking out; which might give a dryness and insipidity to his style.

⁹ See Cheynell against Socinianism, p. 38.

5. Have any Christians ever held that the *ceremonial* Law III. of Moses continues in force under the Christian dispensation. 49

The very early *Jewish sects* of Christians did this; but of them we have spoken before¹.

And² it seems clear that there were some who did the same at the time of the *Reformation*, from the latter part of the same chapter of the *Reformatio Legum*, to which we have already referred³.

The book of the *Familists*, called *Evangelium Regni*, mentioned in Queen Elizabeth's proclamation, is said to hold the same⁴ doctrine: and this sect may be meant in the law *de Hæresibus*.

Bishop *Burnet*⁵ thinks that only *Jews* are here to be disputed with: surely we have proved¹ the contrary;—we may perhaps add the *Schoolmen*⁶, who, according to Bishop *Burnet*'s⁷ own account, said the Levitical Law was perpetual. How fully persuaded the Jews of later ages were of the eternity 50 of their whole Law, may be seen in *Maimonides*⁸.

Martin Luther writes to *Sabbatarians*. And *Strype* speaks of “a *Jewish* sabbath-keeping,” in 1595, in consequence of Dr. *Bound's* Sermon; but it appears from Fuller's History⁹, that *Jewish* is no more than a declamatory expression for very *strict*. However, there have been *Sabbatarians* (Christians I mean) who have kept the Jewish Sabbath, and on the Saturday¹⁰. In Fuller, Book II. p. 144, &c., there are three columns, expressing the two extremes, of *Sabbatarians* and *Anti-Sabbatarians*, and the mean: whence it appears, that in 1633 there

¹ Appendix to Book I. sect. 21, 22.

² There seem to have been doubts amongst Christians how far particular rules were *Jewish*, and how far *Christian*, moral, perpetual. *Oaths* have been rejected by some great Christian fathers, as allowed to Jews, not to Christians. See Art. xxxvii. sect. 5; and Barclay's Apology.

³ *De Hæresibus*, cap. 4.

⁴ Rogers on this Article.

⁵ On the Article, p. 125.

⁶ Mosheim, cent. xvi. l. iii. 11. Mac-laine's note, referring to *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, and Hume. See *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 30. Henry the Eighth's scruples about marrying his brother Arthur's widow.

⁷ Here is an ambiguity: the *Schoolmen* might retain the Levitical Law; but retain it not as *ceremonial*, but as *moral*. *Maclaine* on Mosheim speaks more than *Burnet*, as if they retained it *though ceremonial*. In the case of Henry VIII., Lev. xx. 21, should not be reckoned more valid than Deut. xxv. 5, merely as *Levitical*. Prince Arthur left no child—was only 16 years old.

⁸ On the 10th chapter of the part of the *Misna* called *Sanhedrin*. *Fundamentum nonum*, p. 175, *Pocock*. In *Surenhusius*, at the end of *Sanhedrin*. But see *Bishop Chandler*, p. 270, about the older Jews.

⁹ Book IX. p. 227.

¹⁰ See *Chamber's Dictionary*. *Sabbatarians*.

III. were some perfect Sabbatarians. *Heylin's* History of the Sabbath would give more information, if wanted; and shew what very different notions have been held about it. Some ancient Christians used to keep *Saturday* holy, in compliance with the prejudices of the Jewish converts, though they kept *Sunday* as sacred¹¹ also.

6. Has it been affirmed that the *civil* law of Moses is binding upon Christians?

51 In answer, we might again refer to the early judaizing Christians, and, I think, to our *Reformatio*¹² *Legum*; but we had better go on to something peculiar. The reformed ministers soon after the Reformation were intent upon reforming *states*¹³ upon *Jewish* ideas; and our *civil*¹⁴ *wars* shew many instances of such a turn. Dr. Balguy expresses this folly well, near the beginning of his sixth Discourse.

The *Brownists* might be mentioned here, a species of *Puritans* under one *Robert Brown*¹⁵:—not that I know their notions exactly; but I have imagined, that, looking on the Mosaic constitution as divine, and therefore perfect, they wished to adopt as much of it as possible in church and state. *Strype* has preserved¹⁶ a letter from this Robert Brown to the Lord Treasurer¹⁷; from which it appears, that he thought the Scriptures, as being *divine* and therefore *perfect*, the proper source of instruction in all *arts and sciences*¹⁸. We have
52 already mentioned the *Anabaptists* of Germany, as setting up a

¹¹ See Bingham, Book XX. chap. iii.; but see also Lardner's Works, vol. iv. p. 343, and a little before. *Tertullian* is indignant about Christians keeping the *Sabbath*: i. e. Saturday. Bingham's authorities are none of them very early, though he might think the *Constitutions* were so.

¹² In the title of cap. 4, *de Hæresibus*, we have, "aut *totum* exigunt," (vetus testamentum): circumcision might be the *instance*, as what was the least likely to be retained.

¹³ See Warb. Alliance, p. 46, Book I. ch. iv. fifthly. ¹⁴ Book I. chap. xi. sect. 2.

¹⁵ He is sometimes said to be of *Northampton*, but he had only the living of *Achurch* in the county, after he had given up his own sect, in 1589. His father was a gentleman (and once Sheriff) of Rutlandshire, his mother a Boteler of Woodhall near Hatfield, in the county of Hertford. His return to the Church has

a look of great inconsistency, as he had been particularly strenuous in declaring the Church of England sinful, and I think, idolatrous. He was probably a weak man in intellect, at the same time that he was strong in passion; turbulent and ungovernable. At last he was committed to Northampton jail, for striking a constable, and died there, aged 80. A. D. 1630. See *Strype's* Whitgift.

¹⁶ Life of Whitgift, Appendix to Book III. No. 45.

¹⁷ Chancellor of the University of Cambridge from 1557 to 1593. Lord Burleigh, Robert Cecil, was a relation of Brown's, and got him preferment. See Neal, and *Strype*, and Fuller.

¹⁸ Neal makes the *Brownists* to be only strict Puritans, refusing all communion with the Church of England; but this letter makes the preceding notion probable. It is not *dated*, but by the History, it seems to have been written in 1589.

new *Jerusalem*, in which, probably, some Jewish civil laws III. would be adopted; and *Luther*, in his discourse on the right manner of reading¹ the Law of Moses, mentions “quosdam imperitos et phanaticos spiritus,” &c., who said, that *we* ought to conform to the Jewish *polity*; and afterwards² he calls them “indocti, and decepti *κακοζήλῳ*,” and at the same time tells us how they reason.

Civil laws against *usury* will be mentioned by and by.

7. Have Christians ever been considered as free from the obligation of the *moral* Law of Moses? The answer may be given in the affirmative, merely from what has gone before; because those who are for setting aside the *whole* Law, must be for setting aside the moral part of it. But, before we proceed farther, it may be proper to settle what is *meant* by the moral law: the *Decalogue*? or that part which enjoins what is *right*³ in itself? If the Decalogue, are we not obliged to keep our⁴ *Sabbath* on the Saturday, and observe a very great strictness of rest? If what is right in itself, is not the proposition, we ought to keep the moral Law of Moses, *identical*? as if we said, ‘we are obliged to that, which is universally obligatory.’ But this difficulty is rather overcharged; because the Decalogue may be binding in *substance*, though not wholly so as to *circumstances*⁵. And it is not an *identical* proposition to say, 53 that whatever rules of conduct in the Law of Moses are calculated to promote the good of *mankind* at large, as much as that of a people situated like the *Jews*, those rules have the sanction of *Revelation*: and, where the rules are such as have been established by *reason* and experience, it may be said that the duties of morality are confirmed from *heaven*⁶. *Luther* rejoices in such a confirmation⁷.

¹ In this work, only every other page is marked: this passage is opposite fol. 7. vol. III. beginning.

² Opposite fol. 9. Also fol. 9, he says, there must be confusion and sects if the unlearned *will* cry out to the common people, “Hoc Dei verbum, Dei mandatum est.”

³ Ephes. vi. 1.

⁴ Something of this, Book I. chap. xi.

⁵ We are always supposed to be able to distinguish between the invariable *essence* of a law, and the variable *circumstances* in which it may be executed; as in the law of *condescension* executed by our Lord in *washing* his disciples’ feet. Other instances occur, Book I. chap. xi.

⁶ The Assembly’s larger Catechism, approved by the presbyterian parliament in England, and by Scotland, has a pretty enlarged definition of the *Lex moralis*; and affirms, that the moral law may be looked upon as briefly comprehended in the Decalogue, if we take in what is *implied*, as prohibitions, threats, &c. The two Catechisms of the *Assembly* were confirmed by parliament, but it was by the parliament of 1647: however, King Charles I. offered reluctantly to licence the smaller. See Neal, Index, *Catechism*.

⁷ *Lardner* says, on another subject, “though a thing be in itself reasonable, and highly expedient, yet there is nothing

III. But, though clearing up ideas may be *useful* to us, it does not seem absolutely necessary for our historical account. The distinction between the Decalogue and the moral Law is in fact much overlooked; and our Article does not make it necessary. Martin Luther speaks⁸ of the Decalogue as if it was not binding *as* Decalogue, though we are under obligation to do every thing which it enjoins. On the other hand, the *Assembly of Divines* met at Westminster in 1643, in their 7th Article revised,
 54 have these words, “By the moral Law we understand all the *ten* commandments taken in their full extent⁹.” And the same seems to be implied in our Latin Article by the *parenthesis*: “*obedientia mandatorum (quæ moralia vocantur).*” This parenthesis makes the *mandata* seem to mean ‘the¹⁰ *commandments*’ in the popular sense; but by what authority it is placed, I do not at present¹¹ know. Bishop *Burnet* mentions the ten commandments as the moral Law; but seems to look beyond them.

If it be asked what is the *right* idea of the moral Law of Moses? we, answer there need be no difficulty about it. Our Article gives no definition of it: every one therefore may use his own sense. And, if we are bound to obey every thing enjoined in the Law of Moses, which is for the general good of mankind (as we certainly are,) what does it signify whether it is in the Decalogue or not? No one conceives the moral Law of Moses to be the whole of morality. But we shall have occasion to mention the Decalogue again. Our business now is *history*.

The *Antinomians*, followers of *Agricola*, whom Martin Luther rebukes, being those who wished to set aside the *whole*¹² Law, did not need to be here mentioned again as setting aside the moral part of it, were it not for introducing the sentiments of *Agricola* with regard to the *Decalogue*. These are not easy
 55 to clear up; but *Mosheim* seems to have succeeded as well as might be expected in laying them together: to him¹³ therefore

that so effectually puts objections to silence as a divine precept or precedent.” Works, vol. 11. p. 240.

⁸ In Preface to vol. 111. fol. 2, p. 2; see also fol. 7, p. 2; (only every *other* page, or only every *leaf*, is numbered in Luther’s Works).

⁹ See Articles of England revised in 1643 by Assembly of Divines; in Appendix to Neal’s Hist. Puritans. See also Advice of the Assembly to Parlia-

ment, chap. xix.; and *Doctrina*, &c. p. 80.

¹⁰ There are three words in the Article, *law, precepts, commandments*; the two first are set aside, the last retained.

¹¹ Bennett gives this parenthesis, and mentions some copies which have two *commas* instead of it.

¹² Luther’s Works, vol. 1. fol. 400, p. 2.

¹³ Mosheim, cent. xvi, sect. 3. Part 11. chap. i. sect. 26.

I will refer. Only adding, that possibly Luther's idea of the III. Decalogue¹, as such, might help Agricola forward; though Luther blames him and others for setting aside the Law of Moses at large, in *order* to free themselves from the moral Law in particular.

In this point of view, the Antinomians whom Luther blames seem most nearly connected with those of which Luther himself is reckoned one; and the sorts seem to differ rather in *degree* than in *kind*, when we observe them lowering the value and authority of *any* Law in order to get rid of obligations to *good works*.

It may be worth our while here to read a case, which is mentioned by *Strype* in his *Life*² of *Whitgift*, and afterwards more succinctly in his *Annals*³. Though Luther would undoubtedly have blamed the Antinomians or Libertines mentioned in this case, yet it seems as if his own principles, followed on to a great length, might have led into the error of rejecting the moral Law of Moses. If any Antinomians wanted to settle the maxim, that a man who has true Christian *faith*, cannot sin, they would have to combat the authority of the *Decalogue*; and, in the heat of battle, would make the fiercest attacks upon it they were able.

We may place here, as well as any where, the notion of the *Familists*, "that as many as receive Jesus Christ and his doctrine, do fulfil and keep and do all the *moral* Law given by God to *Moses*⁴:" this seems nearly related to the notion of the later Antinomians. The words quoted are part of the assertions made and signed by Anthony Randall⁵, for which he was deprived by the Bishop of Exeter, in 1581, of the rectory of Lydford.

The *Anabaptists* have⁶ also been here mentioned as aiming to set aside the *whole* Law; it may therefore seem that they need not be mentioned again, as desirous to set aside a *part* of it: nevertheless, their *morals* seem to deserve particular mention. *Steidan* gives an account of a man who cut off his brother's head, in the presence of their father and mother, and persuaded them that God had commanded him to do so⁷. Those who had to defend such an action must have frequent occasion to

¹ Conc. Trent. Sess. 6. Canon 19.

² Page 75. ³ Vol. 11. p. 451.

⁴ Perhaps a good Christian *would*, as such, obey all the ten commandments; but yet it does not seem right to deny all

authority to the Decalogue.

⁵ *Strype's Whitgift*, Appendix to third Book, No. 23.

⁶ *Reform. Legum, de Hæc. cap. 4.*

⁷ At San-gall in Switzerland, p. 116.

III. disclaim the authority of the sixth commandment. In the same history, we find accounts of the Anabaptists allowing of *polygamy*, which is an offence against the seventh commandment. Their king puts one of his queens to death with his own hand, as he does a prisoner of war, with great coolness; representing him as being guilty equally with *Judas*.

Mr. William *Chillingworth*, celebrated as a logical⁸ reasoner, mathematician, and accidentally as an engineer, refused to subscribe to our 39 Articles—for one reason, because he did not believe the *morality* of the fourth *commandment*⁹. Yet
57 our Article requires no assent to the morality of the Decalogue in every circumstance. Any part of it, which is not strictly moral, might be set aside as ceremonial. If this great man allowed that periodical intervals of rest, and periodical exercises of moral and religious sentiments, are for the general good of mankind, he needed not to have scrupled arbitrary modes of promoting these ends in particular cases; any more than he needed to question the morality of the fifth commandment, of giving honour to *parents*, because the reward proposed to obedience is *length of days* in a particular country.

But *Chillingworth* seems to rank with *Whiston* and *Woolston*: we may add *Cheynell*, in another way:—men of great intellectual abilities and attainments, overheated by wrong methods of pursuing religious knowledge.

8. From the history of this seventh Article, we pass to what may be called the *explanation*; the intention of which is, so to *arrange* the matter contained in it, that we need not prove any unnecessary propositions; and that those which we do prove may be as clear and unembarrassed as possible.

Indeed, our present subject is one which will employ our most extensive acquaintance with things divine, and require our best discretion in the management of it. In other subjects, men are different in having different feelings, and in choosing different points of view; but here, difference consists chiefly in degrees of solid, useful *knowledge*. God hath spoken to man at sundry times and in divers manners. All the dispensations of Heaven are to be contemplated together; and the suitability of each to the circumstances in which it was given, is to be taken into consideration. With regard to the *Mosaic Law*

⁸ See Neal, Index. In Biogr. Britanica there is a life of him.

⁹ This expression is in Neal; who also says, in another place, that the Assembly

of Divines had been blamed for allowing in their Confession “the morality of the Sabbath.”

in particular, it should be seen how it suited the times in which III. it was published, how all after times—how the Jews, how all 58 mankind. To repeal a Law of God by the reason of man, is a solemn and awful thing: what but the fear of retaining what was intended to be removed, could possibly make any one venture upon it? But to proceed to our business of simplifying.

1. Though the first proposition of our Article, “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New,” seems as if it would bring on a comparison of the *whole* of both, yet, since the *reason* assigned is, that both teach *everlasting life through Christ*, they need be compared in nothing else.

2. In order to shew that the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, with regard to eternal happiness through Christ, we need not examine them *both*. There can be no doubt as to the New; we need therefore only examine the *Old*; and see whether in *any* sense it can be said to offer mankind everlasting happiness through the medium of Christianity.

3. As Christ has clearly brought life and immortality to light, if we prove that the Old Testament *promises Christianity*—that Christianity which we profess—it must follow that it promises also immortality, or “everlasting life.”

4. But, though we are only to examine the *Old Testament*, yet it must not be thought that we need prove from the *Old Testament* that Christ is the only *Mediator*; we only affirm, in a kind of parenthesis, that he is so. Moses was¹ a kind of Mediator, but it cannot be said that he *is* one: nor indeed could he ever be properly called a mediator between God and *man*, or even between God and the seed² of Abraham; but only between God and one particular *nation*.

5. When we say that the *Jewish Scriptures offered* to 59 mankind everlasting life by Christ, we must not be supposed to affirm precisely who *accepted* or even *understood* this offer. An offer is often made when it is not accepted, or even understood, for want of due attention. It is no way necessary that the *Jewish people* should understand every thing that is offered through their Scriptures to *mankind* at large. It is the *Christian* who is to determine whether *he* can see, with the help of both Old and *New Testament*, that everlasting life through Christ was intimated to *mankind* under the *old* dispensation.

6. Lastly, It is not affirmed in this Article that a future state is announced in the dispensation of *Moses*, strictly so

¹ Lev. xxvi. 46. Deut. v. 5.

² See Mr. Locke on Gal. iii. 20.

III. called. If everlasting life by Christ is announced to mankind in *any part* of the Old Testament, that is sufficient. As it is the opinion supported in that masterly work, the *Divine Legation* of Moses, that *Moses* does not offer more than *temporal* rewards to the Jewish *people*, it seems proper to observe that such an opinion is *not inconsistent* with our Article. This Bishop Warburton hath himself proved³. Many of the Jewish *prophets*, as well as the *patriarchs before* the Mosaic Dispensation, nay *Moses* himself, might believe in Christ, and yet the *people* under him might only be *governed* by rewards and punishments of a temporal nature. *David*⁴ lived 500 years *after* Moses, and the *prophets* considerably later, down to 430 years before Christ. During these 500 years the doctrine of a future state was *dawning*; and about 150⁵ years before Christ

60 Bishop Warburton owns that the doctrine of a *future state* was a *national* doctrine amongst the Jews.

Bishop Warburton has observed a difference between saying, the Old Testament is "*not contrary*" to the New, and saying, the Old Testament is "*the same*" with the New; namely, in the manner of proposing eternal life through Christ. Two different parts of *one plan* may be very *different*, but cannot be *contrary*. Chrysostom seems to have had the same feeling when he says, διαφορά μόνον ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων, οὐ μάχη, οὐδὲ ἐναντίωσις· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ἐκ τοῦ καινοῦ γίνεται παλαιόν. Hom. 56. edit. Sav. tom. v. p. 376, cited by Nicholls on the Articles.

It may seem strange that the omission of the sanctions of futurity should afford an argument in favour of the Divine Legation of Moses; but suppose a person to assume the character of a lawgiver, and to profess that he would undertake to reward every one, immediately, exactly in proportion to his good conduct, with all the good things of the present world,

³ See Div. Leg. Index, "*Article.*"

⁴ Div. Leg. 8vo, vol. iv. p. 199.

⁵ Creation about 4000 before Christ—Abraham about 2000—Moses about 1500—David about 1000. Prophets (Jonah and Hosea) about 800. *Isaiah* began about when Rome was built, 753 A. Chr.—Daniel about 550—Malachi about 430, end of Old Testament—Maccabees began about 150.

I have found it convenient to reduce the principal eras prior to the Christian

era into the above numbers. The regularity of the divisions of time not only assists the memory, but strikes the mind as exhibiting a regularity of plan in Divine Providence. Neither does it seem materially inaccurate to conceive the time of Abraham as dividing the whole duration before the coming of Christ into two equal parts; the time of *David* as dividing the duration between Abraham and Christ into two equal parts: and so on.

health, long life, pleasure, riches, honours; we should say, no III. human power can do this; he who can act up to such pretensions must have some supernatural influence. How could he *know* men's merits with exactness? how could he provide the *means* of rewarding them? how could he stop the ravages of the earthquake, fire, lightning, inundation? of the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the sickness that destroyeth at 61 noon-day? And if, besides his power, he shewed a *propriety* in what he did—shewed that his plan was part of a wise and comprehensive *scheme* to communicate happiness to a great distance, of place or time—certainly our belief in the truth of his pretensions would be much more strong. We should perceive that such an one had a much more difficult task than one who had only to *tell* his disciples, that if they would adhere to him they should be rewarded *hereafter*.

9. From explanation we proceed to *proof*. And here our first proposition is, properly, “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New:” but, by what has been said in the explanation, this proposition is equivalent to the following—“everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ” in the Old Testament. This proposition might be proved by declarations of the Old Testament, as well as by the types of futurity there mentioned. But, with regard to types, they were treated in the first¹ Book; and, in our reading of Bishop Pearson on the Creed², we find no part of our Saviour's history which is not shewn to have been presignified by them:—and, with regard to declarations, promises, predictions, perhaps we may as well take them into our proof of the next proposition, concerning the actual expectation of the most eminent Jews; for though it is one thing to shew that the Old Testament *does* offer to mankind through Christ everlasting life, and another, that the leading Jews or patriarchs understood such offer, and founded expectations upon it—yet, as every proof of the offer must afford some argument for its being acknowledged, we may as well 62 incorporate the proofs of the two propositions together.

10. Our *second proposition* then is, “The Old Fathers did” not “look only for *transitory promises*.” Who are meant by the “old Fathers” here, has been already³ shewn from the Institutes of Calvin⁴.

¹ Chap. xvii. sect. 18.

² See Advertisement to the printed Syllabus, or Heads of Lectures, 1st, 2d,

and 3d editions.

³ Sect. 4.

⁴ “That great man.” Lard. vol. 11. p. 241.

III. We are first to give some account of the *promises* which were made under the Old Testament; and secondly, of the *expectations* which those promises raised in the Jewish Fathers⁵.

First the *promises* made.—Gen. iii. 15, has been, in all times, considered as a promise of the *Messiah*, though one to be particularly understood only by future ages. The Scripture may be considered as referring to it when the Serpent, or Draco, is spoken of (Rev. xii. 9) as having the qualities of the evil Spirit or Satan. But to keep to the Old Testament; we have a series of promises made to *Abraham*, and relating to his posterity. One on the *calling* of Abraham, Gen. xii. 3. One on appointment of *circumcision* as a *seal* of the covenant, Gen. xvii.; which is accompanied with the first promise that *Sarah* shall bear a child. Another on the dismissal of *Ishmael*, Gen. xxi. 12. Another on the sacrifice of *Isaac*, Gen. xxii. 18. These were all made to Abraham *himself*. Afterwards there was a *renewal*, to *Isaac*, Gen. xxvi. 24; and another to *Jacob*, Gen. xxviii. 14. To which we may add, Jacob's dying *benediction*, Gen. xlix. 10.

These, with *Balaam's παραβολή*, Numb. xxiv. 17, and the prediction of *Moses*, Deut. xviii. 15, may constitute a *class*; as occurring occasionally in the *historical* books of the Old Testament.

This class of declarations will scarcely fail to have an effect upon us, who have seen the coming of the *Messiah*, whatever effect they might have on the Jews.

Another class of declarations may consist of the prophetic *Psalms*, the 2d, 16th, 22d, 45th, 102d, 110th, &c.; and of those books which are more commonly acknowledged to be prophetic. To enter into these predictions minutely at present, so as to get a satisfactory knowledge of them, would detain us too long. I must therefore refer to the 17th chapter of our first Book, and to our readings in Bishop Pearson. But it seems as if I should not pass over the information, which is given us in the *New Testament*, in order to assist us in our interpretation of the Old. Our Lord tells us, John v. 39, that the Old Scriptures “testify of” him; and ver. 46, that *Moses* wrote of him. Acts iii. 22, and vii. 37, refer to Deut. xviii. 15. Acts xiii. 23, interprets the promises made to the Seed of *David*; and the 32d, 33d, and following verses,

⁵ Pearson on the Creed, Article 11th, (p. 745, quarto; or p. 379, folio,) gives arguments to prove that the resurrection of the dead was revealed under the *Law*.

shew that the second and sixteenth Psalms were intended to be III. understood as prophetical. Rom. iii. 21, 22. "The Righteousness of God," is spoken of as being "witnessed by the Law and the Prophets,"—"even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of *Jesus Christ*." Gal. iii. 16, makes the Seed of Abraham to be "*Christ*." And ver. 24 informs us, that "the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto *Christ*¹." These passages being sufficient to shew the *nature* of the promises made under the old Dispensation, we may proceed to the *effect* of such promises on the *expectations* of the most eminent Jews, 64 or the "old Fathers;" observing only, in consideration of our having omitted prophecies in this place, that these passages of the *New Testament*, even without an attempt to interpret the Old, afford the *Christian* sufficient reason for believing, that "everlasting life" *is*, in the Old Testament, offered to *mankind* by *Christ*.

The *negative* form of expression used in our Article, seems to arise from the nature of the thing expressed: it *denies* "that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises." It does not affirm that they assured themselves of *eternal* life, or that they had *distinct* conceptions concerning the nature of the Dispensation to come: it seems rather to represent them as having their minds *elated*, and their views *enlarged*, by what was communicated to them—as looking forward to *something* great, noble, beneficial; something which the Divine Counsels had prepared for mankind, some august and awful though benevolent plans, to which they had not for a moment the presumption of conceiving any *limit*.

That these eminent men, to whom the promises were made, should have some idea of their completion, is what I find myself much more inclined to believe than the contrary;—and that is enough for our Article. Are *we*, from certain expressions, able to see that promises of life through Christ have been made, and were those to whom they were made, totally blind to the meaning of those very same expressions? The reasoning of our Article is the same as that which we now are using: "Everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ" even in the Old Testament; "*wherefore*" those who were instrumental in making the offer could not be wholly ignorant of the nature of the offer: they could not be so ignorant as to confine the bene- 65 fits of it to mere earthly luxuries. If we were to put ourselves

² Tim. iii. 15, the *old* Scriptures save through *Christ*. Here repeat Rev. xii. 9.

III. into the place of Abraham, or Moses, or David, we could not conceive it possible. Could *Abraham* receive such assurances as he did, on every great and solemn occasion, attended with so many striking circumstances, and fancy that his posterity were only to be blessed with abundance of *milk and honey*? Could *Moses* receive the Law in the manner he did, and govern the Jews as he did, and when, his mind full of the most sublime conceptions, he came to give intimations concerning futurity, mean some limited futurity, which he could discern the end of? its blessings wholly to be confined to such a life as the present? This is the less likely, in the cases of Abraham and Moses, on account of the supernatural communication which they held with the Supreme Being. Must they not *suspect*, at least, something beyond the transitory things of this life? With regard to *David* and the *Prophets*, as prophets, the case seems clearer still. Few will be inclined to consider them as foretelling mechanically things of which they had no idea; yet, if we only allow that David, and the Prophets after him, looked for *any thing* more than transitory promises, or even *suspected* any thing more, we allow enough for our Article².

66 But the authority of the *New Testament* must have the greatest weight. Therefore we will select a few passages relating to *Abraham*, *Moses*, and *David*, and then a few relating to the eminent persons of the Old Dispensation *collectively*. As to *Abraham*, John viii. 56 seems decisive; whenever it was that he saw the *day* of Christ: but I must confess that Bishop Warburton's account³ appears to me not only ingenious but probable.

Gal. iii. 8, says, that the Scripture "*preached* before (*προενηγγελισατο*) the Gospel unto *Abraham*, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." A man is always supposed to have some idea of what is *preached* to him. Abraham was *promised* Christ, Gal. iii. 16; and the reasoning in that and the 17th verse seems to me to imply that Abraham had a com-

² We might ask, how could *Balaam* apply what he utters, by force of inspiration, to mere worldly enjoyments? He might think the fate of kingdoms a very grand thing, but do not his words, by a comparison with other phrases, bear an higher import? Balak was afraid for his *dominions*; Israel (and Judah in particular, perhaps, might be intended by the *lion*) would overcome all resistance,

and get a settled government; but, if *Balaam* had meant only to express this, would his *extasies* have been needed? would his sublimity have been natural? St. Peter (2 Pet. iii. 15) calls him a *prophet*. But see Div. Leg. Index, *Balaam*.

³ See Div. Leg. Index; or Book VI. sect. 5; also Book I. chap. xvii. of this.

petent understanding of the promise and covenant made with III. him. How can any one be a party in a promise or *covenant*, without some knowledge of its nature? As to *Moses*, it is not so easy to conceive that he wrote of Christ without any idea of him, as that he had some conception of the person and character which he was describing: and this will be confirmed by comparing John v. 46 with Acts iii. 22, and vii. 37. As to *David*, the expression Acts ii. 31, is clear—"he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ." Things much to our purpose are also said of the Jewish Fathers *collectively*.—Consult Acts iii. 21, 24; Acts xiii. 32; Heb. xi. in several places; where, though some of the instances may be as late as the Maccabees, others are plainly earlier; as ver. 10, 13, 16, &c.¹

1 Pet. i. 10—12, should also be read: and lastly, as clearly 67 expressing the *gradual* display of God's will to mankind, the three last verses of the Epistle to the *Romans*.

11. Our next proposition is, that Christians are not bound to retain and obey the *ceremonial* Law of Moses. Something on this head may be deduced from the *Old Testament*, and therefore addressed to the *Jews*. Jer. xxxi. 13—37, is a wonderful prediction. In reading it, we should remark, that Jehovah (or LORD) is the proper *name* of the God of the Jews; as *Ashtoreth* was of the idol² of the *Sidonians*; or *Chemosh* of the *Moabites*. We should also remark the *internal* or spiritual nature of the new Law³; and moreover what is implied in God's being set forth as superintending the *Universe*. This prophecy seems to denote, that, at some time or other, there would be a *change*: whatever be the time, change is inconsistent with the *eternity* of the Law, of which some Jews have boasted. Indeed, some Jews have expected a new Law to take place on the coming of the Messiah⁴; but 68

¹ It may be useful to see these proofs in a small compass.

Promises made:—Gen. iii. 15, Serpent. xii. 3, Call of Abraham. xv. xvii. circumcision. xxi. 12, dismissal of Ishmael. xxii. 18, offering up of Isaac. xxvi. 3, 24, renewal to Isaac; xxviii. 14, to Jacob. xlix. 10, Jacob's benediction. Numb. xxiv. 17, Balaam. Deut. xviii. 15. ...2d Class, David and Prophets, (Isaiah, &c.). Psalms ii. xvi. xxii. xlv. cii. cx. *Prophetic Books* as usual.

Promises applied:—John v. 39, both Life and Christ. v. 46, Moses. Acts iii.

22, Moses, or vii. 37. xiii. 23, 32, 33. David. Acts xxvi. 6. Rom. iii. 21. Gal. iii. 16, 24. Rev. xii. 9.

Expectation raised:—In Abraham, John viii. 56; Rom. iv. 20; Gal. iii. 8, 16, &c...In Moses, John v. 46, with Acts iii. 22; vii. 37...In David, Acts ii. 31... In the Fathers collectively, Luke x. 24; Acts iii. 21, 24; xiii. 32; Heb. xi. 13, &c. 16; 1 Pet. i. 10—12...Conclusion, Rom. xvi. 25, 26. ² 1 Kings xi. 33.

³ See Div. Leg. vi. 6. 2.

⁴ Chandler on Proph. p. 270, as before, sect. 5.

III. others, even in early times, have flattered themselves⁵ with this eternity.

It might be intelligible to the Jews, that if their religion were the only true one, its ritual must be temporary, because those at a great distance from Judea could not conform to it: consult Exod. xxiii. 14, 17, and Deut. xvi. 16⁶. And moreover, because only the descendants of Aaron could officiate in it as *priests*. See Exod. xxviii. 1; xxix. 9; Lev. i. 5, 7, 8; Numb. xviii. 7; (with the account of the rebellion of Korah, Numb. xvi.) and 1 Chron. xxiii. 31. Can it be conceived or allowed to be impossible that *mankind* should profess the only true religion?

Extension and universality of true religion is inconsistent with the Jewish ceremonial Law; yet such extension is not only *likely* to be provided for, but even *foretold* under the Jewish dispensation itself. Read the 2d and the 110th Psalms. Isaiah ii. 2. At the conclusion of Isaiah's prophecy, it is said, that the Lord will take some persons⁷, "*for* priests and Levites:" as also, that he will make new *heavens* and new earth, which, in prophetic language, means a new scheme⁸ of government, or a new *people*. Consult also Mal. i. 11; and compare Isai. xi. 9, 10, with Heb. ii. 14. See also Dan. ix. 27, and Zeph. ii. 11. The Jewish mode of divine worship could not therefore be *perpetual*, because it could not be *universal*.

All the Jewish prophecies are authentic to Christians; but to Christians it may be proved, not only that the Jewish ceremonial Law was *intended* to be superseded, but that it is *actually* superseded by Christianity. The epistle to the Galatians was written on purpose to prove this⁹; but we will take a few passages of the New Testament separately. Gal. iii. 3, may, to Christians, serve as a kind of general principle. See also Acts xv. 24¹⁰. Gal. iii. 25; iv. 1—10.

⁵ Div. Leg. 8vo, p. 470, vol. iv; or Book VI. 6. 3.

⁶ See Lardner about St. Paul's vow, Works, vol. i. p. 209; but evasions are not to be put on the footing of Laws. Or, if it should be said, that some Jews dispensed with the Law through *necessity*, yet it cannot be conceived that cases of necessity should be more common than cases in which men could worship regularly.

⁷ Isaiah lxvi. 21, 22. *Jerusalem* is mentioned verse 20; but may it not mean

'the true or general Jerusalem?' the head place of worship, in *any* church?

⁸ See Daubuz with Lancaster, Symbolical Dictionary, p. 64, *Heaven*. Hurd, p. 195. Sermon vi, where the texts about making an universal religion are collected; as they are in Pearson on the Creed, p. 89, fol. This sense of *heavens* was mentioned in our chapter on Prophecy.

⁹ See Locke's account.

¹⁰ The more Acts xv. is studied here, the better. The four things which the

Col. ii. 16, 17, (or from ver. 11.) Heb. vii. 12; viii. 8, 13; III. x. 1.

As there has not been perhaps any *express* abrogation of 70 the ceremonial Law, Mr. Locke's three Notes on Ephes. ii. 15, might here be read to advantage.

12. The next proposition is, "the *civil* precepts" of the Mosaical Law "ought" not "of necessity to be received in any commonwealth." *Instances* of these may be seen in Exodus, chapters xxi. and xxii. It can scarce be said of these, that they are calculated to produce the greatest possible happiness of all nations, in all ages, whatever improvements may take place. Civil laws should be peculiar to each people, and should depend upon climate, situation for commerce, temper, prejudice, populousness, fertility, &c; they should impose no restraints except where probable evils are apprehended. This might be urged to *Jews*¹, in order to give them an idea, that in the natural course of things, their civil laws must lose their propriety, and therefore their force. Indeed, it is not easy to understand how they themselves can obey them, since the destruction of Jerusalem. It might moreover be urged, that the departure of the *sceptre from Judah*, and of the legislative power, was soon foretold²; and that the cities appointed for refuge³ have no longer any being.

To *Christians* this will have still more weight, as they are more enlarged in their notions. It is indeed so clear, that the Apostles seem to take it for granted. Compare Acts xxv. 9, 10, 25, with Deut. xvii. 8. See also Rom. xiii. 1, &c. and Tit. iii. 1. These relate to St. *Paul*, who offers prudential

council of Jerusalem request the *Gentile* converts to abstain from, are not wrong or *immoral* in themselves, but such as would particularly hurt the *Jewish* converts, and perhaps bring the *Gentile* converts into some danger and difficulty. The *Jewish* converts would be much shocked to see the *Gentile* Christians eat *blood*, or things *strangled*, or partake of *feasts* on heathen sacrifices. While the *Gentile* Christians used their liberty in these things, it seemed impossible for them and the *Jewish* Christians to coalesce—to become one family or fraternity. As to the *fornication* here meant, it is not the *vice* commonly called by that name, nor any *vice*; it seems, by Scripture language, to be something some way con-

nected with *idolatry*. Lardner thinks it may be making *alliances* with idolaters. He has many texts which favour him: 1 Cor. v. 1, has not caught my eye as being amongst them. (Lard. vol. xi. p. 333.) And so part of *our* Scriptures too may "*vanish away*." It should be observed, that this council of Jerusalem absolutely *refused* to ask the *Gentile* converts to be *circumcised*: that was *repel* enough of the law of circumcision, for Christians.

¹ What it is here said might be urged to *Jews*, may of course be urged to all *judaizing Christians*.

² Gen. xlix. 10.

³ Numb. xxxv. 13.

III. and conscientious motives; and seems earnest to clear Christians, sometimes called *Galileans*, from the scandal of favouring the seditious principles of Judas⁴ of Galilee; or of refusing tribute to the Roman emperor. St. Paul uses general moral reasoning to enforce a provision⁵ for ministers of religion; though he borrows a principle from Scripture. St. Peter also seems to take for granted, that different civil governments are lawful (see 1 Pet. ii. 12, 13); and even the different *expressions*⁶ of Peter and Paul seem to arise from the different forms of government under which those persons lived to whom they wrote. *St. Peter*, writing to *Asiatics*, says plainly, that they were to submit to the *king*, the despotic monarch, as supreme; *St. Paul*, writing to *Romans*, who had a sort of a *consular* government in theory, and great confusion in practice, inculcates submission only to higher powers, and to powers actually subsisting.

In Deut xxiv. 1, we have a Mosaic law concerning *divorces*. Our Saviour, Matt. xix., declares this law to be suited to the Jews peculiarly, but to be different both from that which had preceded, and⁷ that which was to follow; though all three of divine appointment. Our Lord may be said perhaps to have repealed the law of *retaliation*, as one of a severity no longer necessary; the only difficulty is, that what he substitutes⁸ is indeterminate, or a duty of imperfect obligation. However, he clearly commands that *tribute* should be paid to the Roman emperor.

13. Our last proposition is, no Christian is free from the moral Law of Moses. Here we have no controversy with the *Jews*; we argue only with *Christians*.

If by the moral Law of Moses, be meant those rules of conduct which are parts of the *law of nature*, there can be no need of proof. Such rules are obligatory without any sanction from Moses. Only some change in human nature can repeal them⁹. But some have thought the moral Law meant the *Decalogue*; which will make it proper for us to say something of the Decalogue. However, as this distinction is often neglected, we may first make a few remarks without attending to it. It seems plain from Scripture, that *something* of the Law

⁴ See Bp. Sherlock's Discourses, vol. iv. p. 349.

⁵ 1 Cor. ix. 7—14.

⁶ Compare 1 Pet. ii. 17, with Rom. xiii. 1—7.

⁷ Matt. xix. 8, 9.

⁸ Matt. v. 38, &c.

⁹ See Div. Leg. vi. 5. p. 375, 8vo, note, quotation from Rimius; or Rimius's Narrative, p. 53.

was to be retained: see Matt. v. 17, 18¹. Rom. iii. 31. In III. Rom. vii. ver. 12, 14, 16, the Law is called holy, good, spiritual; the same 1 Tim. i. 8, where the instances in the following verse are *moral*. This must mean the *moral* Law; though *any* code of laws may be called good, as a standard of which actions fall short. Christ, in his sermon on the mount, corrects abuses of the Law; that Law which is corrected is to be continued. No body of laws can be totally repealed, because it must be the intention of some laws in every code to enforce *virtue*. That mercy is to be preferred to sacrifice, or moral duties to positive, when there is any interference, is a principle of Christianity. See Matt. ix. 13, and xii. 7; both passages from Hosea vi. 6; which seem to confirm our separation of the ceremonial Law of Moses from the moral. When our Saviour tells us, that our righteousness must *exceed*² the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, he must imply, that we must give up no moral rule which they observed. 73

But, as some have thought that the moral Law of Moses means the *Decalogue*, we will offer a few remarks upon that. There is a *mixture* of moral and ceremonial in it, which perplexed the great *Chillingworth*³. Of the ten commandments, the first four relate to *religion*, the six others to the social duties of *men*. The first is about polytheism; the second about idolatry; the third about perjury; the fourth about setting apart times for things spiritual. These four make the first table. The fifth is about *filial* obedience; the sixth about injuries to men's *persons*; the seventh about violation of the rights of *marriage*; the eighth about injuries respecting *property*; the ninth about injuries respecting *reputation*; the tenth about the regulation of our *sentiments*.

All these may be called *moral*, though moral is sometimes opposed to *religious*; but there are moral duties of religion, that is, such duties respecting the Supreme Being as result from our best use of our faculties—rules of *conduct* arising in the pursuit of general happiness. The fourth commandment seems moral in *substance*, and ceremonial in circumstance⁴. Its principle is, the utility of *rest* or refreshment, and of periodically reviving good *sentiments*. Suppose this principle to operate, it would want determining to some certain *modes*;

¹ Wotton understands this to mean, that Christ as the *antitype* came to fulfil the *types* of the Mosaical religion. Misna, vol. i. p. 304.

² Matt. v. 20.

³ Sect. 7.

⁴ Before, sect. 7; also Book I. chap. xi. sect. 5.

III. but so do other moral principles; as that human beings should not act for themselves till they come to years of *discretion*. There might have been, whether there ever was or not, such a thing as a Sabbath in *natural religion*—if *weeks* could have
 74 got settled by a division of lunar months. Yet even then a good deal of time would have been requisite. Men form moral rules on perceiving, that, if such a thing was done, some good must follow. But the good of making periods of religious rest would operate but *slowly*. However, if it be allowed that such an institution as our Sabbath *might* have taken place on *moral* principles, after any time, however great, that is enough to establish the morality of the fourth commandment, as to its substance. Indeed, if we allow the other nine to be moral, it will be difficult to deny this to be so, considering the peculiar and awful manner in which the ten were published *together*.

I suppose that our lawgivers enact the observance of our Sabbath, on the idea that a Sabbath was ordained immediately upon the creation, and therefore belonged to all mankind⁵; and with a design to fall into the usual manner of reckoning time by weeks⁶; and to adopt the practice of the first Christians in marking the succession of the new law, and in celebrating, at the same time, the resurrection of their Lord: induced also, in a principal manner, by the probable and the tried benefits of the institution⁷.

75 What our Saviour says, that the Sabbath was *made*⁸ *for man*, and not man for the Sabbath, together with the occasion of his remark, may confirm what we have laid down, both as to the morality of the substance of the fourth commandment, and as to the ceremonial nature of its particular circumstances.

We have already observed, that the fifth commandment, though of perpetual obligation, is enforced by a temporary motive in the Jewish Decalogue.

Bishop *Burnet* calls the tenth commandment only *secondarily* moral. I would not dispute about a word, but yet the management of our *sentiments* is an essential part of *virtue*; as will appear under the ninth Article. Dr. *Balguy*, in his

⁵ *Heylin*, in his History of the Sabbath, denies that it was instituted at the creation, or that heathens can be said to have reckoned by weeks. *Wotton*, in his book on the Misna, opposes the opinion of *Heylin*, in the first matter.

⁶ See also the renewal, Exod. xx. 10; and all Sabbatical texts collected by *Wotton* in his Misna.

⁷ See Mr. *Mede*, Book I. Disc. xv. p. 57, quoted at the end of *Wotton's* Misna. ⁸ Mark ii. 27.

System of Morals¹, before quoted, of which I entertain a very III. high opinion, has five chapters on Sentiments.

As the name Decalogue implies *ten* commandments, the Romanists make ten: yet they get rid of the second, through fear, probably, of making a difficulty about their *images*, and seem to divide the tenth into two. In a church about 35 miles S. E. of Paris (Moret) are the ten commandments in old French, round the chancel: "the second is entirely left out: the *ninth* is, *Give not up yourself to the flesh, and marry but once*²—the tenth, *Desire not the goods of others, and lie not at all.*" I have two prayer-books, in which the same in substance is in French verse, but neither of them contains a regular *Decalogue*, though one is large, and contains all the three³ *Creeds*.

14. All our propositions are now proved: yet sometimes 76 considerations of *fitness*, propriety, &c., satisfy the mind as much as regular proofs. Let us therefore enter on a few such considerations.

So lost was the world in *idolatry*, and the corruptions attending it, that nothing less than a *Theocracy* seems to have been capable of bringing any part of mankind to a sense of the true God. Hence the *Jews* were put under such a government: they were governed by laws coming evidently from Heaven, and executed by men of sacred characters, endued with supernatural powers. Their minds were kept continually intent upon their God, by a number of significant ceremonies; they were under continual discipline, and more quickly rewarded or punished than they could be as mere men. Nothing could be better adapted than such a plan to keep them from connections with their idolatrous neighbours⁴. And it is such a plan as St. Paul might well compare to the discipline of a *schoolmaster*⁵:

¹ Book iii. chap. 6.

² This is from the MS. travels of a friend. The lines in the Prayer-Books are,

L'œuvre de chair ne desireras,
Qu'en mariage seulement.

³ Livre d'Eglise. ... de Reims. The "Necessary Doctrine," &c., distinguishes between *images*, and paying them divine honours. It often goes between Popery and Protestantism.

There has been a different splitting, made for the same purpose; to keep *ten* commandments in number, and leave out

one of our ten. See *Heylin's* History of the Sabbath, p. 351; or Part I. chap. iii. sect. 3. *Hesy chius* in Lev. l. 6, c. 26, is quoted as saying, that the fourth commandment ought not to be in the Decalogue; and as splitting the *first* into two, in order to get rid of the *fourth*. But the *manner* in which this is done I cannot see: *Hesy chius* not being at hand.

⁴ M. Luther, in his Dissertation above-mentioned, (sect. 6), shews himself sensible of this.

⁵ Gal. iii. 24. Hosca v. 2, where the LXX. have *παιδευτής*.

III. when youth are formed, they must be incessantly watched and employed, encouraged, checked, rewarded and punished. The schoolmaster trusts his scholars out of his *sight* but little; he gives them precept upon *precept*⁶, line upon line; "here a little and there a little." He is more a friend to them than he seems; his ultimate views he mentions but seldom; it is distant
77 good at which he chiefly aims; and when he punishes, it is with a view of preventing distant evil.

This account of the Law of Moses must shew it to be divine; but yet our reverence for it, and our admiration of it must be heightened, when we reflect, that those very ordinances, which were so useful at first, were also *types* and *proofs* of the subsequent and ultimate dispensation.

By this train of thought, we may reconcile those passages of Scripture which describe the Law as *carnal*, with those which call it *spiritual*. As the Jews were to have a great number of observances, and were at the same time to prepare the way for a more perfect dispensation, it was wisely contrived that their observances should be *typical*: these, as duties, would be carnal; as presignifications, spiritual. Compare Rom. vii. 14, & 4, with Heb. ix. 9, 10, 24; x. 1; vii. 15, 16. The general thought is expressed 1 Cor. ⁷xv. 46. 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14.

Things being thus prepared, a new dispensation might be grafted on the old: in which the reasons of temporal sanctions ceasing, the sanctions themselves would cease, and of course the extraordinary providence necessary to support them. And an ordinary providence would take place, and men would be directed to look forward to a *future life*.

And, as we may discern propriety and fitness in the *whole* of the Mosaic religion, so may we in distinct *parts*. Deut. xxii. 5, has been thought to be intended, not only to prevent indecency, and its consequences, but also *idolatry*; as the priestesses of Mars used to worship him in man's apparel, and the priests of Venus used to worship her in woman's apparel. The word, "abomination," βδέλυγμα, seems to favour this idea⁸.

78 I said⁹, that our Saviour had declared the Mosaic law of *divorces* to be suited to the Jews: let us now see the particular

⁶ Isai. xxviii. 10.

⁷ Div. Leg. 8vo, vol. iv. pp. 197, 316, 366.

⁸ More instances may be seen in Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacræ*, Book II. ch. vii. at the end. ⁹ End of sect. 12.

reason of it—the *hardness of their* ¹*hearts*. Poets and III. historians have described² the Jews as rancorous and malevolent. Since the time of Christ they have been often persecuted; and hatred easily becomes mutual. But *in* the time³ of Christ, perhaps spiritual pride might have arisen from their separation from the rest of the world; from the severities seemingly authorized in some of their predecessors to the enemies of their religion. Any kind of malevolence or rancour would make them treat the weaker sex ungenerously, and in an harsh manner, inconsistent with the Christian principle of “giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel⁴.”

The Jews were not allowed to take *interest* for money, of 79 *Jews*⁵, but of *strangers* they were. How far forbearing to take interest was a duty of imperfect obligation, or *indeterminate*, like mercy to the poor, &c. may not be certain. The prohibition to take interest is not followed by any specific *penalty*, but is expressed like prohibitions to oppress the poor⁶; yet, as the Jews were under a special Providence, they might be sure that *they* should be punished for offences, however men might sometimes evade human laws. This idea brings indeterminate offences amongst Jews, under the theocracy, near to the determinate. We may therefore endeavour to assign the reasons of forbidding *usury* amongst the Jews, much as if that prohibition were perfectly determinate.

¹ Bp. Warburton ascribes the whole ceremonial Law of the Jews to the hardness of their hearts. Div. Leg. vol. III. 8vo, p. 394.

² Dio Cassius says of the Jews, τὸ γὰρ τοι γένος αὐτῶν θυμωθῆν, πικρότατόν ἐστι. l. 49. And see the *Shylock* of Shakspeare.

In 1794, I think, Mr. Cumberland brought on to the stage a comedy called *the Jew*, in which old *Sheva* is represented as benevolent and grateful. To appearance indeed he is a miser; and in fact lives very frugally; but he does good in secret. We can only *wish* this may be founded in nature, and ourselves endeavour to promote Christian benevolence.

³ In the time of Christ, the Jews might have got some malevolent sentiments from being subject to the *Romans*. Being obliged to submit to persons whom we esteem inferior to ourselves in merit,

generates *hatred*; especially if those persons have pretensions to superiority in some respects, and treat us with contempt.

⁴ 1 Pet. iii. 7. What St. Peter recommends is precisely Mr. Hume's sense of the word *gallantry*. Essays 8vo, vol. i. p. 148, &c. Essay xiv. On the rise and progress of the Arts and Sciences.

What Mr. Hume says on the subject may help to illustrate the difference between Judaism and Christianity, in point of civilization of manners; and therefore to shew how ill Judaism would suit the present times. I could almost paint to myself a peevish Jew taking a rancorous disgust against his wife, on account of some unavoidable infirmity, and using her so as to make separation the least evil on the whole.

⁵ Lev. xxv. 36, &c. Deut. xxiii. 19, 20.

⁶ Lev. xxv. 35—37.

III. The Jews were to be a separate *nation*; that nation was to be divided into separate *tribes*; each tribe into separate *families*; and each family was to have its portion of *land*, which should be cultivated by that family, and descend from generation to generation. This was the *ordinary* state of things. The only proper *business* of Jews, as such, was to support and transmit a *religion*; *gain* was not their business; and all arguments in favour of interest, limited or unlimited, turn upon the right which a man has to improve his property. Their business was to keep the Jewish polity inviolate, till the coming of the Messiah. But though, in this ordinary course, they needed not either to lend or borrow, yet *misfortunes* might sometimes
80 happen: if they were of a *lighter* sort, brother must help brother, mutually, gratuitously, ignorant whose turn it might be next to suffer. But, if calamity was *weighty*, a family might part with its real property, in the way of *mortgage* or *sale*; only for a time; it must return at the *jubilee*, every fiftieth year at the farthest⁷. Such a scheme seems best preserved by allowing no interest, no usury. Why then allow Jews to take interest of *strangers*? Here the reasons ceasing, natural *liberty* revived. But, would not this liberty *unsettle* Jews? scarcely: they would have but *little* to lend; being not in the *habit* of lending, they would be very *fearful*. Then their *land* at home would always be the great tie: what they lent to strangers would be much more to *residents* than absentees; and would leave them still Jews, both in religion and politics. When indeed their circumstances came to be very much *altered*, by their subjection to the *Romans*, by the destruction of *Jerusalem*, &c. they would have to judge of the *grounds* of their laws, and see how far they might innocently depart from the strictness of them⁸.

15. The reasoning commonly used does not satisfy the *Jews*, with regard to the abolition of their ceremonial law. Why did not Moses tell us plainly? say they. When he
81 uses such expressions as a ⁹statute *for ever*, a perpetual

⁷ See Reland's Sacred Antiquities, Part IV. chap. xi. of *Jubilees*.

⁸ It has been a notion, that taking interest for money was *immoral*; but such notion does not seem well-grounded. It must be always wrong to *oppress* the needy; but oppression is a vice of the *indeterminate* sort. Even in the *Jews*,

usury was allowed to *strangers*, that is, to *men*, as mere men: this could not have been if it was radically immoral. *Grotius* supported the opinion, that usury was wrong (de Jure, &c. 2. 12. 20); but Barbeyrac's Note shews that he did not continue always of that opinion.

⁹ Lev. xxiii. 14, 21, 31, 41.

statute, did he mean to deceive? We answer, popular, natural III. language will always deceive if taken too literally; but where is the fault? not in him who uses the expressions, but in him who interprets them as he interprets no others. But let us look at a few particulars, in which expressions occur that are *not* taken literally by the Jews: from these their unfairness will appear, in taking others literally. The children of *David*¹ were to sit upon his throne for evermore; that eternity has been long concluded. The children of strangers, after a price was paid for them, were to be *bondmen*², or slaves, “*for ever* :” they could not *live* for ever, and any one of them might be manumitted. “O King, live³ for ever!” might express loyalty and respect, but could never prevent mortality. *Twelve stones*⁴ were to be a memorial *for ever* of the dividing of the river Jordan when the ark passed.

The prophet speaks of “*everlasting mountains*⁵ ;” and these might continue longer than the twelve stones; yet “the everlasting mountains were scattered:” nay, “heaven and earth shall pass away⁶.” As to a perpetual statute, or “a statute for ever,” it is literally a thing impossible⁷, because the power that enacts can always repeal. *Darius*⁸ made a decree about Daniel; it was immutable;—in fact, it lasted one night. 82 From these instances we may see the *real meaning* of the expressions in question. “*For ever*,” in popular language, denotes an *unlimited* futurity, according to the circumstances of the case. “*Bondmen for ever*,” are bondmen for an unlimited time⁹: the *stones* were to be a memorial, not for five or ten years, but for as long a time as such a memorial would naturally last. A *law* is perpetual¹⁰ when it is for no certain *term*—when those who are to obey it are to see no time when it will be repealed.

¹ Psalm cxxxii. 12.

² Lev. xxv. 46.

³ Dan. ii. 4.

⁴ Joshua iv. 7.

⁵ Hab. iii. 6.

⁶ Matt. xxiv. 35.

⁷ See Exodus xxix. 9. The first article of the *treaty* in 1785, between the *Emperor* and the *Dutch*, agreed upon an *eternal* friendship between them. And our law about the Church of England decrees, that it shall be safe “for ever.” Sherlock on Tests. Oxf. 1790.

⁸ Dan. vi. 15.

⁹ These bondmen for an unlimited

time, who are foreigners grown poor, and unable to support themselves, are immediately (Lev. xxv. 46, 47, &c.) opposed to bondmen for a limited time; that is, to the children of Israelites, if reduced to poverty and bought by sojourners: these last might be *redeemed*; and *must* regain their liberty at the next *jubilee*.

¹⁰ Spirit of Laws, Book III. chap. x. March 1795, The *taxes* just now imposed have been argued upon as *perpetual* taxes: that is, they are not temporary, or for any time whose limits are known.

III. The Jews are against the repeal of their Law, because it is the dictate of *infinite wisdom*¹¹. Yet a Being infinitely wise may himself repeal, in one situation of things, what was made for another¹². To take a son from his school-master, is as much a mark of wisdom, when the son comes to maturity, as it once was to place him “under tutors and governors¹³.”

16. Our *application* in the present article will be short. If we consider in what sense any one may now *assent* to it, we shall do it merely in the way of recapitulation.

83 ‘Though some through zeal, others through want of discernment, have held that the Old and New Testament are contrary to each other; I believe them to differ only as different parts of the same plan. If I review them together, I can see Christianity opening gradually ever since the creation. Whether the Jewish people at large were able to discern this, need not be settled; yet, from what I read in both old and new scriptures, I can by no means allow, that Abraham, Moses, and the Prophets, confined their views and expectations to this life. When I say, that the Old Testament is part of the same *plan* with the new, I do not mean that the laws of the former are to be obeyed indiscriminately, like those of the latter. The ceremonial and civil laws of Moses were always intended to be temporary; though the moral Law must for ever be of force; except we may reckon as part of the moral Law some circumstances of the laws of the Decalogue, which seem distinct from their moral essence. These may be varied, if it be done by authority, for the benefit of any part of mankind by whom they may happen to be carried into execution.’

As to *mutual concessions* of those who contend about this Article, we need only recommend it to Jews, Antinomians, and others, to consider what has been advanced, and not to retain or reject, without a calm consideration of all circumstances.

Improvements must be of the same nature here with those mentioned under the preceding Article; they must still be improvements in studying the *Scriptures*. So we need not dwell upon them.

¹¹ This Stillingfleet mentions as the argument of *Abravanel*, *Orig. Sacrae*; and Luther, in his *Essay on reading Moses*, vol. III. of his *Works*, beginning.

¹² See before, about divorces, end of sect. 12.

¹³ Gal. iii. 24, and Gal. iv. 2.

I will therefore *conclude* with observing what a grand and III. interesting employment for the mind this Article affords. Can any thing be more truly called so, than the contemplation of all the dispensations of the Almighty, with their connection, resemblance, difference, according to the different circumstances for which they were intended? What wonder, if low and illi- 84 terate sects should have run into various errors on a subject which requires such extensive knowledge and sound judgment! What wonder, if the learned themselves have not been able in all things to coincide!

ARTICLE VIII.

85

OF THE THREE CREEDS.

THE Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.

1. I need not say that the word *Creed* comes from *credo*. In Greek, a creed is called *μάθημα, γραφή, κανών* and *σύμβολον*. The last name only, *symbol*, has occasioned any difficulty. Some have taken it in the sense of contribution, or *collection*, under an idea of the Apostles contributing each his share, or of doctrines being *collected* into a small compass; others in the senses of a *watchword*, a badge, or a *tessera* or ticket of admission. Lord King suits my notion best, when he says, it was something among Christians analogous to *symbols*, which those *heathens* had who were *initiated* into any *mysteries*, in order that they should know one another, and be admitted into the place where the mysteries were celebrated. This sense may be allowed to comprehend most of the others. Symbols¹ were either things to be *shewn*, or forms of *words* (Lord King)—either visible or audible.

¹ On the word *σύμβολον*, one might consult Suicer, Vossius, &c.; and on the subject of *Creeds*, Lord King, Bp. Pearson, Wall on Baptism, Part II. chap. ix.

Nicholls on this Article; Bingham; Usher on Creeds.

Tessera was sometimes a *ticket* to receive a share in a division of *corn*; some-

III. One can scarce conceive a Christian church without some
 86 kind of creed. No person could be admitted into the Christian religion without giving some account of his belief; that account, however short, must be a *creed*. The creed of the treasurer of the Ethiopian Queen was only this, “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God².” On this belief he was baptized; and all creeds are *baptismal* confessions, or those confessions³ enlarged. It soon got to be thought essential to declare a belief in each of the persons of the Holy *Trinity*, according to Matt. xxviii. 19; but all beyond was addition. Additions, however, became necessary, by the evasions and perversions of heretics⁴. Whatever is wanted to preserve peace and unity of doctrine is necessary to promote religious sentiments, and to answer the ends of religious society. Not but we may conceive some use of a creed even where men are unanimous; it may be used⁵ as an *hymn*⁶. So long as no harm arose from it, *each bishop* was at liberty to express the faith
 87 of his Church in what terms he thought proper; and so would suit its circumstances. Hence we have “*impassible*”⁷ in the Aquileian Creed—a word directed against the *Patripassians*.

2. Our method will be, to take the most simple and ancient creed first; to give the *history* of *each*, subjoining such remarks as have not so convenient a place elsewhere.

The expression of the Article is very like what we find in the Reformatio⁸ Legum; but I do not conceive the meaning to be, that we should affirm one creed to have been really made at *Nice*, or another by *Athanasius*. As, in the Article, we have “commonly called the Apostles’ Creed,” so, in our rubric, we have “commonly called the Creed of St. *Athanasius*.” Some *names* must be given to the Creeds; and our Article gives them those names which were most *usual*⁹.

times a kind of bill of exchange; then called *nummaria*, (assignat); sometimes a kind of billet of a quarter-master, or, however, a ticket entitling to a reception in the way of hospitality; sometimes a *watchword*, or perhaps a *sign* used as a watchword.

² Acts viii. 37.

³ Pearson on the Creed, Art. viii. p. 665, 4to; p. 331, fol. Wall, Part II. chap. ix.

⁴ See an instance (of the insertion of *indivisibilem* and *impassibilem*), Pearson on the Creed, p. 321, 4to; p. 159, fol.

⁵ See Cyril’s 5th Catechesis, p. 78,—quoted by Waterland, p. 285, 2d edit. on the Athan. Creed. Ref. Leg. de Trin. cap. 13.

⁶ The Creeds used to be called *Salms*. See Waterland, *ib.* p. 50.

⁷ Lord King, p. 40.

⁸ Ref. Leg. de Trin. cap. 5. & 13.

⁹ A person calls the translation of the Bible the *Septuagint*, who does not believe all the stories about the seventy cells, &c. In Ref. Leg. the Roman Creed is called the Creed of the *Apostles*.

The names given in English Liturgies

We come, then, to some *history* of the *Apostles' Creed*. It III. is sometimes called, the *Roman Creed*, because used in the Roman Church; yet several clauses have been added at unknown times, by unknown persons. On these, Bp. Pearson and Lord King may be consulted; and different forms may be seen in Bingham and Usher, and Wall on Baptism. But why has this Creed been commonly *called* the Apostles'? Our reason for calling it so is, that some of the *Fathers* have called it so. Yet, they do not seem to refer to any one fixed form; which would make one think that their calling it so was eloquence rather than history. Dr. Wall says, every thing was 88 called *Apostolic* which was done at any see where any of the apostles had ever presided. (See on Baptism, Part II. chap. ix. sect. 13.) That each apostle contributed his clause is not credible, especially as St. Thomas's contribution was said to be the descent into hell; the minor James's, "the holy catholic church;" and that of Simon Zelotes, "the communion of saints:" which clauses were not in the creed till some centuries after the age of the apostles. Yet it seems no way improbable that part of this creed might *originate* from the apostles, and be handed down as having been used by them, either orally, or in writing.

3. There are only *two things* in the Apostles' Creed not treated by us elsewhere. "The holy catholic church;" and, "the communion of saints."

"*The holy catholic Church*" is indeed treated in Art. xix.¹ and xx. in some sort; so that we need only speak of it here as part of a *creed*. Lord King says², that this clause is first found in Tertullian, or rather, some part of it; for it came into the creed gradually—in this order, as I conceive, "the church," "the holy church," "the holy catholic church." The reason of inserting it is not clearly known. Probably, it might be inserted in order to discourage *heresy*, to *unite* Christians for their common credit and support, or to give weight to large bodies of Catholics assembled in councils, or to those who were most fit to dictate or govern, though living separate from each other.

4. "The *communion of saints*."—I think Bp. Pearson says that this clause was inserted *last*. And Lord King, that 89

to the Athanasian Creed may be seen in Waterland, p. 244, note to beginning of 10th chapter.

¹ See also Book I. chap. xix. sect. 16, and Book III. chap. xi. sect. 4.

² Page 324.

III. it was introduced by Augustin with a view to the *Donatists*, who refused to hold *communion* with other bodies of Christians. So that, in the primary sense, he who believed the communion of saints, believed that all Christians (called *saints* in Scripture) ought to *communicate* with each other, though they belonged to different particular societies—that they should all be interested for the rest, and have a religious patriotism.

The “Necessary Doctrine,” &c. makes the communion of Christians (the members of Christ’s Body) to be like the communion of the members of the *natural body*; such that the nourishment which is given to the body benefits every member: “In so much that it lieth not in the power of any manne to saie, that the meate whiche he putteth into his owne mouthe, shall nourish one particular membre of his bodie and not an other.”

Yet to some this clause has seemed to imply a common feeling, not only between contemporaries, but also between Christians of all different ages and generations. That such an idea is not without some foundation in Scripture, seems evident from several passages. Successive generations are baptized in one form; Christ is with his church unto the end of the world; he prays (John xvii. 20) for all his disciples without distinction of times; he was the *Lamb* slain from the foundation of the world; and “if we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have *fellowship* (or communion, *κοινωνίαν*) one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” 1 John i. 7. The Holy Spirit guides men into all truth. These things must unite Christians to make a common interest. Nor does departure out of this life make any interruption in the
90 views of the good Christian: there is still, for any friend he has lost, or for himself, “the heavenly Jerusalem,” “the general assembly and church of the first-born,” and “the spirits of just men³ made perfect.”

“*Forgiveness of sins*” is treated under the sixteenth Article.

5. In treating of the *Nicene Creed*, the same method may be used.

The common notion is, that this creed, as far as the words “*Holy Ghost*,” was made at the Council of Nice, or Nicæa, in Bithynia, in 325; and that the remainder was added at Constantinople, in a general council, in 381, or 382. The Nicene

³ Heb. xii. 23.

Council is often called the Council of 318; Beausobre¹ supposes, III. that though there might be about 300 bishops present, the precise number 318 was borrowed from Gen. xiv. 14, about the 318 servants² of Abraham, by whom he overcame his enemies. This council was mentioned before. It was held on account of the disputes about *Easter*, and the doctrine of Arius, and the Meletian schism, relating probably to ordinations. The shorter creed may be compared with the fuller in Books of Councils³; the shorter is in Dr. Rutherford's fourth Charge⁴, and Archbishop Usher's Dissertation on Creeds; but they both seem to trust to the Liturgy⁵ for the longer. Waterland calls it "the Nicene⁶ or Constantinopolitan Creed."

Archbishop Usher was, at one time, of the common opinion, 91 but afterwards thought (as I understand) that the *whole* of our Nicene Creed was *known* at Nice in 325, though no more was *published* than what relates to *Arius*⁷. The part published he looked upon as a *recital*⁸ of so much of the creeds then in use as was to the purpose of the meeting; the remainder being easily supplied from other creeds, when wanted. What made him change his opinion was, finding, in writings composed between 325 and 381, the substance of the last paragraph of that creed, which we use, and commonly call Nicene, and quoted as the doctrine of the Nicene Fathers. Yet there might be doctrines, professed by the Nicene Fathers, which were not inserted into any *creeds* at the time of the Council of Nice.

We now proceed to remark on those parts of our Nicene Creed which have not before been treated, nor are likely to find a more convenient place hereafter.

6. "*Light of Light*," that is, "I believe" in Christ, "begotten of his Father," "God of God;" and I am willing to acknowledge the propriety of this expression or comparison, "*Light of Light*." Now, one does not see how this can appear

¹ Lardner's account of the Council of Nice makes a chapter in his *Credibility*, &c. Works, vol. iv. p. 187.

² See Pearson on the Creed about the *Cross*, beginning of "*was crucified*."

³ Labbe, vol. III. col. 27. 951.

⁴ Rutherford's Charges, p. 83.

⁵ *Symbolum autem hoc quod in divinatorum mysteriorum administratione recitatur*, &c. Usher, p. 16. Yet he says, his form from Epiphanius is very *near* that of Constantinople in 381.

⁶ Hist. Athan. Creed, p. 161, 2d edit.

⁷ Yet did not Arius reckon the Holy Ghost "*creaturam creaturæ*?" Epiphanius. Har. 69, treats of Arius. And see Aug. Har. 49.

⁸ Dr. Rutherford maintains the same opinion. See his Charges, p. 84.

But see Lord King, p. 319, from Epiphanius, quoted before; where the *Macedonians* about 360 boast, that they received the *whole Nicene* Creed. See also Wall, 4to, p. 503.

III. an improper expression, even to an *Arian* or a *Socinian*; for both the Father and the Son are called Light in Scripture⁹.

92 The expression is in fact used because it seems to contain an *illustration* of the eternal generation of the Son of God, likely to reconcile different parties. The Father is the Light as the *luminary*, the Son is the Light as the *effulgence*, or emanation: the sun-beams are *coeval* with the luminous body—they are inseparable, or of the same *substance*, and yet distinct. The word ἀπαύγασμα¹⁰, in the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews, has given occasion to this illustration; it seems to have been adopted with pleasure by men so eminent as *Origen* and *Dionysius* of Alexandria, before the Council of Nice, and about that time by *Athanasius*¹¹. Every illustration must, in such a case, be *inadequate*, but he, at least, who scruples not to use the words, “God of God,” need not scruple to use the expression, “*Light of Light*.”

7. In the fifth Article, though we proved several propositions concerning the Holy Ghost, the expressions of that Article did not lead us to prove that he might with propriety be called “*Lord*,” and “*Giver of life*”—τὸ κύριον¹² καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν, (not Lord of life); though we used some texts from which that might be proved. These expressions were used, no doubt, in opposition to the degrading notions of *Arians* and *Macedonians*.

The Church might think themselves authorized to call the Holy Ghost “*Lord*,” from a comparison of Acts i. 16 with Acts iv. 24, 25; and from a comparison between Exodus xxxiv. 34 and 2 Cor. iii. 17; the word κύριος being used in its highest sense in the former, and used of the Holy Ghost in the latter, in speaking of one and the same *fact*. Also from 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13, where the three persons of the Trinity are enumerated.

The council (of Nice, or Constantinople,) might call the Holy Ghost “*Giver of life*,” from Rom viii. 10, 11; 1 Pet. iii. 18; and indeed from Rev. xxii. 1; if the enumeration of the three persons of the Trinity, and the “*proceeding* out of the throne of *God* and of the *Lamb*,” were noticed, as¹³ well as the word “*life*.”

⁹ See Cruden's Concordance, *Light*, or John i. 5, and John i. 9. ¹⁰ Heb. i. 3.

¹¹ See Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, ἀπαύγασμα.

¹² Τὸ κύριον must be an *adjective*, agreeing with πνεῦμα; but κύριος seems sometimes *substantive*, sometimes *adjective*,

and sometimes a substantive put as an adjective; in the manner in which we say, a *master-key*. The *proof* must be the same as if the Greek was a substantive as well as the English.

¹³ Ver. 1—4. of Rev. xxii. might be all read.

And though, when it is said, “the Spirit giveth Life,” III. 2 Cor. iii. 6, and “it is the Spirit that quickeneth,” John vi. 63, Spirit may be opposed to *letter*, or body; yet these expressions seem to me to imply a sort of *general maxim*, that whatever, in any sense, can be called Spirit, must be conceived as giving life to that of which it is the Spirit.

The Church might deduce the expression, “*who spake by the prophets*,” from Acts i. 16, and 1 Pet. i. 10, 11.

The *propriety* of these several expressions in their several places, would probably appear from a diligent and accurate attention to the circumstances in which they were introduced.

8. We now come to the *Athanasian Creed*. This was not always called a *Creed*, nor, when it was so called, was it always named *Athanasian*. It has been called *Fides Catholica*, *Sermo fidei catholicæ*, *Fides quicunque vult*, *Psalmus quicunque vult*, *Sermo Athanasii de fide*, *Expositio Catholicæ fidei Athanasii*¹, &c. &c. It was not called Athanasian till near the end of the seventh century, and then it might be called so as containing his opinions. Athanasius flourished in 326, and died 94 about 373. Yet some have thought it the composition of Athanasius; nay, such eminent men as Baronius, Allatius, and Bp. Andrewes.

It has been thought to have been composed by *Hilary*, a French bishop, about the year 430, for the use of the Gallican clergy: this was the opinion of Dr. *Waterland*.

Several writers have thought that it was written by *Vigilius Tapsensis*, that is, Bishop of Tapsum, or Tapsus, in the Byzacene, a region of Africa, about the year 484².

Some give only a *doubtful* or a *negative* judgment; saying the author was “a Latin author”—“a Gallican writer”—“doubtful”—“not Athanasius³.” And some have assigned Athanasius of *Spire* as the author, before the middle of the seventh century. Bishop Pearson says⁴, “a Latin author, and one later than the famous Athanasius.”

Dr. *Waterland* has written a very able book on this subject; he seems to have consulted all authorities, as a learned man ought to do. His MS. copies amounted to 74, and the

¹ See Waterland's History of this composition, p. 121, 2d edit. and p. 89.

² This opinion is adopted by Mr. Gibson, Hist. vol. 111. p. 544, quarto; whose decision is said, by the author of a

pamphlet entitled “*Hints*,” &c. to be “acknowledged by *all*.” See Bingham, 10. 4. 18.

³ See Waterland, p. 24.

⁴ Creed, p. 324, fol.; p. 647, 4to.

III. authors, ancient and modern, to a much larger number. When he has given accounts of what information he has met with, he forms his recapitulations into *tables*, which are very useful in exhibiting a subject at one view.

As far as my reading goes, it inclines me to agree with this respectable writer; therefore it seems necessary to take notice
95 of one difficulty. The creed opposes the *Nestorian* and *Euty-*
chian doctrines; the former were condemned at Ephesus in 431, the latter at Chalcedon in 451; yet Waterland supposes the creed to have been composed about the year 430. We have had difficulties similar to this before⁵. The general solution is, that doctrines have been often disseminated, or have even grown up so as to be very troublesome, before those by whom they are professed have acquired that *name* by which, as a sect, they are denominated in history. Waterland mentions the *Apollinarians*⁶ as having held a doctrine nearly the same with that of Eutyches; and the Nestorian doctrines were well known in 430.

It must not be thought inaccurate to speak of doctrines by their usual names, taken from those sects which were the most famous for professing them, though with reference to a time before those names were imposed.

It seems agreed, that the original language of the creed in question was *Latin*; though there are several Greek MSS. of it. This is so generally acknowledged, that even those who ascribe it to Athanasius say, that *he* wrote it in Latin, when he was at *Rome*, or in *Germany*.

Comments on this creed have been made not unfrequently. At first, none were wanted. As it contains nothing but what was to be found in the writings of the Fathers, the expressions and allusions were understood; but afterwards comments were
96 useful. Some were made towards the end of the sixth⁷ century; and before the year 1500 there had been *thirteen* commentators upon it, which are known now.

The *reception* of this creed in the *Western Church* was favourable: it was there read and admired; but some have doubted whether it was ever in the *Eastern Church*⁸. Not

⁵ *Familists*, though aimed at in 1562, had scarce their *name* till near 1579. Of the *Socinians* it has, I think, been said, that their *doctrines* were *forming* in 1562.

Embryo *Anabaptists* also before, Art. vii. sect. 3.

⁶ Waterland, Athan. 197, and thereabouts. Wall, Bapt. 4to, p. 203, on Pelagius's Creed.

⁷ Waterland, p. 88.

⁸ Why then so many Greek MSS.?

with the *Filioque*, as we now have it, probably¹. In *England* III. it got ground in the *tenth century*; but it was never supported by any *council*. Yet, in the *middle*² *ages*, it was appealed to as authority³.

Whoever wrote this creed, he meant nothing more than to *collect* things said in various catholic writers against the various *heresies* subsisting, and to *simplify* and *arrange* the expressions, so as to form a confession of faith the most concise, orderly, and comprehensive possible. Not with any view of *explaining*⁴ any mysterious truths, but with the sole design of *rejecting* hurtful or heretical errors.

Mr. Gibbon objects bitterly to this creed as being *spurious*⁵; but the early Christians used sometimes to ascribe to others their own works, without any bad intention⁶; and what is customary does not deceive. And, moreover, this creed may have been adopted on account of its excellence, in bringing the errors, which were to be shunned, into a small *compass*, in exposing them in a kind of poetic numbers, which strike and possess the ear; and may have been called *Athanasian* only on account of its containing *doctrines*⁷ which had been defended, with peculiar force and brilliance, by the great prelate of Alexandria⁸. 97

9. Let us now pass from the history of this creed to some historical *explanation* of its several clauses. We will follow the *order* of the creed itself.

¹ See a curious passage, p. 372, octavo, 2d edit. of Travis's Letters to Gibbon; from Gibbon and Petavius.

² Middle ages continued from 475 to 1453, according to Harris. Philol. p. 240.

³ Opposite the title-page of D-5-6, Magd. Coll. Cambr. is the following MS. note: in Bp. Gibbon's hand, as I have reason to think.

"A Swedish Minister assures me today, that the Athanasian Creed is read constantly in the public service, on *Rogation* and *Trinity* Sundays, and that all children are obliged to get it by heart. EDM. LONDON.

"Whitehall, Jan. 21, 1730-1."

⁴ "The famous creed which so clearly expounds the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation," &c. Gibbon's Hist. vol. III. p. 544, quarto.

⁵ Gibbon as above, p. 544. This objection is adopted in *Hints*, &c.

⁶ Lardner's Works, vol. 11. p. 310, Book I. chap. xii. sect. 4. of this.

⁷ That it did contain his doctrines, see quotation from Dr. Burgh's *Inquiry*, &c. p. 384, note; made in the answer to *Hints*, &c. called an *Apology*, &c. (supposed to be written by Bp. Hallifax) p. 48. Perhaps some of the old *titles* of the creed might bear such a construction as the following: The true *faith*, according to the opinions of Athanasius. If it was not called *Athanasian* till the end of the 7th century, it could scarcely have been *published* as Athanasius's—in 430 at least; and it *does* contain his *doctrines*: no imposition therefore.

⁸ Waterland observes, p. 273, that "Athanasius has left some creeds and confessions, undoubtedly his, which yet have never obtained the esteem and reputation that this hath done."

III. Some condemning clauses come first; but, as the creed concludes with one of them, we may consider them last.

The doctrinal part of the creed may be divided into *two parts*: one relating to the doctrine of the *Trinity*; the other to that of the *Incarnation* of the Son of God. I wish the paragraphs had been *numbered*.

98 The first question which occurs is, have any Christians *confounded* the Persons of the Holy Trinity? the answer is, the *Sabellians*⁹ did this. Have any *divided the substance*? All those who denied consubstantiality; that is, who were not Homoüsians; all those who have denied the Divinity of the second and third persons; and those also may be added who have held *three* original principles, τρεῖς¹⁰ ἀρχαί: these would be Tritheists. But some would be *called* so who only maintained three *Persons* in *one* Deity; therefore the orthodox might have occasion to declare against such division of the divine nature, or substance.

I look upon all, down to "*three Lords*," to be in opposition to those who divided the substance. The first sentence¹¹ may seem an exception, but I think it is here only introductory to the rest. The term "*uncreate*" would appear to relate to the *Arians*, who thought the *Son* a creature, and the *Holy Ghost* a creature of a creature: as also indeed to others. The word *incomprehensible* means here to express *immensity*, as appears from the Latin¹² and Greek, and from some old English: that which is immense cannot be comprehended in any space; but we do not now commonly use the term *incomprehensible* to signify this. The expressions "*three eternal*," and "*one eternal*," may seem out of the common way; but the thing to be expressed is, that each divine attribute is common to the three persons, though each has personal relative qualities peculiar to himself.

All the rest, which relates to the Holy Trinity, except a kind of recapitulation, is against those, who *confounded the*

⁹ The heretical opinions referred to in this explanation lie so in order, in the first and second Articles, and are so easily found by the Syllabus, or Heads of Lectures, that it seems needless to put down the pages where they are to be met with.—1795. I have also given some short accounts of them in my printed Sermon on Mark xvi. 16.

¹⁰ See Bingham, 11. 3, 4.

¹¹ "For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost." This sentence rather corresponds to what went before, "neither confounding the Persons;" and makes it easier to take the subject of *dividing* the substance first.

¹² Waterland p. 249. ἀκατάληπτος, ἄπειρος, ἄμετρος,—immensus.

Persons; and sets forth the personal, relative, peculiar qualities now mentioned;—so that what has been already said expresses the Union of the three divine persons; what remains to be said (of the Trinity) will express the distinctions between them. But there seems no occasion for any explanatory remark, unless we observe, that those who neglected the distinction of Persons might *substitute* one for another at will; which would make it indifferent to them whether they spoke of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or of three Fathers, or three Sons, or “*three Holy Ghosts*.”

As the former part of the creed rejects and excludes all prevailing errors with regard to the Trinity, so does the latter part with regard to the *Incarnation* of Christ. We will proceed as before, inquiring who the persons alluded to are. Who then have denied that Christ is *God*? Ebionites, Nazarenes, Photinians, Arians; as appeared under the second Article. Who, that he was *man*? The sects of Docetæ, the Apollinarians, and the Eutychians. Who, that he was “God of the substance of his Father?” The Arians called Christ a God, but denied the rest. Who held that Christ was not “begotten before the worlds?” all who denied his Divinity, except the Arians. Who denied that Christ was “Man of the substance of his mother?” the Eutychians; not to mention the Anabaptists, who arose since the creed was made. Who denied that Christ had a reasonable soul? the Apollinarians: they maintained that the Logos was to him in the place of a reasonable soul. By the way, the *colon* put after “perfect man,” for *chanting*, may mislead; it should rather be after “perfect God:” perfect *man* consists of soul and body. Who have spoken of Christ as of *two* agents? the Nestorians. Who have conceived the Incarnation to be effected by means of a conversion or transubstantiation of the Deity into flesh? And who, when such conversion took place, or was supposed to take place, imagined a *confusion* or consolidation of the natures divine and human? Here perhaps heretics have spoken less plainly than in other cases; but they have said enough to require the attention and vigilance of the Catholics in *rejecting* their errors; which is all we are *here* concerned with. The Arians conceived the Word to be made flesh in such a sense that he was susceptible of suffering¹. The Eutychians seem to have conceived, that the Word was so united to flesh that

¹ Pearson on the Creed, under “*suffered*,” p. 380, quarto; p. 187, folio.

III. the humanity was lost, or *absorbed*, annihilated, though the body or flesh evidently remained; which *amounted* to a conversion of the Godhead into flesh; and they, conceiving the *nature* to be but *one*, accounted for the unity by a *melting down* of the two natures together. In the *Creed of Pelagius*², we find some mentioned who held a *double*³ conversion of nature
 101 or substance at the same time, so that the divine nature became human, and the human divine: thus a *confusion* of substance was accomplished; and the Son, instead of being *both* God and Man, was *neither*. These persons are not called by any *name*, as a sect, but are said to assert the Incarnation in *novo sensu*. The expression, “taking of the Manhood into God,” answers to one in the same creed of Pelagius: “Verbum carnem esse factum, sed *assumendo* hominem, non permutando Deitatem;” and to one in the genuine works of Augustin, “à divinitate carne *susceptâ*;” and I do not suppose that more is meant by taking the manhood *into* God, than by Christ’s taking man’s nature *upon* him. If a junction is to be expressed, it cannot be expressed more harmlessly than by saying, the finite was *assumed* by the infinite, or taken *into* the infinite. We want to *reject* all notions inconsistent with an *union* of the natures divine and human; or with their continuing *distinct*, though united.

“*Unity of Person*,” is opposed to Eutychian unity of *nature*, as well as to the Nestorian duplicity of *Person*.

The Paraphrase or Commentary of *Waterland* on this creed, which makes his tenth chapter, is the best that I know of.

10. After the explanation should come the *proof*; but it is the nature of a creed to collect propositions supposed to have
 102 been already proved. We have indeed, in the two former creeds, mentioned a clause or two which had been left unproved, but we have no such clauses here. There is only one thing which wants proof here, that I am aware of; and that is,

² Serm. de Tempore 191, aut 236, inter opera Augustini. This creed of Pelagius is also in *Jerom's* works: and in Wall on Baptism, chap. xix. sect. 29, 30.

³ Illorum quoque similiter execramur blasphemiam, qui *novo sensu* asserere conantur, à tempore susceptæ carnis, omnia quæ erant Divinitatis in hominem demigrasse, et rursùm quæ humanitatis

erant, in Deum transfusa: ut, quod nulla unquam hæresis ausa est dicere, videatur *hac* confusione *utraque* exinanita esse substantia, et Deitatis scilicet, et humanitatis; et amisso proprio statu, in aliud esse mutata; ut [nos] qui tam Deum perfectum in Filio, quàm hominem confitemur, nec Deum verè nec hominem tenere credamur.

the propriety of the *anathemas*, or *damnatory clauses*. But III. we will drop the word *anathema*, as that will be considered under the eighteenth Article.

11. These damnatory clauses have occasioned much needless uneasiness. When such men, I say not as Chillingworth, for we have judged him weak in religious reasoning, but as Clarke, Tillotson¹, Secker, could be uneasy under them, I can ascribe it to nothing but the influence of religious *terror*; a sentiment which operates in all possible *degrees*; which makes us *scruple* to admit in religion what would occasion no difficulty in common affairs, lest our acquiescence *should* be owing to some corrupt or indirect motive. Indeed these great men, or some of them, might possibly attend as much to presumed scruples in *others*, as to any of *their own*. They might judge, that, whatever they themselves could do, it was not to be expected that the generality of men would be induced to set their minds at ease.

Scruples of this kind are owing to not freely admitting those limitations which common sense suggests in the application of every general proposition. Here I would recommend a careful perusal of the opening of *Dr. Ogden's* fifth Sermon on the Commandments; because it expresses well what I mean, and was written without the least view to our present subject. It also explains the expression, "*before all things* it is necessary." I will only give you a small part of it. "The preacher²," says Dr. Ogden, "prohibits in the most comprehensive expressions, and under the severest penalties. For the making of necessary exceptions and limitations, we are left to our own reflections, to nature, to experience, and the common sense of all the world." 103

The damnatory clauses before us may be divided into *two kinds*. The first declaring the evil of rejecting *Christianity*, or the Catholic Faith³, without specifying wherein that faith consists; the second declaring the evil of rejecting the particular *doctrines* of the creed. The first two sentences speak of

¹ See *Hints*, &c. p. 32; and Answer p. 51. *Clarke*, perhaps, as favouring some degree of Arianism.

² A proposer of a system of religion may come under this idea of a *preacher*; it must have been the sense of our Lord, when he said, "Go ye into all the world, and *preach* the Gospel to every creature." Mark xvi. 15.

³ By the Catholic faith seems to be meant genuine Christianity, unadulterated by fanciful notions, whims, refinements, &c. The expression has come from such Christianity being held by what might be called the *whole Church*; reckoning a few fanciful sects as exceptions not worthy of notice.

III. the Christian doctrine in general, be it what it may ; and the last says the same thing—that the creed may end as it began. And that clause which says that we should believe *rightly* the Incarnation, mentions no particulars, and is therefore such, taken separately, as any Christian might agree to. But the others relate to the doctrines of the creed. “The right faith is *this* :” “must *thus* think of the Trinity :” and “the right faith is :”—and then specifying what it is with regard to the Incarnation.

First, let us take the threat, which concerns the right faith in general, or genuine Christianity at large. Does this differ from Mark xvi. 16? “He that believeth and is baptized shall
104 be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Suppose it does *not*, you say, that does not clear up my difficulties. But it ought, considering the creed only as a creed ; for a creed is perfect if it agrees with Scripture. If you have any objections to the text of Scripture, those must not be objections to the creed. In whatever the Scripture is blameable, the creed is free from blame, supposing the creed to quote Scripture, or say what is equivalent to it.

But we will not be so strict : we will consider this text a little, though commenting on Scripture is not now our immediate business. Christ, having given all his proofs of the truth of his religion, just before his ascension commands his disciples to preach his religion after his departure ; and to those *ministers*, whom he commissions to preach, he says, Converts shall be saved, but those who refuse to be converted shall be condemned. The truth of this religion which was to be preached was all the while undoubted—taken for granted.

Therefore the meaning is, whoever accepts a message really sent from heaven must gain some benefit from it ; whoever rejects such message must at least suffer the loss of that benefit ; but he may moreover have positive punishment inflicted upon him because of his rejecting what God gave him sufficient opportunity to accept. For it cannot be questioned that God suits his evidence to our faculties, so that we may receive divine truth if we use them rightly. What more reasonable than such a declaration ?

Such is the case when the Gospel is committed to apostles or other authorised teachers, who believe it, to be by them proposed to mankind ; or when it is preached amongst those who have no prejudice against it. But, if a preacher proposes

Christianity to an *infidel*, threatening punishment on refusal, III the measure may seem more doubtful; yet still the truth of 105 what he proposes must be taken for granted, in order to make his threatening of any significance. And therefore, in that case, the meaning of the threat is, supposing my doctrine *true*, you will incur great evil by rejecting it. This is a very great incitement to examine diligently and honestly, but it cannot afford any argument to accept without examining. For, if the religion were false, it could not be accepted without excluding the true; and all threats of its preachers must be vain.

It is strange, but, apparently, nothing more is wanted for easing all difficulties arising from such threatenings as we are speaking of, than the plainest and most self-evident of all moral propositions: *No man is punishable for rejecting falsehood*. Why then, you say, does not the creed express this? because it is so plainly implied as to be needless; and because it would (according to Dr. Ogden's observation) weaken the effect, which a warning must be intended to produce. Why, you urge, need a creed make any warning or threat? A threat is not indeed essential to a creed; but if those to whom it is made are negligent, light-minded, contemptuous, interested, timid, prejudiced, capricious, or devoted to pleasure; or if they rely on being well-meaning, or commonly honest; or if they have any religious faults, such as fanaticism, &c.; a threat may be very *useful* to *rouse* them, or to *restrain* them, to make them follow their best reason, and exert their best faculties¹. It is 106 a solemn thing, to publish, amidst a crowd of heresies and religious extravagances, a system of sound doctrines; it must, in some cases, require all the efforts of the most powerful teacher to make *truth* ingenuously received. Yet it must always be needful to banish, as much as possible, all indifference for sacred truth. If it is indifferent to neglect *truth*, then *reason* was given us in vain; then error leads to no mischief; yet what are moral errors but opinions that are hurtful to mankind?— If it be indifferent to reject Christianity, then Christ died in

¹ Perhaps the thoughts here offered, may appear better in the following order:

1. A threat promotes examination, instead of preventing it.

2. It is made needful by the many *faults* which may hinder a man from

allowing the infinite importance of religious truth.

3. Wherein the importance of religious truth consists: from the nature of the thing, and from the positive declarations of Scripture.

III. vain²; and the prophets in vain foretold his coming, ever since the world began.

I suppose this might suffice to justify those threats of our creed which relate to rejecting pure Christianity, or the Catholic Faith at large, without specifying any particular doctrines; yet it may be worth while to make one or two additional remarks.

1. Being *saved* and being *damned*, or condemned, do not imply any one fixed degree of happiness or misery; but admit of *various degrees*, without limit. Both in heaven and hell there may be *many mansions*. Nor is any great degree necessarily implied in the word "*everlasting*," taken singly. Indeed, every *fine*, however small, is an everlasting punishment. Yet we may easily suppose too small a degree of evil, as well as too large an one, to be implied in the word "*damned*."

The endless number of degrees of happiness and misery which may be comprised under the terms salvation and condemnation, might serve to compose some disputes about the salvation of *heathens*, and of those who lived before the time of Christ. These persons may possibly enjoy lower degrees of happiness than good Christians, and yet may be *saved*; or may suffer misery in a lower degree than wicked Christians, and yet be *condemned*. It does not appear to me a Christian doctrine, that any person will be happy in the same *degree* with a good Christian; whether his want of Christian faith was his *fault*, or only his *misfortune*. Every man may miss happiness by *misfortune*; by bad *parents*, by being amongst savages, &c. &c.—under a bad civil *government*, &c. &c.: indeed, this is the very meaning of the word *misfortune*.

2. Mark xvi. 16, must be so understood as to be consistent with the texts about *judging*: Matt. vii. 1. Rom. xiv. 4. James iv. 12. Therefore no man, not even a commissioned teacher, has a right to apply Mark xvi. 16 to any particular

² The necessity of a right belief, or of endeavouring to attain one, might be more fully shewn, if it were made a separate subject. See Dr. Balguy Sermon ix. pp. 158—160. What he says in one part answers exactly to my idea of our damnatory clauses when rightly taken; though he probably was not thinking of them. "Let those who think it a matter of small importance whether the religion

of Jesus be true or false, attend well to the force of these expressions (of Scripture), and *tremble* at the consequences of their own neglect."

Whatever should be offered, in treating this subject, of the necessity of acquiring a right belief, or right notions, as far as, humanly speaking, we are able, would be so much in favour of the damnatory clauses in question.

case: not even to his own case. That is, he is not, by the III. general denunciation, to imagine that he can see how any particular man will be finally rewarded or punished.

3. And, as man is not a judge, and as God is the only judge in all particular cases, no extraordinary situation ought to occasion any uneasiness. It is not to be supposed that a Judge all-wise and all-powerful will proceed mechanically: his remission of punishment, as well as his adjusting of rewards, may fully be believed capable of suiting all situations, however nice and complicated. 108

As therefore a person who believes and is baptized may not in effect be saved, if he neglect the conditions stipulated in baptism; so it may possibly happen, that a man may disbelieve and reject the truth itself, and yet not be condemned to any great positive evil, if God knows that his disbelief is owing to some extraordinary want of the means of information. Hence no one should be unhappy about any extraordinary case, of himself, or his friends: the true of heart should be glad.

4. Denunciation of vengeance against *vice* is made in general terms, as in Rom. i. 18; ii. 6, &c.; yet it is not imagined that repentance will be unavailing, or that much will be required of him to whom little has been given. It would be difficult to shew why threatenings against infidelity should be more strictly interpreted.

These additional remarks are often wanted, on a subject which is apt to occasion uneasiness: if they are *abused*, the guilt must fall on those who abuse them.

Let us now consider those condemning clauses of our creed, which threaten all who reject its particular *doctrines*. Here Mark xvi. 16 will assume this form:—‘He that believeth the *orthodox* doctrines of this *creed* (having been already baptized) will be saved; but he that believeth *them* not will be damned.’ When this form is addressed to such as have no particular objections to those doctrines, but only think a *good sort of man* need not trouble himself about such matters, I suppose there is not much difficulty: the threats are then plainly *seen* to be, what in truth they always are, *warnings* and *incitements* to a fair and diligent study of religious truth. 109

But, if an orthodox preacher proposes his system to a dissenter or heretic, then the case, though it may seem more

III. difficult, is the same as when an apostle¹ proposes Christianity to an heathen: to make his threats of any consequence, his doctrine must be supposed to be true. The orthodox teacher says, in effect, *supposing* my doctrines to be *really* those of Christianity, or of the true catholic faith, you will suffer by rejecting them; to reject them is to reject the catholic faith itself. This is, as before, an *incitement* to attention, because still, if the person adopts what is false, he cannot be at liberty to adopt what is true; and therefore the threat, in reality, operates against accepting implicitly.

If, as before, you ask, why does the author of the creed say positively, "the catholic faith *is* this," and not speak on supposition of truth? the answer is the same: it *must* be implied; and it would be unnatural, and unsuitable to the purpose of his solemn exordium, which is of the nature of an eloquent exhortation, to introduce doubts and hesitations, when he wanted to rouse an earnest attention to what he assured himself was truth. Common sense, when you thought calmly, would easily supply you with the *supposition* or limitation, in case you found yourself unable to think that true which he imagined to be indisputably true. It will bear repeating, No man is punishable for rejecting falsehood: and every man sees this, when he thinks coolly; and is ready to act upon it.

If you ask again, why need the author of the creed prefix a threat to his system of doctrines? the answer may be repeated: because he thought the errors of great importance, which his creed was intended to exclude: because he thought every effort wanted to animate men's zeal in the cause. You will do well to prefix a solemn warning to *whatever*² you publish as true and highly important.

¹ So it seems to me. Our Divines in 1689 settled, that the condemning clauses should "be understood as relating only to those who obstinately deny the *substance* of the Christian faith." A man cannot be condemned for rejecting the substance of the Christian faith, but on supposition of the truth of Christianity. And a man may suffer for rejecting the doctrine of the Church of *England*, on supposition of the *truth* of that doctrine. And the same is true of the tenets of any set of *dissenters* from the Church of *England*.

² I am told that the *Baptists* at a cer-

tain town, at a solemn ordination, declared in their sermons repeatedly, that no one can be saved who is only baptized as an *infant*, or who does this or that, contrary to *their* peculiar notions. I hope they meant as is here settled. Mark xvi. 16 would assume this form: He that believeth *our* doctrine, and is baptized, as an *adult* shall be saved; but he that is baptized as an *infant*, or believeth *not* our doctrines, shall be damned.

Our *Reformatio Legum* has a short chapter on this subject: *De summâ Trinitate et Fide Catholicâ*, cap. xvii.

One difference may be urged as subsisting between the III. two cases. Some men may say, (if they receive Christianity, but not what is called orthodoxy,) how unreasonable is it to alarm men with the denunciation of vengeance, in case they do not receive and profess doctrines which are *unintelligible*! It may not be amiss to take some notice of this difficulty, though we before had a chapter on assenting to unintelligible propositions¹. In that chapter it was observed, that a proposition may be intelligible as *rejecting*² an error, which is not so in itself. We can sometimes see that a thing is wrong, when we have not a distinct idea how to alter it, so as to make it right. I look upon the propositions of the Athanasian Creed as rejecting errors, even when they are not in a negative form. Nay, it might bear an inquiry, whether even the unintelligible propositions contained in the *Articles* ought not, in strictness, to be considered in that light. But, if this is true only with regard to the *creed*, the propositions of it may be all intelligible, if rightly taken. And, if this be true in part, they may be intelligible in part. Some propositions in the creed are unintelligible to some persons, because they know not the opinions rejected; as was observed in the chapter above mentioned. But these are only on the footing of other unintelligible propositions, to which a man may have occasion to give a verbal assent, for the good of religious society. (Book III. chap. x.) For whatever *reasons* any propositions are unintelligible, it should always be remembered by those who are to assent to them, that, when we have no *opinion*, we can have no feeling of *certainty*, or clear conviction: our mind is unfixed—our assent fluctuating. The want of such fixed feeling has sometimes occasioned uneasiness and scruples; and so has excited prejudices against confessions of faith.

We may here also make the same additional remarks, as in the former case.

1. The word “perish” admits of *degrees*, as well as “saved” and “damned:” it is probably used either as equivalent to “damned,” or as being somewhat less harsh.

2. An orthodox preacher has no more right to pass final *judgment* on an heretic or dissenter, than a preacher of Christianity at large on an infidel. Nor has an orthodox preacher

¹ Book III. chap. x.

² The negative form of some propositions in the creed of Pelagius, or the *Ser.*

de Tempore 191 (236), are worthy of commendation; as has before been observed.

III. any right to *apply* the threat of St. Mark to any particular
 112 case; not even to his own. That is, though any man may say, I must be careful how I reject *truth*³, because if I do I shall suffer; though any minister has authority to say, You must be very careful how you reject *truth*; yet no man ought to make himself unhappy, as if he must of course be damned for disbelieving the tenets of a certain creed. No minister has a right to say, You will be damned if you do not account my doctrines essential to the true Christian faith.

3. The Deity may exercise his power of *remitting*, on the heretic as well as on the infidel, according to the circumstances of education, &c. Perhaps such power of remitting may be exercised in a greater degree on rejecting a right *mode* of Christianity, than on rejecting the *substance*.

4. The denunciations against heresy ought not to be interpreted more strictly than those against infidelity; perhaps somewhat less strictly: certainly therefore not more strictly than denunciations against vice.

I hope I may now conclude, that a mind not tinctured with superstition, or religious fear, will be able to supply such rational limitations to the general threatenings of our creed, as to judge them harmless in all situations, and useful in many; that their tendency is, when terror does not discompose the judgment, to make men "prove all things," and not to accept even the doctrines of the creed itself implicitly, lest, in accepting any thing erroneous, they should eventually reject the truth.

12. But, lest there should be some too scrupulous in supplying limitations, I will put an end to my remarks on these damnatory clauses by an attempt to supply such limitation myself, in a kind of *paraphrase* on the opening of the creed; and, as they make the most difficult part of our present Article, which does not come into some other Article, we may suppose the *application* to begin here; and with a kind of form of *assent*.

‘Heresies are very numerous; defiling the purity of the faith, making men act on wrong principles, affording handle to infidelity, and dividing Christians amongst themselves, so as to defeat the ends of religious society, and probably lose some degree of future happiness; it seems needful therefore to draw

³ Would not this be the right idea for | the curses or anathemas in Deut. xxvii.
 any one to have when he said *Amen* to | introduced in our *Commination*?

the erroneous notions, which are so pernicious, into a small III. compass, and solemnly reject them; that the unwary may be cautioned, and the bold and busy innovator discouraged. And, lest the unstable, who are tossed about with every wind of doctrine, should continue to indulge their childish fondness for novelty, and live on without any regular and permanent principles, it seems also needful to remind them of the last solemn declaration of our blessed Lord¹; not surely with a view to bias the judgment, but only to inforce the duty of a sober and serious attention to sacred *truth*, uninfluenced by passion or caprice; to suggest, that what Christ died to accomplish cannot be an indifferent matter. He who is impressed with this thought will, of course, describe *particulars* according to his own judgment; but he will do that without denying that all other men, duly qualified and authorized, may do the same.' 114
Such an act of assenting, no one, I should hope, would deem unreasonable.

Mutual concessions seem to have little place in the present Article. Such as relate to the *doctrines* have been proposed (or will be) under the several *Articles* in which those doctrines are respectively laid down. And concessions with regard to damnatory clauses seem to be rendered unnecessary, by the liberty of using them being equally allowed to all: as also by our declaration, that they are not essential to a creed. At least, if the explanations of them here given are not sufficient to prevent disputes, I know of nothing which would answer that purpose.

We may consider therefore whether any thing in the way of *improvement* occurs on looking back on this Article.

And the first question which is suggested by such a review is, whether, on the whole, it would be an improvement if the creed, of which we are treating, were to be expunged from our Liturgy. In *America* it is excluded; and several eminent² men in our own Church, from whose works the members of it receive continually instruction and improvement, have seemed to wish it removed. Dr. *Waterland*, on the other hand, who seems to have attended to it most fairly, is for retaining it. In the commission of 1689³, it was to be retained. Bishop Gibson, whom I consider as very eminent for extensive know-

¹ Mark xvi. 16.

² See *Hints*, &c. p. 32, and Answer, p. 47.

³ See *Waterland's* Pref. Nov. 7, 1727: and Apology, in answer to *Hints*, &c. p. 46.

III. ledge, under the guidance of sound reason and plain unadulterated common sense, appears to have been a friend to the retaining of it.

115 Some have had an idea of throwing out the condemning clauses, and retaining the doctrines; which is not an impracticable plan if desirable on the whole ⁴. But let us take them separately.

With regard to the *doctrines*, one does not see why they may not be retained as long as our Thirty-nine *Articles* are retained, which coincide in doctrine with the creed ⁵. The doctrinal part of the creed has been called a *bulwark* ⁶; and if it be maintained, it should be maintained as a *fortification*. In time of peace, the inconvenience of keeping up fortifications occasions their being sometimes neglected; but, when war breaks out afresh, every one is clamorous in blaming the imprudence of such neglect. If we were at peace now with the powers which would attack us where our creed would be our defence, we should be always *liable* to be at war with them again. We have seen ⁷ how naturally all the heresies condemned in the creed arise, when men once become eager in solving the difficulties of the Trinity and the Incarnation; and such eagerness might at any time arise, on any revolution, or
 116 great disturbance, or confusion. The *Eutychian* notions, which make the most difficult part of our creed, were revived at the Reformation ⁸; and the *Maid of Kent* suffered death at the stake rather than relinquish them, after a twelvemonth's reflection in confinement. And, in case of renewed attacks, our present creed would be a much better defence than any new one that would be made at the time it was wanted. In the *Candid Disquisitions* too much difference is made, in my opinion, between literate and *illiterate* people: an illiterate man understands the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation

⁴ This plan was recommended in a separate paper, or very small pamphlet, printed at Ipswich, in 1794; which the British Critic approves. I am very much obliged to the author for the handsome things which he says of me. Some time after the publication, and after I had spoken thus, my friend, Mr. Pearson, of Sidney college, Cambridge, owned himself to be the author; a gentleman to whom our country is obliged for the best set of Sermons on the State Fast and

Festivals (as far as my judgment goes) that I ever read. Bp. Butler's I have not read lately; and they are only on two out of the four.

⁵ The *Candid Disquisitors* are for retaining the creed, but never having it publicly read; in the same manner as we retain the 39 Articles: p. 96, 2d edit.

⁶ Waterland, p. 274, from Luther.

⁷ Under the Second Article.

⁸ Whiston revived the *Apollinarian* heresy.

as well as the literate. There is no part of learning which is III. of any significance to the creed, but an acquaintance with the opinions of some Christian heretics; and that lies in a very small compass¹.

But we are now in actual war about many doctrines rejected by our creed. And I suspect that many of those, who are so impatient about it, secretly favour a change in the doctrines of the Church; and are, at bottom, adverse to the creed because it is so impregnable.

With regard to retaining the *condemning clauses*, they seem so little difficult to *me*, that I am scarce a judge what should be done. Some *alterations* they might admit; but I think the explanation now given², both of them and the doctrines, such as by proper language might be made intelligible 117 even to the people.

The creed taken altogether has been *admired*; I can conceive it. I believe it is now³ admired by many who have not given themselves to speculations and scruples about it. Doubt and perplexity damp⁴ the warmth of any sentiment; but, if these were settled by some authoritative and received limitations, &c., I should expect it to be admired generally by those who resigned their minds to its *doctrines*. If it really be admired and esteemed, though only by a *part* of our congregations, that is some reason for retaining it. Christians, when they can, should be indulgent to the wishes of their brethren.

What shall we say then? Let the creed be retained, read seldom, and explained (according to what has been said of explaining things unintelligible) to the people. The *Swedish* custom introduces it too seldom, only twice in the year; our's perhaps rather too often, thirteen times. It is a matter which need not be settled to a great nicety⁵.

¹ See *Free and Candid Disquisitions*, beginning of chap. vi. Also p. 280, 2d edit.

² 1795. It has sometimes occurred to me, that the explanations of the condemning clauses here given go more upon the idea of teaching others, than of confessing one's own belief. Yet Mark xvi. 16, is a general declaration, applicable to all particular occasions: a man may use it in settling his own principles, and in listening to instruction, as well as in instructing others. Besides, in the more particular and fuller creeds,

one who repeats them is really in *controversy*: he is professing in what he *differs* from his brethren. He is making a *tacit contrast* between himself and others; and is, in effect, *proposing* to them to join his society.

³ I was once warmly reproved by a sensible and respectable parish-clerk for not reading it on *both* the two successive Sundays, Whit-sunday and Trinity-sunday. The parish a small one in the country.

⁴ Book III. chap. iii. sect. 4.

⁵ The Commission of 1689 had agreed,

III. But before I quit the subject of improvements, I will
 118 submit to the judgment of the candid, whether every *sect*
 should not produce a creed⁶, in order to entitle it to *toleration*?
 and (leaving the two shorter creeds, as being established) whe-
 ther something thrown into the Athanasian Creed, about the
 nature of unintelligible doctrines, and of verbal arguments
 made out of them, might not give satisfaction to many minds?
 And *lastly*, lest the damnatory clauses should still occasion
 difficulty, whether it would not be better to have the *threats*
 in words of *Scripture*, than in words of human composition?
 whether if Mark xvi. 16 was pronounced, or sung, at the
 opening and conclusion, instead of the present application of
 it, and also between the rehearsal of the doctrine of the Trinity
 and that of the Incarnation, in the manner of the *Gloria Patri*;
 and instead of “the Catholic faith *is* this,” some other expres-
 sion was used, such as “the faith *we hold* is this;” the creed
 would not be more generally satisfactory, and its solemnity be
 at least equally great? If Mark xvi. 16 appeared, after all,
 too striking and alarming, perhaps that expression so often
 repeated in Scripture, might sometimes supply its place, “*He*
that hath ears to hear, let him hear;” but I must confess, that,
 if these passages of Scripture were introduced, I should give
 my suffrage for the continuance of the creed, in all its parts.
 And I do not decline assenting to it in its present form⁷.

that it should be read *six* times a year, instead of thirteen. See Postscript to Waterland's Preface, (to his Hist. Athan. Creed) dated Nov. 7, 1727. A note of Waterland, p. 244, beginning of 10th chapter, says, that it was, at one time, 1555, read *daily* in the Church.

⁶ Dr. Wall says, he fears that the *Baptists* have no fixed baptismal creed. See Hist. of Inf. Baptism, p. 509, quarto.

⁷ 1796.—In the year 1790 I seemed to have a kind of call upon me to lay before a respectable audience, at a Visitation, some thoughts on the Athanasian Creed; those, which the reader has now gone through, being in my mind, I of course took such as seemed to suit the purpose. I was desired to print; I complied; saying, in an advertisement prefixed to the Sermon, that I had delivered the same things more at length, in Lectures. This small publication was thought worth a pamphlet in answer, called “A

Review,” &c., but that Review contained so many things contrary to my ideas of controversy—ideas expressed in the second Book of this system—that I forbore replying to it. I felt, indeed, a natural propensity to set several things right, both relating to myself personally, and to the reasonings which I had used; but I have had the happiness to find, that those whose opinions I valued most have done what I had wished to do for themselves. In my Lectures since the *Review* came out, I have declared to my hearers, that I had repeatedly perused it, in hopes of deriving improvement from it, but that I really had no new knowledge to communicate. I hope I shall always peruse with attention, and with a real desire of correcting my errors, whatever may be written in opposition to any work of mine; and as the present work contains many controverted opinions, this may be a proper occasion to say, that if any

THE Articles of the Church of England may be considered III. as consisting of *three Parts*. The first ends, and the second 120 begins, here. The third begins with the eighteenth Article. That part which we have gone through relates to what we are to study, in order rightly to obey *God* and his *Word*. That which we now enter upon regards the nature of *man*, and human obedience, taking man as an *individual*. The last part relates to the same, taking him as a member of a Christian *Church*. As our Articles were composed chiefly with a view to separating from the Church of *Rome*, the doctrines of that Church are treated with peculiar attention.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND PART.

1. THE second part, which is now our immediate object, seems more easy to comprehend in one's own mind than to explain to others. The doctrines it contains, if only *thought of*, may seem consonant to common sense; but, if delivered in *words*, may seem nice and abstruse. These doctrines are connected together; and have all a tendency to determine how far the *agency of God*, or the *agency of man*, should be conceived as effecting the salvation of Christians¹.

The many disputes and perplexities which have arisen concerning this class of doctrines, have been so much owing to the want of considering the nature of human LANGUAGE, that 121 it would be worth while to lay down a few *preliminary* remarks on that subject, before we come to be biassed by our prejudices about any particular tenets.

any persons, adversaries or friends, should ever make me see any subject in a new light, I shall be desirous to make my new opinion as public as the old one; and therefore, if I retract nothing, it may be concluded that I think I have nothing material to retract. As to defending, it is often, as was just now hinted, labour thrown away. Readers in general, or at least the more estimable sort, are able to see through sophistry themselves, and to despise personal abuse. And I might now claim some exemptions on account of age, and of other works which want a finishing hand. Nevertheless, if any candid person, kindly disposed, will openly,

under his own name, take the trouble to inform me, that after a fair and attentive consideration, he cannot get over any particular objection, either to my conduct or my reasoning, it will be my *wish*, at least, to give such a person satisfaction.

¹ Those who favour the agency of man, speak, in their most *formal* discussions, the language of *ordinary life*: those who favour the agency of God, speak *frequently* the language of *ordinary life*; but, on more *solemn* occasions, introduce a mode of language which makes man no agent at all—merely passive.

III. And we shall do this with the greater clearness and effect, if we consider language as relating to human actions, in the first place, independently of scriptural expressions.

We must not expect, by this method, to gain any thing that can be called a complete knowledge of the human mind, or of those principles of action on which virtue and its rewards depend: it must be thought sufficient if we learn where to submit to the ignorance belonging to our present state, so as to avoid *dispute* and perplexity; which are generally owing to our speaking as if we understood that which our Maker has placed beyond our comprehension.

2. Some men are greatly *prejudiced* against this sort of discussion; not so much on reflection, as before reflection. They throw it aside in *disgust*; it is trifling, quibbling, perplexing; too difficult to do good, or perhaps too obvious to require any thought or care. And *after* reflection, it is sometimes condemned as having led men into great intricacies, and produced much false science. There may be some truth in the *facts*; and it is really mortifying to find that we know so little as we do about our own actions. But I consider the evil as having arisen from *abuse*, rather than from the nature of the thing; and I am persuaded, that great *care* to admit only what we really do see and feel, and that only just *as* we see and feel it, is a much better plan than running away from discussion, or shutting our eyes whenever we cannot see distinctly.

122 3. If *popular language* is understood too strictly, it will always mislead. It is taken from our *feelings*, made for *use*, and suited to circumstances; a proposition expressed universally is by no means to be taken as liable to no limitations². A person indeed in the proper circumstances makes the due limitations easily, scarce conscious of what he does; but one not in the proper circumstances, or not able to conceive himself in them, always gets wrong. This is true both of language about *bodies* and language about *spirits*: but yet we are less deceived by the former than the latter; especially since the improvements made by Mr. *Locke*. A man conversant in philosophy, when he hears of fire being hot³, gold being yellow and malleable, does not understand the expressions as if he had a knowledge of bodies independent of their *effects*, though that is what the words seem to imply; but is aware that

² See Book I. chap. x. sect. 1. & 5.

³ See the last section of Article iii.

nothing is meant but to describe the result of past experience. III. I fear, that, when any one speaks of the *foreknowledge* of God, or the *will* of man, the expressions do not get so rationally reduced to what they really mean. To prevent men from taking popular language concerning the mind, of God or man, as if it were strictly philosophical and universal, is the intent of what I am going to offer.

4. First, then, the language which we make use of to express the acts of the mind, is not taken from any theory, perfectly understood; but is merely such as arises from our *feelings*, and such as is *wanted* for the active purposes of life. It *sounds* as if it were more speculative and theoretical, but if we take it as such it will mislead us. When we have said a thing first with a particular view, we are very apt to make our observation *general*, and then it appears like mere theory; but, in reality, words are only invented and used originally, when expressing our feelings has some tendency to procure good. To compare the language of men with that of *brutes*, might perhaps be invidious; else I would wish any one to consider whether the difference is not more in *degree* than in *kind*. When “the lions¹ roaring after their prey, do seek their meat from God;” when the horse “saith among the trumpets², ha, ha,” they are not suspected of making abstract propositions; they are only deemed to express that which they really *do* express, their *feelings*, with a view to *good*. If *men* were more commonly supposed to do the same thing, human language would be better understood. Or, were mens expressions to be construed more with a view to *particular facts* than they are, less error and dispute would arise. 123

5. A man says, “I am my own master; I am certain I can do what I choose:” he expresses what he *feels*, and there is no *deceit*. Of the same man, another says, “hold a pistol to his breast, and tell him you will shoot him if he does not give you a shilling; I am certain he *must* give it you:” this man expresses the result of *experience*, and again there is no deceit. Yet put these into *abstract* propositions, and then the first is, ‘Man is free;’ the second, ‘Man is under necessity.’ And all the disputes about *freedom and necessity* arise from no other cause than the seeming interference between these two propositions. I say *seeming*, because, though they interfere when delivered abstractedly, they do not interfere at all in

¹ Psalm civ. 21.

² Job xxxix. 25.

III. their primitive form. One man, who is the *agent*, expresses
 124 an inward *feeling*; the other, who is the *spectator*, expresses
 a result of *experience*. These two cannot interfere, for they
 have no connection with one another; any more than if one
 had said, 'I have the *gout* in my foot', and the other had said,
 'the *sun* will rise to-morrow morning.' How strange it would
 seem to argue from the admission of one of these events to
 the exclusion of the other!

6. Men are often misled by language about the mind,
 because they take it for *proper* language, whereas it is always
metaphorical. We express the acts of the mind by a *compari-*
son with bodily actions. To *reflect*, is originally to bend
 back; to *instil*, or *inculcate*, is to drop in, or tread in; and
 so on. *Melancholy* is black bile—*dejection*, casting down, &c.³
 Now, what we know by comparison only, we must know much
 less *distinctly* than what we see immediately, and have a plain
 and proper *name* for; and the less distinctly we *see* any thing,
 the less distinctly can we *reason* about it. And, if we affix
ideas to metaphorical terms, as if they were plain and proper,
 we are continually filling the mind with wrong ideas; which
 must, in time, produce erroneous propositions and conclusions.

7. Language about human voluntary actions is imperfect
 in other respects—in using positive terms in *negative* senses.
Spirit is a word which is used as if we had a positive idea
 affixed to it; yet the safest way is to consider it as a mere
negation of matter; and so the *soul*, as a negation of the body.
 But this observation is most wanted for the terms which imply
infinity; for, though *infinite* is evidently in its etymology a
 negative term, yet *omniscient*, *omnipresent*, *immense*, *omni-*
potent, &c., are apt to occur to the mind as having a positive
 125 signification: and Mr. Locke⁴ says, "there be those who ima-
 gine they have *positive* ideas of *infinite* duration and space."
 This greatly affects our *reasoning*; for, if men go on *connect-*
ing these terms in arguments, they get into errors, which they
 would have avoided if they had constantly kept in mind what
 kind of ideas are really annexed to them. Such terms, indeed,
 of positive sound and negative meaning, do occur in common
 life. *Health* means often only a negation of diseases, those
 particularly to which the person in question is subject; *sweet*
 often means only *not putrid*;—and it may be the least evil

³ This has been mentioned in Book II. chap. iii. sect. 4; but it is particularly
 wanted here.

⁴ Underst. II. xvii. 13.

to use such terms in such senses¹: but this does not remove our III. danger: in matters of a metaphysical sort we cannot be too cautious about admitting false conceptions.

8. The imperfections of language in assigning *causes* should also be clearly seen. Assigning causes is a thing which is so very frequently to be done, that it is done quickly, and familiarly—inconsiderately, one might say; in words not weighed or attended to. Those to whom it is done are left to supply, from the nature of the thing, what is deficient in the expression.

Sometimes a *partial cause* is assigned as if it were the whole. This happens when there is some particular *end* in view, of *recommending* or *depreciating*. The Romans were freed from kingly government, and enjoyed liberty under consuls. To whom was their liberty owing? to *Brutus*, says an orator complimenting his family: to *Lucretia*, says another, either speaking in favour of her act of suicide, or proving that Providence brings good out of evil. Here, for *theory*, that which is omitted should be *supplied*; as in assigning good *principles* as a cause of any thing, good *actions* are implied; and in assigning good *actions* as a cause, good *principles*. What is the *cause* of that man's preferment? his good *conduct*: this cannot be a *complete* account, except his good *principles* are supposed to be implied. What is the cause why you are so attached to that man? because I believe him to be a man of thorough good *principles*. This is a partial account, in some sense, except good *conduct* be supposed to be implied. 126

Sometimes an effect is ascribed to a cause which is merely *verbal*. What is the cause of the moon's being retained in an orbit? *gravity, attraction*: but you know nothing of gravity or attraction, except those very effects which you ascribe to them. In this way, events are ascribed to *nature*, or to *fate*, and, we might perhaps add, to *merit*.

Errors frequently arise from our speaking of unknown causes, as if they were known before their effects; and from our losing *sight* of those effects from which all the little idea we have of the causes is derived. Whether we know the Being of a God *à priori*², has been doubted; but it seems

¹ When I speak of imperfection in language, I only mean, that it is imperfect if taken *strictly*. The present manner of speaking may possibly be as con-

venient as any; and it is that into which men naturally fall; only we must take care it does not deceive and mislead us.

² Book I. chap. iii. sect. 3.

III. that we more commonly form our particular ideas of him *à posteriori* from what we know of *man*: we enlarge and purify human qualities to the greatest degree³ possible, and thence form our conceptions of the character of God. This is the
 127 best we *can* do; but sometimes we are not consistent; we ascribe qualities to God of which we have had no experience, though perhaps under old names. I should not wonder if the disputes about the Divine *prescience* were found to have had this origin.

I do not mean ascribing *human* actions, bodily members, &c. to God, but things too remote from humanity. When we speak of God's using any *human means*, or *powers*, as *arm*, *eye*, &c., we only intend to assert, that God accomplishes some *end*, which, if it was performed by man, would be performed by the intervention of such means.

We are apt to say, *Nature intended* that such a thing should be so or so. Our being right or wrong in this seems to depend upon the distinction before us. If we gather the intention of nature from *experience* of what is *best*, we are safe; if from a notion that we know something of nature as a *person*, before any experience, the intentions of nature will prove to be nothing better than our own crude fancies⁴.

9. We have already hinted⁵, that propositions seemingly universal are in reality calculated for some particular situation of things; so that the circumstances in which any proposition is used make a *part* of its *sense*; and you cannot change those circumstances without *changing* the sense. But this should now be mentioned again, for the sake of some illustrations belonging particularly to our present subject. There are several propositions used in morals and religion, which are in
 128 strictness only *declamatory* expressions, used for the purpose of *persuasion*; or, as Mr. Harris calls⁶ lamentations on the comparative wickedness of the present age, "natural declamations incidental to man." The assigning of partial causes, before mentioned, comes sometimes very near these eloquent enunciations. But sometimes *propositions* in general terms have more the appearance of speculation than such descriptions, though they are made for a particular situation or con-

³ Book I. chap. iii. sect. 1.

⁴ We have contended, Book I. ch. iv. sect. 4, for reasoning from effect to cause, and then back from cause to effect, in some cases. Advantage is not taken of

that here, because *nature* seems nothing *real*—a mere *name*.

⁵ Sect. 3; also Book I. chap. x. sect. 1.

⁶ Harris's Works, vol. iv. p. 529.

ception of things, "A state of *nature* is a state of *war*." III. Suppose the state of nature mentioned to be a state of undisciplined *passions*, and the assertion may be true: suppose the state that in which every principle of human action has the strength and influence *intended* it by nature, and the assertion is false. The former state comes nearer *fact*, the latter nearer *ideal* perfection; so we may say, the assertion is true in *practice*, though false in *theory*.

10. Hence, if due regard be not paid to circumstances, propositions will *seem* to *contradict* each other, when they really do not; or, they will be contradictory in *words*, though not in *meaning*. The gravity of a body, says one, is greater as the size of the body, towards which it is attracted and moves, is greater. No, says another, the gravity of a body must be greater as its *own* size is greater; the larger a body is the more it will weigh. No, says a third, the gravity of a body is greater the nearer it is to the centre of attraction. These are all *right*, and only *seem* to contradict each other through want of attention to circumstances. However, it has been thought worth while to mark the different situations here to be conceived, by giving gravity different *names* when spoken of in those different situations. In *morals* this is not done; therefore we should use the more caution, to answer the same end. The *will* of man is sometimes understood as equivalent to his *wish*, or desire—sometimes to his *determination*; so that, when a man determines to do any thing disagreeable, or contrary to his desire, his will is *contrary* to his will. And sometimes a man *permits* another to follow his own choice; who may, by acting in consequence of the will of his superior, do something *against* his will. Nothing can be more intelligible than all this, (if the jingle of the words does not give some alarm;) and yet, when things are said about the will of God, or man, without due attention to these circumstances, dispute and confusion are apt to arise. 129

11. The subject reckoned most difficult in religion, natural and revealed, is *predestination*. I believe that most of the difficulties attending it are owing to want of attention to the elements now laid down.

All our observations are useful on this subject: about words being taken from *facts*, being intended to answer some *good* purpose, and being *metaphorical*; about *negative* senses; assigning *causes*, *partial* and *verbal*; and confining general

III. affirmations to particular *circumstances*—including *declamatory* expressions; for I am persuaded, that no saying about predestination is any thing more than a declamatory expression, calculated to *persuade*, or excite good *sentiments* or emotions. But to enter farther into this at present, would carry us into too great length for an Introduction. Therefore I pass on to expressions of *Scripture*; only hinting, that elements are seldom perfectly clear at first mention; that their justness must not, in general, be expected to appear fully, till they come to
 130 be applied to those particular cases for which they were intended, and from which, indeed, they were *collected*.

12. Let us then first observe, that the *same* kind of expressions occur in *Scripture* which have been now examined. Scripture-language is *popular* language, and *must* be so, however imperfect that language be; otherwise it would have misled all those to whom it was addressed.

As to words coming from *facts*, external and internal, it will suffice to say, that numberless instances may be found in which an *agent* speaks of himself as *free*, and in which a *spectator* speaks of an agent as subject to *necessity*. We might allege such instances as Matt. xviii. 7; Luke xvii. 1; which give merely the result of *experience*. Scriptural terms relating to the mind must be metaphorical; there are no others. Positive terms with negative meanings are common in Scripture; as *Spirit*, *Almighty*, *All-wise*, &c. *Partial causes* are assigned, as in the case of *faith* and works; and one of these is *implied* in the other. And I believe *predestination* may be, sometimes at least, considered as a *verbal* or unknown cause of known effects; and much the same might be said of *desert*, or deserving. Descriptions of *God* taken from the qualities of *men*, and even from their bodily members, are more numerous in Scripture than in any other book.

From general expressions, supposed to be used in certain *situations*, arise all the seeming *contradictions* of Scripture. I have already mentioned *declamatory* expressions; and I might add instances of such lamentations as Mr. Harris was speaking of in the passage before mentioned: “there is none that doeth good, no *not one*,” &c. The seeming inconsistencies about *temptations* being desirable, or the contrary, and
 131 about the *will* of God, are all to be referred to this head; and indeed every other seeming inconsistency whatsoever¹.

¹ Book I. chap. x. sect. 10. Note ⁶, vol. I. p. 51.

13. But, besides these difficulties, common to the Scrip-III. tures and other popular writings, we seem to have some in addition when we study the sacred Volume.

Our judgments are apt to be *discomposed*, by a warmth of veneration sometimes running perhaps into superstition; or by admiration and devotion; or by fear of deceiving ourselves; or sometimes, possibly, by a fear of being obliged in conscience to give up the party to which we have been attached; or by suspicions that we are not so ready to give it up as we ought to be. Such feelings hinder us from judging *calmly*; they prevent our common sense from doing its proper office.

14. Our belief that Scripture is the *word of God*, makes us scrupulous of treating it so freely as we would the word of man; and therefore we decline making those limitations which are necessary to give us the true meaning. And though it must be a weakness to omit any thing which we know is calculated to bring to light the truth, yet scruples do in effect produce the evil here described.

15. As the Scripture is a *revelation* of the will of God, we are apt to expect that every part will open to us some *new truths*; and therefore that we must not use our reason and rules of interpreting here as in common cases. *New facts* may produce some new reasonings; but in general it appears, as we improve in the knowledge of the Scriptures, that the sacred writers took the knowledge of our duties for granted¹: and, if we take a scriptural remark on a *known* virtue for a publication of a *new* one, we must run into error. The Scriptures have no doubt improved morality, by occasional remarks and reproofs, and by proposing new motives, &c.; in short, by methods which cannot now be particularly enlarged upon; but nothing is delivered which need be exempted from the ordinary rules of rational interpretation and criticism. 132

16. Another thing, which has occasioned difficulties in understanding the Scriptures, is the use which the sacred reasoners sometimes make of the *argumentum ad hominem*². They sometimes do say things as *true*, and reason upon them, without seeming to mean more than that those to whom they address themselves will *allow* them to be true. And the length

¹ Dr. Balguy, p. 196. See also p. 87, about politics.

² Book I. chap xvii. sect. 19, near end. Book II. chap. ii. sect. 13. Bp. Sher-

lock's Discourses, vol. II. p. 2. Collyer's Sacred Interpreter, vol. II. p. 228. Warburton on the Spirit, Pref. p. 17; also p. 175, note.

III. to which they carry this does not seem very easy to be ascertained. Some have thought that St. Paul only speaks of the history of *Adam* in this light; and Christ of *Demoniacs*. But it is easy to carry the notion too far. I should keep it in *mind*, when I read expressions of God's *hardening* the heart of Pharaoh³, *hating* Esau, and leading men into *temptation*; and I should consider, whether St. Paul did not sometimes, through a principle of compliance with the Jewish notions and expressions, use terms which he might not have used to Gentiles.

These remarks, about additional difficulties in the language of Scripture, seem to shew that it might be useful, in considering the Articles which follow in the Second Part, to try how near to each article of revealed religion a corresponding *article of natural religion* could be brought. Such an attempt might shew, that the difficulties in our way were not such as belonged peculiarly to the Scriptures; and might contribute to make us satisfied with several doctrines which are at present apt to occasion uneasiness and discontent.

134

ARTICLE IX.

OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.

ORIGINAL Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; 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 therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek, *Φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

³ Book I. chap. x. sect. 9.

Having now finished our Introduction to the Second Part III. of the 39 Articles, we proceed to the Articles themselves contained in that Part. In treating the ninth, we may follow our former plan, as to giving *history, explanation, proof, and application.*

1. We begin with the history. And first, if we put ourselves in the place of *early Christians*, we cannot but think that they must find it necessary to form *some* doctrine concerning the sinfulness of man. Several things in Scripture must conspire to this end. The history of Adam, the application of it by St. Paul, the lamentations of wickedness and corruption, and of man's being even conceived in sin—all these they would naturally join together; and a cause of evil being wanted, this would most naturally occur. Then justification by faith is grounded on the idea of all men's being concluded under sin; and Jews becoming Christians are represented as being born again, as if their natural birth was so impure, that it was to be set aside, and something was to be substituted in its place. Whatever these things in Scripture may really mean, they are too solemn, and in appearance too *fundamental*, to be wholly passed over and neglected: some *doctrine must* result from them. 135

2. What did result we are now to consider; but, in order to do this distinctly, we must divide the notion of original sin into *two parts*. One thing, implied in original sin, is the *state* or condition of offenders in the sight of God; the other is a mind, or set of *passions*, disordered, or strongly *inclining* man to commit actual sin; we call this *concupiscence*. These parts are sometimes professed independently of each other; sometimes they are supposed to be joined together, and the vicious passions are accounted the *effect* of the *state* in which we are born, or of Adam's transgression, which brought us into it. Sometimes original sin seems taken as compounded of both, without any attention being paid to the division¹. Were I to speak of this *state* of offenders as somewhat analogous to a state of native *slavery*, or of hereditary *rebellion*, if I may use such an expression, when families are disgraced for rebellion, and their estates are forfeited, I should only mean to give my idea, not to prove any thing. 136

3. Thinking men and *philosophers* seem to have been struck, in different ages, with the appearance of *evil*; and have

¹ There is something like these two parts in the Necessary Doctrine, Article of Justification, beginning.

III. thought it a phenomenon so extraordinary as to require some particular *solution*: which, by the way, must hinder *any* solution from appearing entirely vain and unnecessary².

4. What notion the *Jews* had of original sin seems not satisfactorily ascertained. *Voltaire*³ indeed has no difficulties: he says, the Jews knew nothing of the matter; and others have
137 said the same. And it must be confessed, that *Maimonides*⁴, in the 13th century, said, that no one could be born with *habits*, and therefore that original sin was a thing impossible: which does rather look as if nothing had been recorded about it by the ancient Jews (such as had come down to Maimonides), which the moderns thought very important; or which they thought need prevent their attacking the Christians on this head; but yet, they (the ancients) must be supposed acquainted with the history of *Adam*, though they might find difficulties in it. They also must know of the *curse*s denounced against him; and of the many complaints of human *depravity* which are contained in their own Scriptures. Some of the Jews seem to have solved the appearance of evil by a *pre-existent* state⁵. And it is said, that some of them understood the casting away of the *præputium* after circumcision was casting away corruption, at least emblematically. And they not only circumcised, but baptized or washed those whom they admitted into their religious community: for what was such

² See Bp. Gibson's second Pastoral Letter, sect. 3, where he translates a part of Cicero's Tusc. Disp. 3. Pref. I rather wonder he should not have translated a few words more, *ut penè cum lacte nutriticis errorem susxisse videamur*. For, if we suppose *errorem* to mean what was mentioned in the preceding sentence, (which *ut* seems to imply,) Cicero's idea of *pravitas et perversitas* taken in with our mother's milk, comes to much the same thing as ours of *birth-sin*. It might be proper also to read here Horace, Od. iii. 6, particularly ver. 1, 18, 19, 33, 48. The Delph. note on the opening of that Ode refers to *Plato*. I do not find the exact thought in *Plato*; but I find, in Lib. 2. de Republ. (about one fourth from the beginning) that certain persons, called *ἀγύρται καὶ μάντεις, circulatores et vates*, perhaps some low sort of priests, used to go to the doors of rich men, and tell them, that, if any *ἀδίκημα* had been

committed by them or their *ancestors* (*προγόνων*), they could appease the gods by sacrifices, and (*ἐπιφθαίς*) incantations. Origen mentions *oracles* to our purpose: *Contra Celsum*. edit. Spencer, p. 403, quoted in Div. Leg. B. v. 5.

In Shakspeare's *Tempest*, act i. scene 2, we have "*thy vile race*," where the note says, "*race*," in this place, seems to mean original disposition, "*inborn qualities*." Edit. Stockdale. See also Dacier's *Life of Pythagoras*, Preface; and vol. 11. pp. 125, 199.

³ See vol. xxvi. 4to, index, or p. 384.

⁴ Calmet's Dictionary, under *Grace*.

⁵ John ix. 2. It is a Jew that asks, "*who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?*" So that the man *himself* might have sinned, some way or other, before he was born; or the sin of his *parents* might have caused his blindness. See Macknight on the passage.

cleansing wanted? But I do not see how *Christians* can deny III. that the Jews in St. Paul's time had notions of what we have since called original sin. For St. Paul argues with Jews from Adam's transgression, to redemption by Christ. He must argue from what was well known to that which was to be proved; therefore, whether we suppose St. Paul to believe the history of Adam, or not, in its literal¹ sense, we must think that he knew the *Jews* believed it. When Christians judge 138 concerning the notions of the Jews in this point, they forget that it could not appear to a Jew of the same consequence² as it does to a Christian, who esteems it the corner-stone of his own system. I look upon it therefore as a probable conclusion, that the Jews professed the doctrine of original sin in as great a degree as they wanted it in their religion; although those, whose writings have come down to us, may have been tempted to oppose St. Paul and the Christians on this popular ground.

5. We come next to the *early Christians*. That they knew nothing of our doctrine, though affirmed by Voltaire, I do not grant. Let any one consult *Wall*³ on Infant Baptism, and see the passages which he has collected from the early Fathers. I am mistaken if he does not allow that they held our doctrine with as much exactness and precision as could be expected before disputes arose⁴.

After the very early Christians we may take all those together who lived *before the fifth century*. Here we have artless, unsystematical expressions, like those of Scripture, sometimes implying the *state*, sometimes the evil *propensities*, as occasion required. The doctrine was as much brought into form as it could be without controversy. And when at last controversy did begin, it proceeded by the same degrees which have been before described⁵, in the case of other doctrines. Perhaps it would be found, from *Wall's* quotations, that the 139 doctrine grew from time to time more *particular*.

In this place we may recollect what was before⁶ mentioned with regard to the *Manicheans*; as they are placed as flou-

¹ About the *allegorical* sense of the history of the Fall, see Warb. Div. Leg. Book IX. vol. III. p. 640, quarto.

² The principal things to attract a Christian's notice would rather make a Jew desirous of evading our doctrine.

³ Part I. chap. i. ii. iii. &c.

⁴ This must appear probable, merely from the considerations offered in our first section.

⁵ Art. i. sect. 4, vol. i. p. 495. Art. ii. sect. 2.

⁶ Appendix to Book I. sect. 4, vol. i. p. 248.

III. rishing toward the close of the third century. By setting up an original evil principle, they allow that the existence of evil wants accounting for. They are, moreover, said to have considered the *soul* as originally *pure*, but as having contracted evil by its union with the material *body*. Thus they accounted for what we call *concupiscence*. And in saying, that by this union the soul lost its *freedom*, they approach near to the idea expressed in our tenth Article. (See Lardner's Works, vol. III. p. 475.) It has been thought strange, by some modern Christians, that those writers, who contended with the Manicheans, did not shew them that the true Christian method of accounting for *evil* is that used in explaining the doctrine of *original sin*. But a good reasoner will always reason on some principles allowed by his adversaries: it would have been in vain to refer to the Old Testament, or to quotations of it in the New; for the Manicheans rejected both. Therefore Augustin and Titus of Bostra⁷ were more logical in arguing on topics of natural religion, than they would have been in dwelling on those of Revelation. Indeed, the hypothesis of the Manicheans with regard to evil, was not properly *Christianity*, even in their own ideas, but *philosophy—Persian philosophy*, as professed long before⁸ the Christian era. It might as well have been applied to solve the transgression itself of our first parents, as any bad consequence of that transgression.

140

6. We will now proceed to the *fifth century*—to the age when the doctrine of Original Sin was brought, by the warmth of controversy, to its full maturity.

Pelagius is placed in the year 405: he was an Englishman, or, more strictly perhaps, a Welchman: his real name was *Morgan*, which is said to mean the same as *Marigena* in the Latin, or Πελάγιος in the Greek. He chose the Greek as best suited, probably, to all parts of the then world. He was a monk, but that term did not always imply one belonging to a community; only a person giving up worldly greatness and pleasure, and applying himself to religious pursuits. He was a man of good understanding, learned and pious, and amiable in his disposition⁹. He had two *followers*, who were as much

⁷ See Lardner's Works, vol. III. p. 388.

⁸ In the time of *Plato* it seems to have been disputed whether evil arose from *matter*. See Dacier's *Plato*, vol. I.

pp. 163, 165. (French).

⁹ See Bower's *Life of Zosimus*. Wall's *Infant Baptism*, Part I. chap. xix. sect. 3 & 29.

known as himself, *Celestius*, an Irishman (Scotus¹), and *Juli-III. anus*, who was somewhere a bishop. Pelagius was at Rome in 405, and lived in friendship with the best and most eminent² of the Christians; but Rome being sacked in 410, we find him in Africa, and afterwards in Palestine; Celestius remaining in Africa. He always wrote on the *Trinity* as an orthodox Christian; and, when he wished to publish something against original sin, and the necessity of divine grace for salvation, he mentioned his own opinions as if they were those of other people. After the seeds of his doctrines were thus sown, he was less reserved about them; and at length publicly owned them to be his. As to *original sin*, he professed that Adam 141 would have died had he never offended; that he hurt only himself; and that all children are born in the same state in which Adam was born, and in which he always remained, before his offence. Yet Pelagius and his followers seem to have been sometimes so much pressed, that they gave way as far as they possibly could; even so as sometimes to have had some appearance of prevarication. It seems probable, from his character, that Pelagius had only in view³ to hinder men from running into fancies injurious to the honour of God. He was however attacked and censured; and he, or his two followers above mentioned, underwent excommunication and banishment.

There are reckoned up twenty-four councils which were held on their account in the fifth century, and before the death of Augustin; that is, we may say, between 412 and 430. How much agitated must the Christian world have then been in discussing his doctrines! He defended himself, and sent a *creed* to the pope, which is still extant. I suppose no other entire work of his remains, except a letter⁴ to *Demetrias*, a female Christian; though many fragments may be found in the writings of those who opposed him. The notion attributed to the Pelagians in our Article only rose out of what has now been mentioned: the particular nature of it will appear under our explanation.

7. The principal person who opposed Pelagius was *Augustin*. Jerom indeed did labour in the same work, but not with the same gentleness⁵ and candour. Indeed, the more I see of 142

¹ See Wall, sect. 3.

² Ibidem.

³ That the Pelagians argued to this purpose, is said by Wall, xix. sect. 1.

⁴ These works are, I think, in the last

volume of Augustin's Works: edit. Benedict. They are also amongst Jerom's works.

⁵ Bower's Lives of the Popes, vol. i. p. 329.

III. Augustin's works the more I am pleased with his character. He was certainly an open and zealous opponent of Pelagius; but I cannot with satisfaction call him an enemy; for, though he has written a great deal⁶ against the Pelagians, he "always speaks of" Pelagius himself "as a man of extraordinary capacity and accomplishments⁷, and one whom he should much admire and love, were it not for his heterodox opinions." It has been charged upon Augustin, that, whilst he was writing against the Manichean, he wrote in defence of free-will; and that when he came to write against the Pelagians he depreciated it. We know he was capable of retracting an error on perceiving it: but yet it is possible he might seem to contradict himself when he did not; as is the case with the Scriptures. The Manichean servitude of the will is, in its nature, distinct from any scriptural notion; so that an idea of free-will might be maintained in opposition to that, which should be no way inconsistent with our doctrines of original sin and grace. Indeed, I am not aware that free-will, in the common sense of the word, is understood to be taken away by either of those doctrines. To examine Augustin's works on this question, would carry us too far out of our way. I will only observe farther, that both Pelagius and Augustin seem to have been able and worthy men. In modern times they are spoken of too hastily. The only aim of Pelagius might be, to defend the justice and goodness of God; the only aim of Augustin, to defend the Christian religion, or keep its doctrines strictly *scriptural*: at the same time, Pelagius was a true Christian, and Augustin a true believer in the divine justice and goodness.

143 8. After giving my own idea of this celebrated era of the Pelagian controversy, it is natural to mention one or two writers from whom others may seek information relative to it. Dr. *Jortin* is a favourite author, but his remarks on ecclesiastical history do not quite hit my fancy. He appears to me in *them* to have a kind of flippancy, which does not suit a man of his character in other respects. It always reminds me of a school-boy, who, having acquired some talent for writing, uses it in ridiculing those from whom he has received instruction, and who ought to be the objects of his veneration or respect. He seems, in this work, one of that class who consider ingenuity as consisting in pulling to pieces every thing that is

⁶ Cave—Augustin. in *Hist. Lit.*

⁷ Wall, xix. sect. 29.

established ; and liberality of mind, in striking out something III. singular, which shall relax habitual reverence, and indulge the presumption and petulance of the forward and inconsiderate. He seems to make no allowances for the customary follies and weaknesses of different ages and countries, but to try all men as if they had every advantage of modern improvement.

I should depend much more on the information which is to be gathered from *Wall's History of Infant Baptism*. Original sin being one great cause of infant baptism, an history of infant baptism is, in a manner, an history of original sin. This writer is very well informed, grave, sensible, attentive, and candid ; indulgent, not only to those whose opinions he favours, but to all who deserve indulgence, whatever opinions they prefer.

9. Not long after the rise of the Pelagians, there seem to have arisen some who thought that the Pelagians were right in some respects, but that they had carried matters *too far*. These were called *Semi-pelagians* ; probably not by themselves. 144 As the tenets of those who had this name have occasioned some dispute, we must not enter upon the subject very minutely. We may conceive the title to have been given lightly, whenever any persons mitigated the doctrines, either of the orthodox or the Pelagians ; and, as this might be done in various particulars, various opinions might come to be called Semi-pelagian¹. As to our present subject, it used to be called a notion of Semi-pelagians, that those who died under years of discretion would be rewarded or punished according as they *would have been* good or bad, had they lived². If you ask, whether this is meant of baptized or unbaptized, they would answer, God *decreed* that those *should be* baptized³ who *would have* behaved well. Whereas Augustin is said to have held, that God decreed that certain infants should be baptized, and so they were saved of course ; (I now speak only historically). This approaches too near the subject of predestination to be considered at present. And, as we shall meet the Semi-pelagians again under the tenth and seventeenth Articles, we will dismiss them now. Any one may consult Mosheim, cent. v. 2. v. 26.

10. The *Mohammedans* seem to acknowledge a something of native corruption in man, as they think it necessary

¹ Of Pelagians and Semi-pelagians see more, Art. xvii. sect. 5 and 6.

² Bower's *Life of Zosimus*, vol. i. p. 350.

³ Wall, chap. xix. end.

III. to settle some way in which their *Prophet* is freed from it. An angel, I think, plucked a black grain out of his heart, or squeezed three drops of black blood from it, and then he was cleansed from the pollution of humanity.

145 11. The *schoolmen* refined upon our doctrine, and entered into curious questions concerning the nature of original sin, and the manner in which it descended from one generation to another⁴; but, as our Article does not require any such investigations, and as the schoolmen are expressly mentioned under the thirteenth Article, we may dismiss them for the present.

12. We may proceed to the age of the *Reformation*. The general idea is, that, though we differed from the Romanists in many things, we did not differ⁵ with regard to original sin: which may be right enough; yet there seems to be a verbal difference, at least, between our present Article and the decree of the Council of Trent⁶. We say, "the infection" remains after baptism; they say, original sin is taken away by baptism: but all we mean by "the infection" is *concupiscence*, which they allow *does* remain. We say, *concupiscence* "has the nature of *sin*;" they allow that the apostle *calls* it sin, but not *strictly*—only because it *comes* of sin, and *leads* to sin; which seems to be our reason for calling it sin. Such a difference as this seems⁷ scarcely worth dwelling upon, though the expressions seem to be intentionally opposed⁸. The *state* of offenders may be changed or superseded, though the *mental corruption* may require a course of discipline to change it.

The *Anabaptists* are particularly mentioned in the Article 146 of 1552, and in the *Reformatio Legum*⁹. All those, seemingly, who are against infant baptism, must deny original sin.

Martin Luther is very strong in his expressions against those who let down the doctrine of original sin¹⁰. It suited his temper to be so, and his views of justification.

Strype says¹¹, that it was common in England for men to call each other *free-willers* and *Pelagians*, by way of opprobrium: so that introducing Pelagians into our Article would not, at the time, seem uncouth or strange; as I fear it does now, to many readers.

⁴ One need only consult the *Index* to Thomas Aquinas, under *Peccatum Originale*.

⁵ See Heylin's *Historia Quinquarticularis*, p. 518.

⁶ Session 5th.

⁷ See Rhemists on Rom. ix. 11.

⁸ The 5th session of the Council of Trent was held, A. D. 1546.

⁹ *De Hæresibus*, cap. 7.

¹⁰ See his work on Genesis, vol. vi. folio.

¹¹ *Annals*, vol. i. p. 331.

13. The *Calvinists* and *Arminians* must of course differ III. about original sin; as will appear when we come to speak of them more particularly hereafter¹.

14. The *Socinians* have varied their ground considerably. The *Racovian Catechism*² says of man, that he was *created* mortal; and then for Adam's offence he (man) was decreed to *eternal* death. Afterwards, "omnes homines eò quòd ex eo nati sunt, eidem æternæ morti subjaceant." In a subsequent chapter³, "*Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est.*" This may be acknowledging that men are now in a *state* worse in some way than before Adam's offence, but denying that the *mental* corruption observable in the world has any connection with it.

Dr. John Taylor, the celebrated author of a work on the Epistle to the Romans, is a very respectable writer. He has published a volume on the subject of original sin. His notion is, that "*death, labour, and sorrow,*" came into the world by Adam's sin; and that we, the *descendants*⁴ of Adam, are subject to death, labour, and sorrow, merely on account of his transgression. He owns⁵ that, in *fact*, there is great *corruption* in the world; but he does not *join* this corruption to the history of our first parent. He holds, that *virtue* must be⁶ a man's *own*—that no man can be virtuous or vicious for another. (Which, by the way, seems wandering from original to *actual* sin).

*Dr. Priestley*⁷ sets out with Taylor's words, "*Labour, sorrow, and death;*" and supposes, that though "the mind may be more feeble, and therefore more prone to comply with some temptations," by "the body being more subject to disease," yet as sickness does some moral good, "it is probable," "upon the whole," "that our condition is more favourable to virtue than that of Adam." But afterwards he seems to quit Taylor's ground, and *deny* that the sin of Adam was imputed⁸ to subject men to *death*: he seems also to make death the recompence of "*actual and personal sins.*" He is afraid to take Taylor's ground; and, if I understand them right, Taylor would be

¹ It seems enough at present to read a few heads out of the *Indexes* to Calvin's Institutes, and Arminius's Works. Near the end of Arminius's volume there is a sort of *summary* of his opinions.

It might be mentioned, that our Puritans, particularly the *Assembly of Divines* were Calvinistic; especially as John Tay-

lor has strictures on the Assembly's Catechism. See Taylor on Original Sin, p. 90, &c.

² *De viâ Salutis*, cap. i. p. 15, &c.

³ Cap. 10, *de Libero Arbitrio*.

⁴ Taylor, pp. 27, 30, 37, 164.

⁵ P. 98.

⁶ Pp. 127, 190.

⁷ Famil. Illustr. p. 11.

⁸ P. 13.

III. very unwilling to take his; for he (Taylor) reasons copiously on Adam's offence as bringing death on mankind. Either there is much *unsteadiness* among the Socinians, (which would shew a want of *satisfaction*;) or I am not able rightly to comprehend their opinions.

148 15. It seems needless to offer more historical accounts here, especially as, from the connection of this Article with those that follow it, we may expect to meet with the same persons and sects again. We are to come now to the *explanation*; the intent of which is, to clear up the terms of our Article in such a manner, that the propositions contained in it shall be intelligible, and require nothing but such proof as the mind can easily attend to.

16. "*Original sin*" has been usually opposed to *actual sin*. It is called "*birth-sin*," because men fall into it by *birth*; either by being so born as to appear in the state of offenders, or by being born in such circumstances that their *propensities* will, in the common course of things, be disorderly. (See section the second). Human beings are supposed to have no concern with any other sort of sin till they come to have some sort of self-government. But, when members of any *community* are said to offend, as such, it is worth observing, that they may be all the while perfectly innocent in their *individual capacity*. A corporation, or a city, a regiment, or an university, may behave so ill as to deserve and bring on *extermination*; yet there may be in such worthless *body* the most virtuous *man* that ever lived: notwithstanding, this virtuous man may, *as a citizen*, be said to behave ill or offend, because the citizens offend *collectively*. These two different ways of offending, in the social and individual capacities, should never be *confounded*. In order to keep them distinct, I would call the sin of the individual *proper sin*; and that of the member of a *body*, as such, by way of contradistinction, *improper sin*. I should hope this distinction would be *intelligible*; and if so, I doubt not of its being very *useful*, in solving *objections* to the

149 doctrine of original sin. And *punishment* may be distinguished into proper and improper, in the same sense. I do not expect this explanation of terms to give full satisfaction at present. *Original sin* is not mentioned in *Scripture*, in so many words.

17. It "standeth," or consisteth, "not in the *following* of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,"—"fabulantur.")

The word "*following*" here may mislead an English reader; III. it means *imitating*, *acting* as Adam acted, sinning after Adam's *example*. The Latin is, "in *imitatione* Adami:" we find the English word *following* for "imitating" in Scripture. The word "followers," is *always*, in our Bible, the English for *μυηται*, that is, six times; in the passage, Eph. v. 1, "Be ye therefore *followers* of God," and five other passages. The Pelagians, by this idea, seem to exclude both our parts of original sin, the *state* of offenders, and the disorder of human *propensities*; they make it to consist in *acting* after a certain *model* or *original*; and therefore, in effect, speak only of *actual* sin, and annihilate original. Augustin's reasoning¹ against them agrees with this notion; and in King Edward's intended Laws, in the chapter against heresy, those are censured who reduce original sin to this, "quòd ex Adami delicto propositum sit peccandi noxium *exemplum*, quòd homines ad eandem pravitatem invitat *imitandam* et usurpandam."

18. We come next to the words, "the *fault* and *corruption* of the *nature* of every man," &c. *Fault* in the Latin is 150 *vitium*; which seems always to imply a sort of comparison between what is and what might be; or would be, if things were as they were intended to be. Sometimes the *vitium* or *fault*, is *defect*, sometimes *excess*, sometimes a *change*, after the manner of *putrefaction*, or *corruption*; so that, in some views, the words *fault* and *corruption* coincide, though *fault* has the more extensive meaning. "*Infection*" varies the idea a little; but language about the mind is all comparative.

If we consider what we mean by the *nature* of any thing, we shall find it something of this sort: that combination and relative strength of its different powers, on which the effecting of its peculiar *end* and purpose depends. The nature of any thing is *corrupted* when any of these powers is too much *diminished* to answer that end; or so much *increased* as to *overpower* others, and prevent their executing their proper office. The nature of a *watch* is corrupted when the spring is become too strong or too weak; or when any of the wheels are clogged, retarded, accelerated, beyond the velocity *intended* for it by the maker. The nature of any particular civil *government* is corrupted when the people have diminished the constitutional

¹ Ep. 88, 89; or, in the new order, 156, 157, from and to Hilarius. See the passages translated in Wall on Infant

Baptism, p. 179, 2d edition. And in Nicholls on the Article, p. 73.

III. power of the king or senate, or when these have diminished the constitutional power of the people; so that the political machine cannot promote *security*, &c., in that way which was *intended* by those who framed it. But what is the nature of *man*? He is a very nice and complicated machine—consists of a great number of powers, some of which impel, others restrain: they are all *intended* to act together, each with its proper force, and in its own manner, so as to promote the greatest good which can be called human. Every man sees
 151 this himself in some degree; but the description of the human constitution given by Bishop Butler, in his three Sermons on human nature, may be recommended as the best extant. Conscience is the constitutional supreme; extensive prudence and benevolence have great authority; and of many passions and appetites, together with the senses, there is none which has not its proper work and department, though under control of superiors. Any one who has once acquired a right idea of our nature, will find no difficulty in seeing wherein consists its *corruption*. When sensual pursuits prevent intellectual attainments; when appetites overpower prudence and benevolence; when passions rebel against conscience, and continue in a state of rebellion;—then may our nature be said to be *corrupted*: or even if the inferior principles are only *troublesome*, *sedition*, as it were, and turbulent—do not yield *easily* and *freely* to those powers which ought to be superior to theirs.

In order to see the right sense of *nature*, *natural*, &c., in common life, (and therefore in Scripture,) we might observe in what sense it is said that an Englishman *naturally* speaks English: this seems to mean, that it is according to the *common course of nature* that a person *born* in any country should speak the language of that country. But here is no idea of compulsion or *necessity*²; he *may* speak a *foreign* language. The best mode of learning the *sense* of words is from such common expressions as these.

As we are speaking of *nature*, we may take, in this place, the expression, “is of his own *nature* inclined to evil.” It seems to mean, not that man is *irresistibly* impelled to evil,
 152 and that this is seen in his constitution; *in fact* only it appears, that the inferior propensities *have* too great influence in our constitution—so constantly, that an *expectation* is raised of finding the same thing in *future* instances.

² Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 127.

19. The expression, “every man that naturally is engendered of the *offspring of Adam*,” seems to me an expression of some nicety. The word “*naturally*” seems only intended to exclude our *Saviour* from original sin, his birth being *supernatural*; but I mean to take the expression independently of this word. Does it mean only, ‘*every man?*’—*all* men are “engendered of the offspring of Adam:” or does it mean, that every man is inclined to evil naturally *because* he is sprung from the first offender? I should rather think that the intention of the compilers was, to leave men a liberty of assenting who should *doubt* whether the disorderly propensities of man were owing to Adam’s transgression; though to omit Adam entirely, in this place, would have given offence to many. My reason is, because many serious and thinking Christians have judged that the first part of Genesis is not a literal description of *fact*, but an *allegorical*¹ story (like the *Pilgrim’s Progress*?) Now it was probably far from the intention of our Church to exclude any such; and if this clause was made with a view to giving liberty to them, it must, though perhaps accidentally in some measure, give liberty to those who understand “every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam,” as meaning no more than, *every man*.

20. The next expression we come to is, “*original righteousness* :” the primitive² meaning of which is, that righteousness which our first parents had before their fall. They are not described as having offended immediately after they were created; and if they did not, their minds must have been *pure*, though inexperienced—free from shame and remorse; and their consciences cheering. And had they and their offspring continued in such a state, while their experience increased, it is not conceivable, that, in later generations, the lower and grosser appetites would have been disorderly in the manner we now find them: but I mean not here to reason, farther than is necessary for the explanation of the idea affixed to the words “*original righteousness*”³.

¹ See Div. Leg. Book ix. in Warburton’s Works, quarto, vol. III. p. 640.

² See Necessary Doctrine, on Free-will and Justification. Also Heylin’s *Historia Quinquart*. p. 513. And first paragraph of Homily on the Nativity.

³ We might digress so far here as to give a *conjectural* idea of the situation

of our first parents before their fall. Some would say, it had better be omitted; but my purpose would be, to shew what the situation *might* be—on this principle, that if *any* situation could be described consistent with the short account of Scripture, it would follow that the scriptural account is not objectionable.

III. This original righteousness, though spoken of only as in fact belonging to our first parents, must be, in its *kind*, such rectitude of mind, such a combination and relative strength of mental powers, as God originally *intended* for man—such as he adapted to procure his *greatest good*. May we not therefore understand “*original righteousness*” in that sense? without relation to *Adam*, or to man’s ever having actually been in a state of such righteousness? And so only mean, by man’s
154 being “far gone from original righteousness,” that every man is at a great *distance* from that frame of mind which our Creator *intended*⁴ for us? Dr. *Balguy’s*⁵ manner of speaking of the act of our first parents, as of one “of which we are very obscurely and imperfectly informed,” seems rather to *imply*, that he would not lay much stress on a state so little understood.

21. This seems the proper place to take some notice of the expression, “God made man in his own *image*⁶ ;” as it is sometimes, though not in our Article, made a proof of actual original righteousness. The expression seems to me *indefinite* and *comparative*. Man might be said to be like the intelligent Creator in comparison of other earthly things. Adam begat *Seth* after his own *image*⁷ ; that is, so that his son should be of the same nature, and in the same situation with himself. In like manner *we* now bear the image of *Adam*, as far as we are *men* ; as *Christians*, we are described as to be conformed to the *image*⁸ of *Christ*, which means the same as putting on the *new man*⁹. We must labour to acquire the true Christian *disposition*, and then the words of St. Paul¹⁰ will be applicable to us: “as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.”

Bishop Warburton, Div. Leg. Book ix., makes *reason* to be the image of God in Adam.

22. We now come to an expression which is more terrible in the sound than in the sense: “It (original sin) deserveth God’s *wrath* and *damnation*.” The *wrath* of God can only
155 mean¹¹ the cause, in God, of such effects as, in man, would be

Any one might read Archbp. King’s Sermon on the Fall, and my Poem on Redemption, vv. 115—122. If this be done, Div. Leg. Book IX. (former part) should be attended to.

⁴ The *golden age* of the heathens implies dissatisfaction with the *present*

age—shews (if not borrowed from Scripture) that the idea of original righteousness is natural. ⁵ Charge 2d, p. 200.

⁶ Gen. i. 27 ; ix. 6. ⁷ Gen. v. 3.

⁸ Rom. viii. 29. ⁹ Eph. iv. 24.

¹⁰ 1 Cor. xv. 49.

¹¹ See Book I. chap. xix. sect. 5.

produced by wrath. It is not implied that wrath must actually **III.** be exercised on all who are subject to original sin; they only *deserve* it, or are *liable* to it. They are called the “*children of wrath*¹ ;” but children in Scripture are not always supposed to inherit. The children of this world do not always inherit² this world; nor can the children of light inherit light. *Damnation* is only equivalent to *judgment*³ ; it does not, of itself, imply judgment *after death*⁴ , nor does it imply any *determinate* degree of evil. It is as applicable to the *Socinian* scheme as to any other; as Taylor himself contends (p. 29, &c.) A *verdict* against any one, in our civil judicatures, is judgment, or *damnation*, how small soever the fine. But we are going too far in speaking as if *any* judgment *must* be passed, or any fine levied: men are often *liable* to punishment in some theory of law, who are never punished, or so much as sentenced to punishment. As is the case, in our country, with those who continue assembled after the *Riot Act* has been read.

23. Here it may be proper to take notice how many expressions of our Article are immediately taken from *Scripture*. “The flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit,” seems to be Gal. v. 17, with a reference to Rom. vii. 7, &c., and ver. 23; “wrath,” alludes to Eph. ii. 3; “damnation,” refers to Rom. v. ver. 16, or 18,—only we should observe, that, if we take the latter verse, our Article rather softens the expression of Scripture—κρίμα, judgment, or damnation, being a softer term than κατάκριμα, condemnation. φρόνημα σαρκός is taken from Rom. viii. 6; and “is not subject to the law of God,” from Rom. viii. 7. “There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized,” is from Mark xvi. 16, and Rom. viii. 1: “The Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of Sin:” this may refer to several places, as Rom. vi. 12; Rom. vii. 7. &c.; but this latter seems sufficient, “I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known *lust*,” (ἐπιθυμίαν, translated in the margin, and in other passages, *concupiscence*,) “except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” Mr. Locke paraphrases, “I had not known *lust*,” “I had not known concupiscence to be *sin*.” These passages are not mentioned here as *proofs*, but only to give the reader a right notion of what is *composed* in our Article, and what is *quoted*. No interpretation is yet given of any passage; yet it seems as if our propositions would scarcely be cleared from all

156

¹ Ephes. ii. 3.² Matt. v. 5.³ 1 Cor. xi. 29, margin.⁴ Ver. 30.

III. extraneous matter, without an *explanatory* remark on one or two scriptural expressions; as *φρόνημα σαρκός*, and, “is not subject to the law of God.”

24. But the word “*regenerated*” comes first; which is so very near the phrase “*born again*,” that it may be reckoned *scriptural*; “*renatis*” must be reckoned so, which is the word in our Latin Article: though we should see in what sense it it was *used* when our Articles were compiled. *Wall*⁵ says, “’tis abundantly evident, that the common phrase of the Jews was to call the baptism of a proselyte his *regeneration*, or new birth. And the Christians did in all ancient times continue the use of this name for baptism.” This remark he applies to John iii. 3. In our Article, the Latin word for “*regenerated*” is “*renatis* ;” and “*renatis*,” in this same Article, is the Latin for “*baptized* ;” whence it appears, that our Article means the same thing by “*regenerated*,” and “*baptized*.” Some may apprehend danger from this remark, as if it let down regeneration to mean only the external form of baptism; but I do not see how it does that. When shall we complete our contract? when shall we sign and *seal*? These being used for one another, does not let down *contracting* to the mere outward ceremony of *sealing*. The outward part, in a symbolical act, must always imply the thing signified; that is, in baptism, putting on the *new man*⁶, or acquiring the true Christian disposition. When we speak of *entering* on any state of life, as by manumission, indentures, marriage, &c., we take for *granted* the ordinary effects: they pass unmentioned, because it seems needless to mention them.

25. The sense of *φρόνημα σαρκός* might be sought in lexicons, which indeed give a satisfactory account; but three verses of the passage from which the expression is taken would be sufficient of themselves—I mean Rom. viii. 5, 6, 7. τὰ τῆς σαρκός φρονούσω, “*mind* the things of the flesh,” *think* of them, *relish* them, are *interested* about them: this expression explains what is meant by *φρόνημα*, the *mind*ing, &c.—The understanding and feelings are both concerned; which they are in the word *sentiment*. Indeed they are naturally much connected, because we *think* of that which we *enjoy*. Hence *φρόνημα σαρκός* has been thought⁷ well translated in our version, because *mind* contains both understanding and feelings, or both sorts of

⁵ Introduction, p. L.viii.

⁶ Ephes. iv. 22, 23, 24.

⁷ Parkhurst's Lexicon.

sentiments. The English and Latin Articles give us each *four* III. *words* to choose out of; which I only mention as a specimen of the liberality of the compilers in interpreting; the same that, I 158 should imagine, they intend us to use on all occasions.

26. This interest about carnal things “*is not subject to the law of God*¹,” that is to say, allowing the inferior propensities of our nature to take up our attention, so that we cannot attend to the higher principles, is keeping them in a state of rebellion to nature, and the Author of nature. The apostle, not the Article, adds, “neither indeed *can* be;” which may mean, it is not possible that such a state should be any other than a state of rebellion. God having fixed and settled our constitution to be such, that conscience and enlarged self-love shall have authority over the desires of the flesh.

I do not observe any other expressions in our Article which want clearing up, and therefore I here close the *explanation*². Nothing is affirmed concerning *death* being introduced into the world by Adam’s disobedience; nor indeed about man’s being made in the *image* of God, though I have touched upon that expression.

27. Let us now therefore proceed to the *proof* of the propositions which our Article contains. . . . I cannot perceive more than *four* propositions.

1. Original sin consists in the corruption of our nature, or mental constitution.

2. Into our state of corruption there is some reason to conclude that we were brought by the offence of our *first parents*.

3. Whatever strictness of propriety there may be in calling 159 this state a state of *sin*, we have ground to consider it as making us liable to what may be called a *judicial sentence*.

4. Not only mere men, but Christians, are capable of sinful concupiscence, or mental corruption.

28. In the proof of the first proposition I find a difficulty. Original sin is not a *scriptural* expression, and yet all we want is to establish a set of doctrines on scriptural foundation. What then is the question here between us and our adversaries? The best idea I can acquire is this. There is *something* in Scripture which has given *occasion* to the expres-

¹ See Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 123.

² It might indeed be observed, that concupiscence having “the *nature* of sin,” is distinguishable from its *being* sin, as murder is sin: but we have

already (sect. 12) described it as coming of sin, and leading to sin. And more will appear, relating to concupiscence, in what follows; particularly in the latter part of sect. 30.

III. *sion original sin*; so that this expression has become *established*, and all parties have made some use of it; but it has suited best with the notions of one party to use it in one sense, and with those of another party to use it in a different sense. The question seems to be, Which speaks with the greatest *propriety*, or most according to the true meaning of Scripture? The *orthodox* says, it consists in mental depravity; the *Pelagian*, wishing only to deny that there is any such thing as depravity in any human being when he is *born*, speaks to this purpose: If you *will* have such a thing as original sin, I do not see to what you can give that name but to sin as committed after the *example* of our first parent, taken in the light of a *model* or *original*. Now, therefore, if we can prove, what some wish to deny, that mental depravity is a thing which may be called *hereditary*, or that it is a thing which does depend, in some measure, upon our *birth*, we seem to prove the only thing which is needful³. The *fact* is allowed, that 160 men *are* very corrupt; and Dr. John Taylor allows of the word *degenerate*⁴; but he will have it that each man's moral corruption depends wholly upon⁵ *himself*. For authority of *Scripture* consult here, Gen. viii. 21; Psalm li. 5; lviii. 3; cvi. 6; and Job xiv. 4. These passages, if they are taken literally, make men, in some way or other, to have a pollution even from their birth; and if they are construed with latitude, as declamatory expressions, it does not seem easy to explain them without supposing a mental depravity or corruption in men, such as would not have been found in any man had he been the *first* human being.

On these scriptural expressions, *reason* and *experience* will furnish the best comment. What then do we see and observe? That human beings have different *minds*, different *principles* and *feelings*, according to the circumstances in which they are *born*. Savages have savage principles and passions; an Algerine feels differently from an Englishman, in treating a captive; and so on. Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws would afford many instances of different principles and passions, handed down from generation to generation, in different societies of men.

It may be said, mens different principles and passions depend, not on *propagation*, but on *education*, in a large sense

³ So that the first of our four propositions may stand thus: 'our corrupt nature may be looked upon as, in some degree, *hereditary*; inasmuch as it depends, in

some measure, on the circumstances of our *birth*.'

⁴ Taylor on Orig. Sin, pp. 98, 125.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 58, note*.

of the word, as including *sympathy*, and all the effects of *living together—consuetudo*. But first, what is the *cause* of education, or sympathy? you must not say education is the cause, and so go back for ever¹. . . . The question, how far propagation is concerned in handing down mental depravity, was, I think, one of those which were given up²; and indeed if we know not how diseases of body descend, it is not likely that we should understand the descent of qualities of the mind. The word "*engendered*," in our Article, may seem to favour the idea of descent by propagation; but it is scarcely intended to require³ us to adopt such idea, strictly and exclusively. We are concerned, in Scripture and Articles, with popular, not philosophical language; and the former seems to regard any thing as hereditary, which is handed down from one generation to another, in a course of nature⁴. It is *probable* that qualities of *mind* are sometimes continued by propagation, as well as by sympathy, instruction, praise and blame, &c.; and it seems as if the causes of such continuance are often not clearly discerned; which may be one reason why popular language does not try to distinguish them. Children *resemble* their parents in features: is this by propagation or sympathy? perhaps by neither wholly; yet it is ordinarily ascribed *wholly* to propagation. However, *insanity* is a striking instance of mental disorder handed down by propagation; and bodily qualities, which are allowed to be propagated, (Taylor, p. 192), do frequently increase or diminish the strength of mental powers. We have before referred to a passage of Horace, where he makes *fortitude* to depend on breed. (Od. III. vi. 33). I have been told that the scrofula, which is reckoned the most hereditary of all bodily disorders, affects the intellects. Mr. *Wm. Ludlam*, paraphrasing "that which is born⁵ of the flesh

161

162

¹ Perhaps it would be answered, the cause of bad education is bad *choice*, bad use of powers, in those who educate: so it is, in some measure; but traditional error, and habitual mental disorders, cause bad education in a much greater degree.

² The authority for this was not distinctly enough noted down, and is now forgotten. Yet it may possibly refer to what was said, sect. 11, about the *schoolmen* having entered into niceties (particularly, I suppose, about propagation)

which we do not meddle with.

³ Sect. 19.

⁴ Taylor, p. 124, ascribes the corruption of many men to Seth's posterity *intermarrying* with the Cainites. He did not mean to ascribe wickedness to propagation, but he mentions a *fact* (supposed true) which might be mentioned here. He ascribes what we should rather call the *joint* effects of propagation and sympathy, sometimes to one, and sometimes to the other.

⁵ John iii. 6.

III. is flesh," says⁶, "that which is of the breed and race of fallen man, has by birth and nature the carnal and corrupt affections that belong to all the race of fallen man." And this sentence is a kind of reference to *experience*, with regard to the breed of *animals* in general. The ancients were aware of the influence of good parentage in *brutes*; though they might not enter into all the niceties of modern *pedigree*. *Bien né*, in French⁷, means one who has good *inclinations*; and amongst *us*, a well-bred man means a man of polished *sentiments*. In good *families* (in different ranks) there is a *something* which we value, whether we are looking out for patrons, friends, or servants—something good in the disposition: we are led to ascribe this to *birth*, though we know it is in part owing to early living with good people. Vice may possibly diminish it, virtue may strengthen it; but its *reality* is acknowledged in practice; and it arises from the *circumstances* in which a person is *born*. The qualities of body and mind conveyed down by propagation, we do not as yet precisely understand. We cannot tell beforehand the *degree* in which any quality of parents will appear in their descendants; but the *general* notion, that
 163 all sorts of human qualities may be propagated, or transmitted to posterity, seems sufficiently established. And still more clearly the notion, that moral qualities, good and bad, descend from generation to generation, in a course of nature.

It seems to *follow*, from what has been said, that the prevalence (not necessary, nor invincible, but usual, probable) of inferior and sensual appetites in our constitution, may depend, and is generally understood to depend, upon the circumstances in which we are *born*; and therefore, that such disorder and irregularity may be called *Original or Birth-sin*.

29. Our second proposition is, "Into our state of mental corruption there is some reason to think that we were brought by the offence of our *first parents*." I say *some* reason, because the history of our first parents is faint, obscure⁸, and imperfect; and has been differently understood by candid and thinking Christians.

The principal authority for the opinion, that the offence of Adam was, in some degree, the cause of our corruption, is the reasoning of St. Paul in the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, where he compares the effects of Adam's transgres-

⁶ Essay on Scrip. Metaphors, p. 4.

⁷ Dict. Acad.

⁸ Dr. Balguy, p. 200, as before.

sion with those of Christ's obedience. This reasoning, it must **III.** be confessed, is not perfectly clear and perspicuous; yet I think a candid and attentive reader of it will at least find a very sufficient *apology* for any church which should profess the orthodox doctrine. We may begin with the 12th verse, and read to the end of the chapter. The 13th and 14th verses seem intended to prevent any one's thinking that the death of men, after Adam, was owing to their *own* offences, or *actual* sins. Those between Adam and Moses, having no *law*, might ¹ 164 be looked upon as free from mortal sin; yet they died. Their death must, therefore, supposing death caused by some sin, have been owing to *Adam's* offence, and inherited from him. The 18th and 19th verses, according to our translation, are very strong; and I believe our translation to be on the whole a very good one—not faultless, but better than any we are likely to have in this age. The passage now before us will recur very soon; therefore we may now pass on to another proof. The necessity of being *born again*² shews that there was something faulty or deficient in our natural birth; and when could the fault begin but with our first parent, if it belongs to all mankind? "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Taylor says³, that this means no more than that the natural birth produces only the powers of a man; the spiritual birth produces "a man sanctified into the right use and application of those powers in a state of holiness." The difference between generation and regeneration is here rightly described, supposing no fault in the parents which could affect the offspring; but this idea does not seem to me to come up to what is implied in the word "*flesh*," considering the many places of Scripture in which that word denotes the *vicious* prevalence of carnal appetites. Regeneration, or entering on a Christian scheme of purifying our nature, does not seem to be described as if it were intended merely to lessen the hazard of abusing our natural powers; but as if its proper end were to correct ¹⁶⁵ some abuse, or moral evil, already existing.

I own myself unable to believe, that, if Adam and his race had continued faultless, we should have been, in point of disposition, passion, sentiment, what we are now. *Savages*

¹ See some passages in Taylor, p. 44, note. They explain how the idea of death, as a penalty, is included in the scriptural notion of the word *law*.

² See John iii. 5, 6.

³ On Orig. Sin, p. 146.

III. have, as was before observed, savage *dispositions*. Can we avoid concluding, on the contrary, that, after an uninterrupted succession of virtuous generations, our dispositions would have been virtuous?

When I see the good produced by a few good successive generations, in one family, parish, &c., I could be in raptures at the thoughts of what we should all have been now, had our predecessors been virtuous.

The *Socinians* (or at least *John Taylor*, the most eminent of them) hold that all generations of men have experienced *sorrow* merely, in consequence of the first transgression. *Sorrow* is in the *mind*; the *sentiments* then are affected by the fall? we are approaching very near to passions and appetites. When *sorrow* is *excessive*, or even *defective*, it is the “fault and corruption” of our nature: but then sorrow is not *made* excessive or defective by the fall, in the Socinian idea. It seems however here as if it were only some apprehension of *consequences* which kept us asunder; for *we* do not hold that our passions are necessarily and *unavoidably* excessive or defective; but only, that from experience it is to be *expected*, on a footing of *probability*, that they will be so—in the same sense in which Scripture says, “offences must needs come⁴.”

30. Our third proposition is, “Original sin makes men *liable to judgment*”: or, with whatever propriety original sin may be called sin, with the same may we say that *punishment* is *due* to it. As proper punishment is due to proper sin, so may we look upon that *evil* which men suffer through the sins of their predecessors, and which is often popularly called punishment, though not in strictness of propriety⁵, as *due* to such sins in different generations taken collectively.

But there are some *prejudices* which may hinder this truth from being accepted; these should be done away before the proof can have its effect.

It seems always to be presumed, when it is said, such conduct *deserves* punishment, or, it must excite the divine *displeasure*, that it of course *is punished*⁶. It is amazing how often this is presumed, even in good writers; as if God had given up his power of *remission*—as if every man *amenable* to the law was punished by the law⁷. I take the cause

⁴ Matt. xviii. 7.

⁵ This want of strict propriety is too much insisted on by Taylor, p. 21. See

before, sect. 16.

⁶ Sect. 22.

⁷ Ludlam on Divine Mercy, p. 47, note.

of this fallacy to be, a strong inward sentiment, an indignation III. at the sufferings of innocence, an horror at the dreadful state in which a man's imagination paints his brethren to be, not without a distant reference to himself: this shock throws reason out of her seat.

Men have also a reluctance in coming into the opinion, that God will punish different *generations collectively*. Not so much when the thing is expressed in this form, as when they come to speak of innocent men suffering for what, as individuals, they have not committed. Then their reasonings about this matter are continually warped. But is their reluctance reasonable? God *does* punish men collectively in various ways. 167 It appears in his government—he declares it in his *word*¹. Supposing this unjust, that is nothing to us, at present: what the Author of Nature does, what the Scriptures declare, that is our foundation; we go no deeper. Were we defending truths of natural religion, we might ask why the Author of Nature does so: were we defending the divine authority of the Scriptures, we might ask whether what is said of Jehovah is consistent with the true character of the one supreme wise and good Being. But we are not defending Scripture; we are reasoning upon it, taking its divine authority for granted. Not that it would detain us long from our proper business, to see, that a good Governor may *unite* men together by sometimes rewarding and sometimes punishing them *jointly*, whenever union amongst them is that which promotes their greatest *good*.

Another thing to be mentioned here, as continually preventing reason from having its proper effect, is confounding two different punishments together—I mean, the punishment of the *individual*, and the punishment of the *community*. God sometimes punishes one, sometimes the other; and, as the punishment of the community affects the individual, so the punishment of the individual in some measure affects the community; but, if the ideas are not kept *distinct*, dispute and confusion must ensue. How often have men complained that the punishment of the individual was unjust, when in reality there was *no* punishment of the individual, but only one of the community, which affected the individual incidentally, and by a law calculated to promote the *general good*²!

168

¹ Exod. xx. 5.² To what was said, sect. 16, we may | add here, that the sin and punishment of a community *may* be what we have called

III. We will now, without attempting to remove more prejudices, proceed to our *proof*.

It will not be denied that there are several passages of Scripture which represent men collectively as standing before God *in the light of sinners*: read Rom. iii. 9, and 19, with marginal translation; Rom. v. 6, 8, 10; Gal. iii. 22. If it be said, that this is meant as the effect of *actual sin*³, my difficulty is this: when men are spoken of as amenable to law as individuals, they should be spoken of individually; the peculiar circumstances of each individual should be stated; for, in that light, every man will be subject to a sentence of his *own*, one different from the rest. And if men are spoken of as punishable collectively, it will make no difference whether you collect different *generations*, or different *contemporaries*.

Now, that the Scriptures do represent men as to be *considered*, nay as to be *rewarded* or *punished*, collectively, may⁴ easily be proved:—*considered*⁵, as when *Levi*⁶ paid tithes in Abraham, to Melchisedec; *rewarded*, as when Abraham⁷ was made father of the faithful; *punished*, as when God declares that he himself will visit the sins⁸ of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generations. Suppose any man of one of those generations to be *born*; would not he appear in this world in the light of a sinner? or, at least, as one of a *number* which stood in that light? One might add the instances of *Esau*⁹, *Canaan*¹⁰, and others; but why should we

a *proper* sin and punishment. This is the case when a community sins *as* a community, and is punished *as* a community. Sin and punishment are only what we have called *improper*, when a man, innocent as an individual, is a member of a community which sins, and when he therefore sins only in his social capacity, and is punished only in his social capacity. *Families* are communities; a member of a family may offend and suffer as such (in family quarrels), when in his private capacity he is kind to the inimical family, and beloved in return. This illustration brings to one's mind the play of *Romeo and Juliet*; the more common the instance, the more it will serve to shew that we must not turn from the distinction here offered as *abstruse*: we all make and acknowledge it continually. ³ Taylor, pp. 116, 254.

⁴ This rewarding and punishing a set

of men collectively, is not inconsistent with rewarding and punishing individuals separately, at the same time. A remark is made, not unlike this, with regard to the *Jews*, in Bp. Green's 1st pamphlet about Methodists, p. 46. But he seems to say, that individuals who did not fulfil *conditions* would not share in *any* of the benefits which the Jews had as *elect*, &c.; that is going rather too far. But we can scarcely dwell too much upon the different rewards or punishments which any *one* man may have; some resulting from all the various circumstances of his private conduct as an individual, others from the different situations in which he stands as member of different communities.

⁵ See Taylor on Romans, p. 32, note.

⁶ Heb. vii. 4.

⁷ Gen. xxii. 15, 18. Gal. iii. 6, 9. Rom. iv. 11, 16.

⁸ Exod. xx. 5.

⁹ Rom. ix. 13.

¹⁰ Gen. ix. 25.

go lower than our first parents? a sentence of this sort on **III.**
them is a sentence on the whole race of *man*. Taylor will not
 allow that the sentence on Adam was a *curse*¹. It seems clear
 to me that what was pronounced upon him was an infliction of
evil, in consequence² of his *offence*—a *condemnation*; and
 this appears from Taylor's own reasoning³ on Rom. v. 19. If
 only his posterity was spoken of in this sentence, and not him-
 self, that is in our favour. St. Paul says, that by Adam's 170
 offence "judgment came upon all men to condemnation,"—
 "many, or *the many*, were made *sinner*s." All men therefore
 were made *liable to judgment, in some way or other*. Taylor
 says, they were only condemned to *death, labour, and sorrow*;
 but this is saying that we *do* suffer in consequence of Adam's
 sin; and can our Church say any thing more strong to shew
 that the generations of men are judged collectively? and there-
 fore that each individual appears in this world in the light of
 an offender? Still it would probably be said, to come into the
 world under the sentence passed on Adam, is not to *be* a sin-
 ner; a man can only⁴ be a sinner by some *choice* of his
 own;—certainly not a *proper* sinner, as an *individual*; but
 who says he is? yet it seems to have been proved, under the
 first of our propositions, that a man is more *likely* to have his
 mind in a corrupt and disorderly state for having had sinful
 progenitors. Taylor allows that the *Jews* are treated by
 their Lord *collectively*⁵, nay, that the bad conduct of Adam
 affects his posterity: but that is all that is needful for our pur-
 pose; that is owning that all men are punished *collectively*:
proper punishment is, in that case, on the *race* of man—on the
community, not on the *individual*. He says, Adam's offence
 only affects our *external circumstances*; what punishment
 does more? if we may reckon *sorrow* amongst external circum-
 stances. But it does not make us *vicious*—it makes us *rank*
 as offenders collectively, and in fact has disordered our prin-
 ciples, though not by a proper compulsion. But this matter
 of compulsion belongs to the 10th Article⁶.

What is called *Original Sin* has before been said⁷ to con- 171
 tain two different ideas; our appearing in the world in the

¹ Page 20.

² This is owned by Taylor, p. 21,
 sufficiently, I think, for all our purposes.

³ Page 33, and 30, note.

⁴ Taylor, p. 58.

⁵ Page 203, favoured and rejected, (as
 I remember) on Rom. ix. & xi.; for
 Adam, see p. 205.

⁶ See Taylor on Romans, Key, para-
 graph 310. ⁷ Sect. 2.

III. *state* of offenders, and our having a *corrupted nature*. I will offer nothing more to prove that our coming into the world ranked as offenders makes us liable to judgment; but I will now endeavour to shew how our having a *corrupted nature* makes us so. But here we might premise something similar to what was premised before: as we said, that men might be amenable to law, and yet law not be executed against them; so we say, that men, whose *minds* are in a disorderly state, may keep continually *correcting* the disorder, and continually *improving* their principles and dispositions, without limit. And this work may be continued through any number of successive ages. In such a case, the desert of “wrath and damnation” would continually decrease without limit. Of the *assistance* given us for this purpose, we need take no notice at present. That a corrupted nature deserves punishment, might be left as self-evident; for a corrupted nature means a mind in which the inferior principles are in a state of rebellion to their lawful superiors. But as this is all internal, it may be better to say something more on the subject. Our *explanation* has already⁸ led us to consult Rom. vii. 7, as a proof that “concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.” But some texts are more *clear* than that. We may consider the tenth commandment; and some parts of the sermon on the mount, as Matt. v. 22, about being *angry*; ver. 28, about *lust*⁹, and ver. 44, about love of *enemies*; and 1 John iii. 15. These passages¹⁰ shew that irregular and corrupt sentiments and passions make us guilty in the sight of God; or, at least, liable to judgment and punishment.

And reason and experience coincide with declarations of Scripture. As punishment is intended to *prevent* wickedness, every thing *requires* (or deserves) *punishment* which *must* be punished in *order* to prevent wickedness. This is the case with bad sentiments; and therefore we have *laws* against bribery, subornation of perjury¹¹, and seduction. Exciting bad sentiments will as naturally produce bad actions, as *sowing tares* will produce tares; in both cases it may be said, “an *enemy* hath done this¹²: and in both cases the enemy deserves

⁸ Sect. 23.

⁹ *Incesta est etiam sine stupro, quæ cupit stuprum*—quoted in *Essay on Old Maids*, vol. II. p. 98.

¹⁰ We might add, Matt. xv. 19. Acts

viii. 21, 22. Ephes. iv. 22, 23. James i. 15.

¹¹ We had occasion to make this observation, Book III. chap. iii. sect. 1.

¹² Matt. xiii. 28.

restraint and *punishment*. Who will say that *Guy Faux* suf-III. fered unjustly, though he did not blow up our parliament? or that he did not *deserve* King James's *wrath* and *damnation*? Some difficulty there is, arising from one man's ignorance of another's thoughts; so that it is sometimes said, that human laws do *not* punish sentiments, but only *overt acts*; yet, in some cases, it seems to me that *sentiments* are really punished, though it must be in those cases wherein *overt acts* prove the reality of the sentiments.

Difficulty may also be raised from the notion, that sentiments are involuntary; but they can seldom in strictness be deemed so. Sometimes in their nascent state they may be involuntary, or nearly so; but even then they may be owing to occasions which we might have avoided, or to habits which, by 173 proper discipline, we might have conquered. The actions of a drunken man are involuntary, but he might have kept sober.

We conclude therefore that concupiscence has so far "the nature of sin," as to make us liable to *judgment*¹.

Ephes. ii. 3, might here be read, as *joining* the two parts of original sin together—the state of sinners, and the corruption of our nature.

If any one says, that, though concupiscence has the nature of sin, that has no relation to *Adam*, we can only refer him to what was said under the preceding proposition.

31. In short, though the doctrine of original sin has occasioned many difficulties, and does involve discussions of some nicety, when it comes to be argued, yet a plain *case* seems to take in the whole of the matter. Suppose our King to address himself to a descendant of one of the lords who were beheaded in the *Rebellion* of 1745 he might say, (and he might say it with a smile of benignity,) 'You are born of a family which bears me no good will; and in truth I *must* consider you and your family *collectively*. You are, from your *birth*, therefore, a *rebel* in my sight; and for being of such a family you are more *likely* to be really *disaffected*. If your parents, and afterwards yourself, encourage your disaffection, you will be not only a *native* but an *actual* rebel; then I must *punish* you *as such*, on having sufficient evidence. But, if your parents bring you up by *correcting* your disaffection, and you *acquire*

¹ How near Dr. John Taylor comes to our representation of the *probability* of men being drawn into sin by the usual

propensities of the human mind in its present state, see p. 188; or his Answer to Objection 3d.

III. the *principles* of a good subject, you have nothing to fear
174 from me. Though, in strictness, you may be *amenable* to
the law, at least so as to *lose privileges*; yet, while you give
me *hopes* of a favourable change, I shall not carry the law into
execution against you.⁷

32. There yet remains a *fourth* proposition; namely,
“Christians, after baptism, are capable of concupiscence, or
mental corruption.” This proposition rather belongs to the
fifteenth Article than the present; we may however observe,
that baptism only puts us in a *way* to conquer our evil prop-
ensities; we may not therefore conquer them instantaneously².
And this agrees with the language of Scripture; Gal. iii. 17;
1 Pet. ii. 11³. What is affirmed is so plain, that it is only the
appearance of the objection alluded to in the Article which
makes it to be expressed at all. “There is no condemnation
for them that believe and are baptized⁴;” that is, they are in a
state of safety; that *sentence*, under which they laid, as mem-
bers of human society, is taken off and abolished by virtue of
Christianity⁵: they may, indeed, by their ill conduct, defeat
this plan, but this is the plan which is contrived for their good.
The context of both Mark xvi. 16, and Rom. viii. 1, shews this
to be right: they both take comprehensive and general views.
“Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to every
175 creature;” then there is only one grand division, into those
that believe, and those that believe not⁶. The Apostle too looks
over the whole *world* at once—Jews and Gentiles are in a state
of condemnation⁷, but Christians are relieved from it; “there is
no condemnation” for *them*. Exceptions, and failures of indi-
viduals, could not be properly mentioned on so great an occasion.
Human governors, when planning enlarged schemes of policy,
take the compliance of individuals for granted.

33. I will not enter into more proof of the direct kind;
but we have generally found it useful to give some *indirect*

² See Warburton on Grace, p. 90, &c., about primitive Christians having *immediately* good minds.

³ And with practice. A soldier who has taken the *sacramentum*, or military oath, has not at once the steadiness of a veteran. The apprentice does not make himself master of his trade by signing and sealing his indentures. Sect. 24, end.

⁴ Rom. viii. 1.

⁵ This may be the meaning of Dr. Balguy, p. 157. This comes near Vossius's account, “*remanere vitiositatem, tolli reatum.*”—De Baptismo Disp. 6, Thesis 1. Works, vol. vi. p. 276.

⁶ Being baptized is making a *contract*; that must imply observing the *conditions* of that contract.

⁷ See Mr. Locke's last note on Rom. chap. vii.; that is, on the verse next before the passage in question.

proof; that is, to answer some *objections*. The reasonings of III. our adversaries have been already examined in some particulars; but still it may be worth our while to select a few objections, were it only for the purpose of illustrating and applying our more formal proofs.

34. It has been thought that our doctrine has *fewer* supports than might have been expected from our account of its importance. In *Scripture*, Taylor says, there are but *five*¹ passages which *certainly* relate to it. Suppose there were no more, are *five* passages of Scripture to be neglected, whatever they may teach? The passages from Gen iii. and Rom. v. are of very considerable length. On what ground are they to be neglected? because, if the doctrine had been essential, it would have occurred more frequently? I do not see what right any man has to say that; or to judge how frequently God shall repeat any truth in his sacred volume. Because, if St. Paul had not been led by a particular subject to use certain reasoning, (in Rom. v. &c.) we should never have heard of such a doctrine? This is not to be admitted. If God had not used this method of instructing us, he might have used others: the question therefore is not, what the state of things *would have been*, if “these passages had never been written;” but, what it is “now they *are*² written.” Because Christ himself did not mention it in form³? but it seems agreed by all judicious⁴ divines, that Christ himself meant to open his religion only in part, and to leave the rest to be opened after the whole proof of his resurrection and ascension could be laid before the world, by persons to whom he gave credentials by enabling them to work miracles. Some things might more properly be opened by himself, others by his agents; shall we take upon us to determine what things were most proper to be opened by him, and what by them? If we adopt no doctrines but those which were delivered by Christ himself, we must cut off a number⁵ of those which the Church has usually thought important. This is our answer, on the supposition that there are no more passages in Scripture to our present purpose than five. But we see that a great many more have been of use to us; and more still might have been added.

Some valuable authors, it must be confessed, have not

¹ On Orig. Sin, pp. 5, 6, 254.

² Gibson's 3d Pastoral Letter, p. 235.

³ Taylor, pp. 6, 254.

⁴ See Gibson's 3d Letter, as before.

⁵ Gibson, *ibidem*, p. 235.

III. dwelt much on original sin. Bishop *Butler*, in his *Analogy*, seems to be brief upon it⁶. We have not an *Homily* on the subject by *name*; though much is said to the purpose, in the 177 homilies of the *Misery of Man*, and the *Nativity* of our Saviour.

Dr. Balguy has only two very short expressions relating to it. Probably, some candid men have been diffident about it; or, though satisfied themselves, have thought it the part of modesty and forbearance to desist from pressing what was esteemed difficult, on others. And they found that the omission of this subject did not hinder them from proceeding to others, even to such as are connected with it—the sinfulness of the world, and the communication of evil, natural and moral, from parents to children⁷.

P. S. Bishop *Warburton*, in his ninth Book of the *Divine Legation*, has shewn no desire of evading any part of this subject.

35. We will mention, as a second objection, that question which is often urged by *Taylor*⁸: Can any man be sinful except by *choice*? Not as an *individual*; but, as a *member* of a community or *collective* body, he certainly may. A member of a corporation may vote against some abuses; and yet, if they are practised, he, as a member, is guilty of them, and liable to be punished; not by evils inflicted purposely upon *him*, but 178 by evils inflicted on the corporation, and incidentally affecting him. And, in the case of corrupted nature, though no man is strictly sinful without choice, yet being born in certain circumstances will make it more *difficult* for him to choose right; insomuch that, on a footing of *probability*⁹, it may be said, in the language of Scripture, “it is impossible¹⁰” but that he will offend. But this is only the same as saying, if a man is drawn into bad company he will be drawn into the commission of some bad actions.

⁶ Part II. chap. i. p. 186, 12mo.

⁷ Talking the language of *common life*, about *good* sort of men, &c., sometimes seems to exclude this theory, when it really does not: and this language is in *Scripture*, as well as in common writings. It is a language which may be allowed even to those who are perfectly orthodox, in the ordinary intercourse of men. Saying, ‘fire is hot,’ is allowable in the strictest natural philosopher; and his using such common expression on all

common occasions, does not hinder his speaking with *precision* when the *case* requires it.

⁸ *Taylor*, pp. 127, 190; though the former passage rather relates to the tenth Article. Also p. 58.

⁹ *Taylor* treats this as an absolute *necessity*; a notion which we have frequently contradicted and disclaimed. *Taylor* on *Orig. Sin*, pp. 53, 131, 188.

¹⁰ Luke xvii. 1.

36. The generality of objectors to our doctrine exclaim III. against its *cruelty*; or conceive it as implying cruelty (supposing it true) in the Supreme Being. But this is a groundless objection. If any men come into this world as sinners, it is because God treats some men, or all men, collectively; but to do so is, or may be, a mark of a good governor¹. If any man derive inordinate appetites from others, it is by a benevolent law, which connects different generations together. *Good* is hereditary as well as evil. Indeed, the law of our nature, by which *things* or *qualities* are hereditary, has nothing to do with good and evil properly—only as *qualities*, which are hereditary, are good and evil. *Evil* is hereditary *accidentally*, as *belonging* to those things or qualities which are made hereditary by nature. How is this, then, cruelty? If you are still dissatisfied, and cannot get rid of your idea of cruelty, except your individual be spared who has only offended as member of a community—except he also be spared who has offended through the impulse of irregular propensities, owing in some measure to others; how do you know that, at the last judgment, they 179 will *not* be spared? If it be *cruel* to punish them, assure yourself God will *not* punish them. I defy all the world to prove that he *will*.

Taylor allows² that God may entail labour and sorrow on all men, in this world, and at last death, in consequence of Adam's offence; but nothing which can be punished as *sin*. Where would be the cruelty of this last, except in inflicting sorrow after death? does it then lessen the cruelty that the evil should be suffered on this side the grave? is not an evil equally an evil on both sides the grave?

Dr. *Ogden's* second Sermon on Christian Faith might be consulted here; particularly p. 140, 12mo³.

¹ Sect. 30; and Taylor, p. 205.

² On Original Sin, pp. 27, 101, 149.

³ Having, in this section, endeavoured to *enlarge* our ideas of hereditary qualities; and to take the mind out of the narrow and confined track of original *sin* and *evil*, into the more open and extensive way of original *qualities*, of different kinds, sometimes evil and sometimes *good*; I think it may illustrate my idea of *hereditary good*, or *original virtue*, to reprint a letter from the Duke of

Fitzjames to Louis XVI. which appeared in the public prints in January 1791. The community is a *regiment*, the virtue is *military virtue*, but it is what was pursued and felt as virtue; the sentiments of loyalty, &c. are the counterpart to our *concupiscence*. The "*original purity*" mentioned has some correspondence to our "*original righteousness*." The qualities of the community are distinct from those of the *individual* members; yet the individuals *deserve reward* as members of the community.

III. 37. A great deal of alarm has been given, as if it neces-
 180 sarily followed from our doctrine, that *infants* dying unbap-
 181 tized must suffer eternal *torments*. Poor harmless babes! they
 are perfectly sheltered from all ill-treatment in the bosom of
 an all-kind and powerful Creator! Can any one shew that *He*
 is bound by the letter of any law, contrary to the spirit of it?
 or that he is tied up from shewing even *mercy*⁴ where the case
 requires it? Suppose the theory indispensable, that Christianity
 alone can take off the condemnation pronounced upon our first
 parent; yet, cannot God, in cases of extreme necessity, dispense
 with forms of admission? is it impossible that those who have

*An authentic Letter of the Duke of
 Fitzjames, just sent to the King of
 the French.*

“SIRE,

A faithful subject, who has not the honour of being particularly known to your Majesty, thinks it his duty, at this interesting crisis, to lay the homage of his sentiments at your Majesty's feet. These *sentiments*, Sire, are *hereditary* in his family, and he claims no other merit than that of preserving them in their *original purity*. My grandfather, a stranger in this kingdom, but of an illustrious descent, was created by your magnanimous ancestor a peer of France; since which period both himself and his descendants have ever been distinguished for their loyalty. Of this he gave various proofs, during the course of a long and glorious life, terminated in the service of France at the siege of Philipsbourg. My father followed his example, and *transmitted* with his name *the same sentiments to me, his son*.

“In the midst of the public calamities, Sire, I am deeply affected by a consideration, peculiar to myself, which my confidence in the goodness of my King emboldens me to lay at his feet.

“My grandfather came not alone into France—*his brave companions are now mine*, and the dearest friends of my heart. He was accompanied by thirty thousand Irishmen, who abandoned their country, fortunes, and honours, to follow an unfortunate king. For the *descendants* of that respectable class of men, whom your ancestors thought worthy of protection,

because they had been faithful to their sovereign, I now entreat the same bounty from the great grandson of Louis XIV. It is reported, and seems not improbable, that the National Assembly purpose disbanding the Irish regiments as foreign troops. The blood *they have shed* in the cause of France ought to have procured them the advantage of being *denizens* of that kingdom, although their capitulation had not entitled them to that privilege. Permit, Sire, that I lay at your Majesty's feet the ardent wish of the *Irish regiments*, as much attached to France by gratitude, as they formerly were to the House of Stuart by love and duty. If the Assembly of France now rejects their services, they implore your Majesty's recommendation to the prince of your family now reigning in Spain; presuming to assure your Majesty that the present will be worthy of being made by a King of France, and of being favourably received by a prince of your royal house.

“Fidelity and valour are their titles of recommendation. Of the former they expect an authentic testimonial from the French nation, setting forth that *they have never once departed from their duty, during the space of more than a century*, that they have fought its battles, in which *their valour* has been uniformly conspicuous. I entreat you, Sire, to listen to their request; for myself, I ask no compensation—for me there is none. The honour of commanding them is not to be repaid. It secures my glory, since to lead them against the enemy afforded a sure pledge of speedy victory.”

⁴ Rom. ix. 15.

no chance of being baptized should benefit by the Christian III. sacrifice? All men are mortal, all have been condemned to death through the offence of their first parent; is it impossible, that, as the offence came on all men to condemnation, so the free gift¹ should come “upon all men unto justification of life?” But, when men will treat extreme cases as if they were ordinary, they must involve themselves in difficulties.

Laws are made for ordinary cases, and are superseded by necessity. We talk of different genera and species, as if they were perfectly distinct; but we find some intermediate things which perplex our classing. We talk of *human beings* having such and such qualities, rights, &c.; but we find some beings such that we cannot decide whether they are human² or not. Of these we can only say, *as far forth* as they are human beings, such and such things may be predicated of them; and this we may say of infants—as far as they have the *moral* qualities of an human being, so far they seem susceptible of human rewards and punishments. We may talk abstrusely; but, in reality, there needs be no more difficulty about an infant being rewarded or punished, than there is about a young lord or emperor, who is “mewling and puking in the nurse’s arms³,” and at the same time governing an extensive monarchy. 182

It may, moreover, be observed, that the speculative doctrines of Scripture do not seem intended for *mere* speculation, or to make us judges of each other: each man should take them as applicable to *his own practice*. If then you think the theory of Christianity such, that infants are in danger, if not admitted into the community of Christians, baptize; but do not *judge*. What I have now said, though I think it just, seems liable to be misapplied. Those who form hasty conclusions may think, that I make the baptizing of infants a matter of too little importance; but this is not really the case; in practice, I think it *indispensable*⁴, (in case of sickness); but doing *our parts* is a very different thing from determining what part *God* shall act. Nay, I not only think that negligence may affect the parent, but even the *child*. I say, *may* affect; to say, *will* affect, is to run into the error I am condemning. What is omitted through *negligence* is very dif-

¹ Rom. v. 18.

² See Locke, III. vi. 26, on Human Understanding.

³ Shakespeare’s *As You like it*, Act ii. scene 9.

⁴ I am only speaking *here* of those who *hold* infant-baptism.

III. ferent from what is omitted through *necessity*. As the negligence of the parent may deprive the child of education, health, or even life itself, or occasion his having vicious principles, no man can prove that negligence with respect to a sacrament will *not* occasion material evil to the child, or deprive it of
183 material good. I say not, it *will* do so; you must not say, it will *not*⁵. But this affords no argument against the doctrine under consideration.

38. We find, in disputes about original sin, passages are frequently quoted out of the eighteenth chapter of the Book of *Ezekiel*, as expressing that a man's goodness or wickedness is to be ascribed to *himself*: "The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die." On first view, we can say, that the declarations of the prophet must be, in some way or other, *reconcilable* to Exod. xx. 5, otherwise both cannot come from God; therefore to argue from one of these passages, without any attention to the other, is not the way to arrive at truth.

But the case seems to be this: If any part of Scripture be abused, and that abuse corrected by a subsequent writer, the correction, expressed artlessly and warmly, will sound like a contradiction⁶. Some men seem to have abused Exod. xx. 5, as expressing the influence of one generation on another. The end and design of visiting sins of parents on children probably is, to make parental love act as an auxiliary motive to virtue; for many men will be more careful for their offspring than for themselves. Some Jews seem to have made this plan of Provi-
184 dence, instead of a motive to virtue, an excuse for vice, and a pretence for evading their duty. We *cannot* be in the favour of God, say they; it is vain for us to be careful or good; our parents have already made us reprobates. To this evasion they seem to have added insolence, in applying a taunting proverb, "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Instead of using that law of God, which connects generations, to assist virtue, they used it to

⁵ There is something, I think, in *Augustin* very like some part of this; but I do not recollect where. Sometimes he, and the other ancients, run too much into determining what *will* become of infants. *Our church* (see end of Private Baptism) goes so far as to say, that infants baptized will certainly be *saved*. This is much better, I think, than any

other determination of the kind. It is intended to *comfort* parents, and encourage baptism.

⁶ This I conceive to happen, when St. James corrects the perversions of St. Paul's doctrine about justification by faith. Lardner dates Paul to Romans, 58; James, 62. But this will be a subject of discussion in Art. xi.

overthrow virtue, and then laid the blame on God. Impudent III. hypocrisy! yet they said, "The way of the Lord is not equal¹!" Well might the prophet retort, "are not your ways unequal?"

From comparing Exod. xx. with Ezekiel xviii. it appears that there are *two laws* of God's government: one is, 'parents by their conduct affect their children;' the other, 'each man must work out his own salvation.' Supposing these rules declared for men to *act* upon, they do not interfere with each other. The first is for the *parent*, the second for the *child*; and, if a man is *both* parent and child, they conspire and assist each other as motives to virtue: the man does what is right for the sake of his *offspring*, and also for his *own* sake. The *degree*² in which the parent affects the child, we know not precisely; but we know that communication of good and evil from parents to children by no means renders diligence fruitless or unnecessary³.

39. I fear that our doctrine has been considered, even by 185 some candid persons⁴, as a theory of little *utility*. But who shall call a doctrine useless which Scripture has published? which gives us the most grand and comprehensive view of God's government, and shews us how he treats our whole *race* as one; and how he makes one generation to depend upon another? Can that be useless which lets us into the right way of treating ourselves? which keeps us from presumption on the one hand, and despair on the other? Can that seem useless to a Christian (for with such we now argue) which makes us set an high value on our Redemption by Jesus Christ? If a child is diseased from his birth⁵, is it useless to be aware that he is so? or to know that he is not incurable? And, if we can come at some

¹ Ezek. xviii. 25, 29.

² Sect. 28.

³ Bp. Warburton gives a different account of this matter, Div. Leg. Book V. sect. 5; 8vo, p. 151, &c. to 160. His notions are always well defended, but I am unable to give up my own. I have been rather at a loss with regard to Jer. xxxi. 29, 30. Can the meaning of the Prophet be, that under the new dispensation men should not be guilty of such impudent hypocrisy as to use the proverb about sour grapes? The *law* of visiting sins of parents on children might continue, in some degree, though men

improved so as to leave off the use of an insolent *proverb*.

And the law of making parents to affect their children, may be enforced in different degrees at different times, without limit. If the *Mosaic* dispensation required that preceding generations should affect posterity *in a greater degree* than under the mere law of nature, yet in *all* ages the *two laws* subsist; and therefore our solution retains its force.

⁴ Sect. 34, latter part.

⁵ See Girtanner on the venereal disease in children; reviewed Sept. 1790, in the Analytical Review. 8vo. 459 pages, 1788.

III. knowledge of these things, without having recourse to our present doctrine, yet can it ever be useless to see a subject to the bottom? I mean, as far as man is capable of seeing it? or to endeavour to hold it on the best grounds?

40. Lastly ⁶, I believe it is often objected to our doctrine, 186 in one way or other, that it *disgusts* men of *philosophical* minds, and makes them averse to Revelation. But, if it has had this effect, I think the fault was in the minds of those who were disgusted. The pride of science has often hindered men from treating the doctrines of revelation with sufficient respect, even on their own principles; or seeing how nearly they are connected with natural religion ⁷. Shall not the true philosopher enlarge his views of things? shall he not study the laws of God's government, giving particular attention to those which are great and extensive? shall he not study the state and condition of human nature? and the provisions to be made against bad internal principles? Suppose he thought that all mankind had not two common parents, but that several tribes of men had each its own; yet still each tribe must trace his present qualities up to some confessed origin, in the same manner that we trace ours up to Adam. Shall Horace shew that he had the idea of improper sin and punishment ⁸; shall he say, that effeminacy in the offspring is to be ascribed to vice in the parent? shall Cicero lament our early depravity? shall Plato ⁹ hold that God punishes offences down to the fourth generation?— and shall the philosopher set our doctrine at nought?

187 What Voltaire ¹⁰ has written on this subject is silly and contemptible.

41. Let us now come, in the last place, to our *application*; or, to consider, what is the result of the foregoing remarks, in our present circumstances. It has been already ¹¹

⁶ I might here reply to the objection— does not Christ take away original sin wholly? how then can concupiscence remain in Christians?—but I have already mentioned this objection. (Sect. 32.) I am inclined to mention it here, because it is properly an *objection*.

⁷ Mr. *Locke* himself is thought to have “set himself to reduce the fundamental doctrines of Christianity to the narrowest compass he possibly could.” (See *Gibson's 3rd Past. Let.* p. 231). This is *scarcely* treating the doctrines with sufficient respect; it is being afraid, and

almost ashamed of them.

⁸ See the passages, sect. 3, note. It might be proper to read them again before entering upon this objection.

⁹ See *Hor. Delph. Od.* III. vi. l. note.

¹⁰ *Voltaire's Works*, quarto, vol. xxvi. p. 384. I should not have left this matter so very short, though I believe I should not have detained my hearers long upon it, had I not been unable to procure the 26th vol. of *Voltaire's works* at the time of giving the Lecture.

¹¹ Sect. 16. of *Introd.* to Part II.

observed, that it would be useful, in treating most of the Articles of our second part, to try how near an Article of *natural religion* would come to each Article of our Church. Be this our first task. A right execution of this will facilitate the rest. We must suppose our pagan to say nothing but what is found in ancient heathen writings, or is clearly to be gathered by the light of nature. On this ground, a man might say thus:—

‘We, at this time, surely are not such as our Creator *intended* when he formed us. A *golden age*, though feigned by poets, shews a sense of our present depravity. What is the cause? Surely, in some degree, the generations that are passed. If our forefathers had been better so should we. But how *far* are we to go back, in order to find the first source? as far back as the generations of man extend. It is not merely to bad *examples* that we owe our moral disorder: in the descent of qualities from parents to children there is an *influence* much greater than that of example; whether it lie in *propagation*, or in education, or in both. But, while one generation after another keeps in a state of depravity, in what *light* can our *species* stand before our Creator? only in that of a *criminal*. He does not regard each man merely as a separate individual; (for he punishes the children for the faults of the parents); but if he *did*, our *depravity* must *incense* him; and the state of our *passions* makes it *probable* that we shall *continue* to offend. What is to be done? We might agree upon some *plan*, some *association*, for *meliorating* our nature. And, though we must not expect to get all the benefit of such plan at *once*; though *habitual desires* are not to be rooted out in a moment, and *purity* planted in their stead, and brought to maturity; yet it is to be hoped that God would, from the *first*, consider us and our undertaking in a favourable light.’

42. Having thus prepared the way, let us come to our proper business, and see in what sense a *Christian* may *assent* to our Article at this day. We may suppose, in some such sense as the following:

‘Scripture treats men, considered before Christianity has had any effect, as concluded under sin, and children of *wrath*: it also describes the carnal appetites as, what we find them, too prevalent and unruly. This is true description: but unruly appetites, however truly described, must be wrong. God did not *create* man for a state so defective: so long as we continue in it our *species* must appear *criminal* in his eyes, and there-

III. fore so must *every one* that helps to compose our species. Nay, *each man*, must be punishable *singly*, so long as his *passions* are in a state of rebellion or anarchy; because vicious passions have the *nature of vice*. What is the *cause* of this evil; the offence of our first *parents*? The account of them is drawn in *faint* characters; yet our evil is, confessedly, in *some* measure traced up to them; and many instances appear of God's treating human beings *collectively*; and experience
189 shews that faulty passions *are* transmitted in a course of nature, from generation to generation. *Example* cannot solve such appearances; for example is only forcible when the models are *at hand*.

'Our *remedy* for these mischiefs must lie in the *Christian Religion*. That, immediately on admission, *restores* us to a state of *favour*, so far as to take off the *condemnation* lying upon our *species*; and puts *each man* into a *way* by which he may *purify* the principles and passions of his mind. Only he must be aware, that mere *admission* into Christianity will not, *of course*, effect a thorough reformation in his *heart*.'

43. The next part of our application relates to *mutual concessions* between contending parties.

We, on *our* part, might perhaps drop the expression *original sin*, if that was found to be the real cause of dissension; using some harmless terms, with which no idea of dispute was associated. We might also change any expressions which seem to imply that sin is a part of our *nature*, as *reason* or *memory* is, fixed, *indelible*—into such as shewed that the prevalence of our carnal appetites was a thing only to be expected on a footing of *probability*, and always *voluntary* in each particular instance, and always *curable*. We might also change the word "*damnation*," into any word which would convey less *terror* to common minds, and would allow of all possible *degrees*. We might perhaps leave more *latitude* for those who doubted whether the history of *Adam* was to be understood *literally*, or as *traditional*, like the *creation*.

On the part of our *adversaries*, (I speak not of *infidels*, for the question is only about different interpretations of Scripture amongst those who acknowledge its authority), it might be
190 allowed, that individuals, though *innocent* as such, may be, agreeably to what we find in Scripture, affected by what is properly the punishment of the *community*. That vicious sentiments may *descend* from parents to children, in a course

of *nature*, like *insanity*; and that the *usual* acceptation of III. *hereditary* does not pretend, in *all* cases, *precisely* to distinguish¹ between the effects of *propagation* and *living together*. That, when it is very *probable*, from experience and observation, that certain *passions will* prevail, it is according to custom of *language* and *Scripture* to speak of them as *prevalent*; though in *each act* of the mind there may be *choice*, and though the *state* of the mind admits of continual *amendment*.

It seems to me as if those who follow *Taylor* might make these concessions; and then but little matter of dispute would remain. If any should remain, *moderation* in carrying it on would be here peculiarly becoming: and it would also be *practicable*, because all parties allow the *existence* of *evil*; the difference is, about the manner of *accounting* for its existence. And this is a difference which need not hinder men from *uniting* in finding and applying *remedies* for our mental disorders.

44. We now come to the last thing; which is, as before, to consider whether our researches have made any openings for *improvement*. The great subject of improvement here must be *hereditary evil*, natural and moral. The *nature* of this, and its particular *laws*, should be investigated by a series of *experiments*. In such investigation, the *remedies* would be observed with a watchful eye. And success in this would lead to an *analysis*² of human *sentiments* and passions; and to the best methods of regulating them, and producing from them their greatest good. 191

Improvement might be made in *classing* texts of *Scripture* which have any relation to our subject. Some texts consider the Christian in *theory*, others in *practice*; and speak of him, accordingly, as *good* or *bad*—as free from *condemnation*³ or obnoxious to it. Sometimes man is spoken of as a *species*, sometimes as an *individual*. Sometimes the *entrance* into Christianity means nothing more than mere admission; sometimes it implies all the *consequences* which follow from it in the common course of things. But we shall again have occasion to mention this classing: a great deal of dispute has arisen from the want of it.

¹ Perhaps it may be from this part of the subject that Augustin says, "eo (peccato originali) nihil ad prædicandum notius, nihil ad intelligendum secre-

tius."—(Quoted in Encycl.)

² See *Essai sur les moyens de plaire*, p. 178; said to be written by Monerieff.

³ Sect. 32.

III. The *denunciations* made on occasion of the offence of our first parents⁴, with regard to *labour*, *agriculture*, and *parturition*, might afford hints for improvements in those particulars.

Labour might be improved, or the evil of it diminished, by every ones *sharing* in it; with a view to health, and other ends; and by improving the condition of those who earn a subsistence by labour. As also by contriving to have incitements to labour from some noble or affecting sentiment; for we know, that, in the warmth of friendship, compassion, emulation, &c., the evil of labour is entirely annihilated. Amongst these incitements should be the *hope* of success; to which it would contribute greatly if the *materials* were improved on which men labour.

This last thought leads us to improvement in *agriculture*.
 192 The ground seems to *resemble*, in some sort, the mind of man: if *neglected*, it is *overrun* with weeds; but attention and experience shew the best methods of *extirpating* them, and *preventing* their growth. The present generation is too well skilled in the methods of improving agriculture, for me to offer any hints concerning that subject.

Nor dare I hazard any particular remarks on the subject of *parturition*. I think it does admit of improvement; and some cases have appeared, in which a strong sentiment, particularly that of *shame*, and a course of *healthy activity*, have greatly reduced its evils. These are hints of nature which should be pursued: probably the "pain and peril of child-birth" would be diminished as *labour* grew more pleasing. And as yet no particular *limit* appears at which the improvement *must* stop.

45. We may now draw towards a *conclusion*. And what thought is so natural, after the discussion of our grand, awful, and interesting subject, as this? that the whole history of mankind seems to consist in a departure from original perfection, and a gradual return to it. We may recollect what was said about a *state of nature* being a state of *war*⁵. . . . Supposing man to come out of the hand of his Creator such as he must have been *intended* to be, his first state would be a state of *peace*: but he offends, he grows corrupted, his *passions* grow turbulent, he falls into contentions; his state of undisciplined nature becomes a state of *war*. He gets

⁴ Gen. iii. 16, 19.

⁵ Sect. 9, Introd. to Part II.

involved in such evils, that *civil society* becomes necessary for III. his *security*. Civil society brings on *order* and discipline, encourages industry and *civilization*; its benefits cause it to be *enjoyed*; *patriotism* springs up in the mind; and the public good is pursued with *ardour* and affection: the result is *peace*. How like to this is the progress of the *mind* in its 193 *moral* capacity, according to the scriptural history so much decried! It sets out from *original righteousness*, falls, becomes depraved, suffers, is made sober; has recourse to Christianity, is regulated by Christian discipline, gets corrected, meliorated, purified; and becomes, at last, what it was originally *intended* to be, virtuous and happy.

Is it too visionary to hope that the same progression may, at one time, be experienced in those other things to which the first dreadful condemnation related? Were this to be the case, *labour* would become like the animated and generous exertions of the beneficent hero, or the eager activity of the hunter, or the engaging pursuits of the man of science, and the enthusiastic virtuoso. *Agriculture*, by adopting what was *useful*, in the field or plantation, and embellishing it with an ornamental simplicity, would make the earth, if not a perfect *Eden*, a beautiful *garden*; delightful to the senses, as well as replete with salutary nourishment. And the generations of man would be continued and perpetuated, without danger, pain, or material inconvenience, to those who never appear more amiable than in the maternal character.

ARTICLE X.

194

OF FREE-WILL.

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.

1. The *connection* of this Article with the preceding is obvious. In the preceding, man is described as under the

III. influence of disorderly *passions*; that influence must affect his *choice*, or *Free-will*, as it is called; he will not so easily choose what is *right* as if he was free from that influence. This is a lamentable state, it may be said, if we consider the consequent punishment;—true; but the present Article affirms, that God will *assist* man under this difficulty—by his *Spirit*, or what has been usually called his *Grace*. So that the present Article relates as much to *Grace* as to free-will; or perhaps more; for the remedy is more the object of this Article than the disorder. However, it had been customary 195 to discuss freedom of will; and the fifth article had laid down doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit.

2. We begin, as in former Articles, with *history*; and we must be careful not to repeat what was given under the ninth Article, nor to mention any facts which would be more advantageously introduced hereafter.

Let us first see whether *Heathens* and infidels have held any notions resembling our present doctrine. The ancients seem not unfrequently to refer mens good qualities to divine assistance and inspiration. Agamemnon says¹ to Achilles, in Homer's *Iliad*,

Ἐι μάλα καρτερός ἐσσι, Θεός που σοὶ τόγ' ἔδωκεν :

Fortitude is one of the four cardinal *virtues*. Parkhurst mentions² several instances in which Homer uses the word *ἐνέπνευσεν* for inspiring the *mind*. *Pythagoras*³ makes truth and virtue the gifts of God. *Pindar* says⁴, of virtues in general, Ἐκ Θεῶν γὰρ μαχαναὶ πᾶσαι βροτέαις ἀρεταῖς, &c. *Socrates* used to say, Θεοῦς—σημαίνειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπέων πάντων⁵. *Erasmus*⁶ speaks of Cicero as inspired; and, in modern times, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, a famous deist, addresses God as “giver of all inward illuminations⁷.” These seem to be instances of referring *moral* qualities to God. *Natural* events are frequently referred, as the finding of Polycrates's ring⁸, to Neptune; but I will 196 only recal to your minds the prayer of the countryman to

¹ *Iliad*, I. 178.

² Hebr. Lexicon under כח—sense vii.

³ See his *Life* by *Ladvocat*; also by *Dacier*, vol. II. p. 219.

⁴ *Pyth.* l. 79. or *στροφή γ'*: see also some of his commentators. The ancient idea of *virtue* was extensive; see *Hume's*

Essays, vol. II. p. 232.

⁵ *Xen. Memorab.* I. 1. 19.

⁶ See *Olivet's Tusc.* disp. beginning.

⁷ See *Leland's View*, vol. I. p. 24, 4th edit.

⁸ *Valer. Max.* vi. 9, quoted by *Pearson* on *Creed*, p. 444, 1st edit. or 218, fol.

Hercules, as that is an instance of uniting *divine assistance* III. with *human* ¹ *endeavours* ².

3. The *Jews* seem to have been more in the *habit* of referring things to God than any other people: they spoke of him not only as the cause of *good*, but of *evil*. One reason probably was, that they were more immediately under the government of God than any other people. When the more extraordinary communications between God and them ceased, they had the *prophets* to connect them with him; and, when prophecy at length was silent, they still remained a distinguished people. I imagine no other people would speak of God's *hardening* the heart of an oppressive prince, or of leading men into *temptation* ³. Yet they had not all exactly the same idea of the divine agency, when opposed to human. The *Essenes* are said ⁴ to have favoured divine agency, the *Sadducees* human, and the *Pharisees* to have been in a kind of middle opinion. The *Psalms* contain some prayers for moral qualities ⁵. *Maimonides* says ⁶, that every man has it in his *power* to *turn* himself into a good way, and to be just, צדק, righteous. And this he proves from Gen. iii. 12, which is consequent to the fall. His expression is general; but it seems to be opposed, in his mind, to *decrees*, rather than to mental corruption, or slavery of the will. Isaiah xi. 2, 3, and Lxi. 1, may be reckoned out of the ordinary course of things. Prov. xvi. 1, 9. 197

4. With regard to *early Christians*, the same observations may be made here which were made under the preceding Article ⁷; including that on the Manicheans. If any one doubts whether any passages can be found in the early writers

¹ *Fable* of the Countryman and Hercules.

² These instances do not express the *slavery* or captivity of the will, nor distinguish between preventing and assisting grace. Niceties are not to be expected; yet, in Dacier's account of the doctrine of Plato, (French edit. p. 153,) there is a something about *blindness* of the mind; and vicious actions becoming *involuntary*, which seems really to bear some affinity to the Christian (or Jewish) expressions. Men are drawn on, (Dacier says, representing the doctrine of Plato,) "par le malheureux penchant de leur

cœur, qui leur fait commettre le mal qu'ils ne voudroient pas faire; ils sont esclaves du péché, qui les domine, et au service duquel ils ont engagé leur liberté." But I have not an opportunity at present of giving the passages in the original.

³ Introd. to Part II. sect. 16.

⁴ Burnet on the 17th Art. Rogers on the 10th Art. mentions both Sadducees and Pharisees as holding Free-will, "and that unto the best things."

⁵ Psalm i. i. 10, 11; and cxix. passim.

⁶ *De penitentiâ*, cap. 5, edit. Clavering, Oxon. 1705.

⁷ Art. ix. sect. 5.

III. which are to our purpose, I need only refer him to Vossius's⁸ *Historia Pelagiana*, and Nicholls on this 10th Article. Nicholls has collected some passages, with regard to the *slavery* of the will, others concerning *preventing*, others concerning *assisting* grace. *Baxter* also tells⁹ us, that "both Greek and Latin Fathers, who wrote before the days of Augustin," "deny any such grace" as, by an insuperable operation, "shall infallibly convert."

5. We now proceed to the *fifth century*; and here we again get into the Pelagian controversy. The history of Pelagius¹⁰ has been given before; and a charge of inconsistency¹¹ against *Augustin* has been mentioned, which belonged, as to the subject of it, to this place; though, as affecting his character, more properly to the former. Our present subject seems to have been the principal one of the Pelagian controversy; the others were rather secondary objects: but it admits of so many niceties, that to give the history of that controversy with precision should be a separate work. *Vossius* has been very attentive in giving it; and a student, who is desirous of searching into this matter, can scarcely, I should imagine, read a better work¹². *Forbes* may also deserve mention. The *general* idea of the doctrine of the Pelagians, with regard to our present subject, is, that they wanted to reduce all the sayings of Scripture concerning the divine assistance in things moral and spiritual, or concerning the divine influence on the *mind*, to *external* helps; such as the publication of the gospel, the promise of eternal rewards and punishments, &c. These were allowed by all to influence the mind; but the orthodox understood the Scriptures to declare an immediate action of the Deity on the mind of man. The Pelagians contrived several expressions, which had very much the appearance at first of delivering the orthodox doctrines; but, on an accurate examination, they were found to be ambiguous. Such is that strong one mentioned by Dr. *Jortin*¹³—God "assists us," "by illuminating us with divers and ineffable gifts of his heavenly grace." This many orthodox would be ready to take in their own sense; but it is capable of being construed so as to

⁸ P. 644. 6, with regard to grace in general; but with regard to *preventing* grace, see Book IV. chap. 2.

⁹ On Perseverance, p. 3.

¹⁰ Art. ix. sect. 6. ¹¹ Art. ix. sect. 7.

¹² P.S. I am glad to see so good a character of this work as there is at the end of *Plaufere's Appello*, given by Dr. Chr. Potter, p. 423.

¹³ Dissertation 2d, p. 51. Wall, p. 169.

signify only *external* information. And other parts of the III. Pelagian writings required such construction, in order to avoid inconsistency. We have before produced the *creed* of Pelagius, as delivered to Innocent the First. We find these words in it, with relation to our present subject: "Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus nos Dei semper indigere *auxilio*." Augustin shews¹ the ambiguity of *auxilio*; which indeed may mean *external* help; and was probably intended to convey that idea to the Pelagians. What the orthodox doctrine was, we may see from the letter of the African bishops to Pope *Zosimus*; who seems to have taken the Pelagians in the sense they wished, and therefore to have been desirous of favouring them. These prelates require that Pelagius and Celestius "do, by a *plain* confession, own that we are in every action assisted by the grace of God, not only to *understand*, but also to *practise* righteousness; in such wise as that, without it, we are not able to do, to speak, to think, or to have any thing of true and sincere *piety*."² It might be added to this account, that the Pelagians seem to have carried on their idea of *imitation*:—as original sin was an imitation of Adam, so the grace of Christ consisted in part in his setting³ us a good *example*. It should also be mentioned, that the Pelagians talked much of the grace of Christ illuminating the human *understanding*⁴; not perhaps internally⁵, as some moderns do, and immediately. Jerom's letter to *Ctesiphon* may lastly be mentioned, as shewing the manner in which the Pelagians *argued* against divine grace. They used a kind of *reductio ad absurdum*, by asking, whether, if we wanted to do the most vulgar or unclean actions (specifying them), we need require the divine assistance⁶.

6. Though I have not read regularly all *Augustin's* writings relating to the Pelagian controversy, yet, from what I have seen, I retain my partiality for him as an acute and noble writer; especially the times considered. Allowing that controversy warmed him into saying some things too strong in favour of divine agency, as interfering with human, (though I

¹ *De Gratiâ Christi*, c. 33. vol. x. edit. Benedict. (See Wall, chap. xix. sect. 29.)

² *Prosper contra Collatorem*. c. x. This translation is in Wall, c. xix. sect. 15. Prosper's was a famous work against Cassian, in defence of Augustin.

³ See Vossius, *Hist. Pel.* p. 654, or lib.

3. par. 2. Antith. 3. from Aug. *adv. secundam Juliani—responsonem*, lib. 11, cap. 145, (should be 146), p. 753, edit. Ben.

⁴ Vossius *ibidem*. Wall, p. 171, or c. xix. sect. 15.

⁵ See Ludlam's *Essay on the Spirit*.

⁶ See Wall, chap. xix. sect. 20.

III. should doubt whether it really did, notwithstanding⁷ I have seen some things which at first appeared strong,) yet one would think nothing very bad could come from one who uses the following expressions⁸: “Si non est Dei Gratia, quomodo salvat mundum? si non est liberum arbitrium, quomodo judicat mundum?—Quia ista quæstio, ubi de arbitrio voluntatis et Dei Gratiâ disputatur, ita est ad discernendum *difficilis*, ut quando defenditur liberum arbitrium, negari Dei Gratia videatur; quando autem asseritur Dei Gratia, liberum arbitrium putetur auferri⁹.” Since this is the case, he says, only let Pelagius express himself in terms which are not *ambiguous*, and all controversy will cease.

This is not the language of a bigot! “Quod si forte latenter sentit, *ignoscat* aliter suspicantibus; ipse enim hoc facit¹⁰,” &c. It is Pelagius’s own fault if we suspect him, he might so easily speak out. This surely is liberal, as well as acute. In his book *de Civitate Dei*¹¹, Augustin speaks in favour of free-will, on principles of natural religion; just as any philosopher would speak.

7. Augustin died in the year 430. *Fulgentius*, who was also an African bishop, and lived to the year 533, may be considered as a *successor* to Augustin, in taking the lead as far as related to defending the orthodox doctrines. Indeed the bishops in other parts of the world, both in *Europe* and *Asia*, seem to have had that diffidence with regard to the doctrine or expressions of Augustin, and to have felt that shock, which some good men in other parts have felt in most ages. This

⁷ P. S. See afterwards in Art. xvii. sect. 5. The change of opinion in Augustin consisted in this: (*De Præd. Sanct.* cap. 3): He once thought we had something so much our own, that we need not ascribe it to God; but he was struck with 1 Cor. iv. 7, and he found other passages in which even *faith* was ascribed to God, as 1 Cor. vii. 25; therefore he determined to ascribe faith to God. His former opinion, he says, was *right*, as far as it went; he had before ascribed *virtue* (or benevolence its chief source) to God; now he ascribes *both* faith and virtue. They are both our own, he says, “*propter arbitrium voluntatis*,” yet both may be called the gifts of God. “*Love with faith*,” Eph. vi. 23.

I see no fault but taking the sentimental expressions of Scripture in too strict and speculative a way. But one side did that as much as the other. Here is no scheme to set aside free-will: there is rather the *contrary* in the writings of Augustin to the monks at *Adrumetum*.

⁸ Vossius *Hist. Pel.* ad init. from Aug. Ep. 46, *ad Valentinum*, printed edit. Ben. in 10th vol. p. 470.

⁹ Aug. *de Gratiâ Christi*, cap. 47, or sect. 52, p. 168.

¹⁰ Aug. *de Naturâ, et Gratiâ*, cap. 59, or sect. 69, p. 105.

¹¹ Vol. VII. edit. Ben. Lib. 5, cap. 10.

occasioned the sending of *Petrus Diaconus* from the East, at III. the head of a deputation, to confer with the *Africans*. It also was the occasion of some debates, into which a countryman of our own¹ entered: his name was *Faustus*, and he was distinguished from others of that name by the title of *Riensis*, or *Regensis*, from the bishopric of *Riez* in France, which he held. Fulgentius lived much under persecution; as the *Arian* party were in power in his time. He wrote to *Thrasimund* with 202 great and unaffected dignity, at the time when he was under a sentence of banishment, passed by the authority of *Thrasimund* himself:—he wrote in a style so manly and so rational, as nothing but a strong conviction and a fixed sense of duty could dictate.

8. We have already² given a general idea of the *Semi-pelagians*. Their opinion with regard to our present subject is most briefly expressed thus: they allowed an assisting or co-operating grace, but denied a *preventing* grace. This is said; but there are some distinctions, which might be made, if it were our particular business to get a very precise idea of their notions; as that they allowed a grace preventing, or previously inspiring, good *works*³, but not dictating *faith*, or good *will*. They did not allow that grace was given exactly according to men's *deserts*; yet they thought a good character was an *occasion* of giving it, or rather of *offering* it; for they thought that every man was *free* to accept or *reject* the divine assistance⁴. The person mentioned, as the leader of the *Semi-pelagians*, is *John Cassian*, who is placed in the year 424, six years before Augustin's death. Cassian founded two monasteries near *Marseilles*, and therefore the *Semi-pelagians* are frequently called *Massilienses*. The chief person who opposed Cassian was *Prosper*, who is placed in the year 434: he followed Augustin, and his works are sometimes made an appendix to the works of that father. Notwithstanding his efforts, the *Semi-pelagians* gained ground in the sixth century, and have never been extinct. They seem likely to continue, and to be 203 popular; as they neither offend by depreciating Scripture, nor by neglecting reason. The *English* divines have been supposed to favour their tenets, though the Liturgy of our church

¹ Cave says, *natione Gallus*, only of a British family.

² Art. ix. sect. 9.

³ See Vossius, *Lib. 4. par. 1, p. 683.*—

Aug. De prædest. sanctorum, with the Letters of Prosper and Hilary prefixed, ed. Ben. vol. x.

⁴ Mosheim, *Index*.

III. implies, in several places⁵, that we hold the doctrine of *preventing grace*.

9. The disputes about grace, which began in the fifth century, have never wholly subsided; they have grown more and more *intricate*, and therefore more *voluminous*. *Calmet* says⁶, that more has been written by divines upon grace than upon any other subject. *Voltaire* seems to account for it by saying, “cette question, ainsi que presque toute la metaphysique, rentre pour le fond dans le labyrinthe de la *fatalité* et de la *liberté*, où toute l’antiquité s’est égarée, et où l’homme n’a guères de fil qui le conduise⁷.” This being the case, we must content ourselves with selecting a few remarkable eras.

The *Mohammedans* seem to attribute a great deal to the divine assistance; nay, so much as to take away even human co-operation. See *Calmet’s Dictionary*, under *Grace*.

In the *ninth century*, our doctrine, and those connected with it, occasioned disturbance. *Gotescalc*, or *Godeschalchus*, studied the works of *Augustin* with great ardour, and filled his mind with lofty conceptions of the divine grace and decrees; some of them such as *Augustin* had really never entertained, as they ran into the extremes of absolute reprobation. He was a *German* by birth, but belonged to a monastery in France, near *Soissons*. There is a bishop of *Soissons*, but he is
 204 under the Archbishop of *Rheims*. This zealous monk took a journey to Rome, in order to visit the tombs of the Apostles. On his return he visited the Bishop of *Verona*, and poured forth to him the sublime notions which he had been imbibing. The Bishop heard so much of

“Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute⁸,”

that he began to be alarmed and terrified. He thought the matter required advice; he accordingly applied to *Raban*, Archbishop of *Mentz*, to whom *Gotescalc* was as ready to open himself, though in a synod, as he had been to the Bishop of *Verona*. *Raban* caught the alarm, and accused this admirer of *Augustin* to his highest superior, the Archbishop of *Rheims*—the hot, imperious *Hincmar*. *Hincmar* called a provincial council; had the monk condemned, degraded, imprisoned, beat with rods; nay, what might be worst of all, compelled to burn

⁵ See *Nicholls* on this tenth Article.

⁶ Dict. under *Grace*.

⁷ Siècle de Louis XIV, du Jansénisme; near beginning.

⁸ *Paradise Lost*.

his own writings with his own hands. He died in prison¹; III. and after the sacraments had been refused to him when alive, burial was refused to his body. On this occasion, the flames of controversy about grace (and the doctrines allied to it) broke out afresh. And the affair of Gotescalc has seemed of such consequence in later days, that eminent men have written upon it; *Vossius* and Archbishop *Usher* particularly. *Usher* was a strong predestinarian, and published a little volume about Gotescalc expressly. *Vossius* has made the transactions here imperfectly mentioned the subject of the last part of his Pelagian History.

10. The *schoolmen*, in the twelfth century, seized on every question in the subtle controversies about grace, and separated it into its minutest fibres; which they moreover twisted with the fine threads of the Aristotelian philosophy. We shall have 205 occasion to speak of the schoolmen under the thirteenth Article: we will only mention some here as the leaders of *sects*. *Thomas Aquinas*, of the illustrious family of the counts of Aquino (Juvenal's birth-place) followed the notions of Augustin. He is often called St. Thomas. His "*Summa Theologiæ*," or body of divinity, is praised by the authors of the French Encyclopédie, as a great effort of human intellect. But what I mean now to say of him is only, that from him his followers had the name of *Thomists*; they were opposed to the *Scotists*, whose head was *John Duns Scotus*, an Englishman, (or Irishman, according to Cave). Probably his name was *John Duns*²; *Scotus*, as before observed, was in old times the Latin word³ for *Irishman*: which might not be distinguished from Englishman. In the age we are speaking of, the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* had all the learning of the times between them. The Dominicans were *Thomists*; and Scotus (or John Duns) being of the Franciscan order, the Franciscans were *Scotists*. Any one who wished to take a slight view of the subtleties of the schoolmen, with regard to the doctrine of *grace*, might read part of the index to Thomas Aquinas's *Summa*. There are in it about nine columns of the word *Gratia*. Or he might read the disputes of the Dominicans and Franciscans at the Council of *Trent*⁴. The greatest in-

¹ About the year 868. He was imprisoned in his monastery.

² See Ladvoat. Sir John Duntze is an English Baronet.

³ Handel was called *il Sassone*; so Paul Veronese, Claude Lorrain, &c.

⁴ Heylin's *Hist. Quinqu.* Part. I.—Chap. iii. sect. 4, &c.—Paolo's History.

III. tricacies seem to be about the *beginnings* of grace, with acts of the *will*. I think it was said, that God waited for the *volition* 206 when a man was previously prepared by *grace*: that is, in the language of the schools, when the man was “constitutus in actu primo sufficiente ad bene operandum.” It will not be forgotten, I hope, that I am here speaking historically, and not explaining or reasoning.

11. We will now proceed to the age of the *Reformation*. The *Reformers* in general, from Wickliffe down to Luther and Calvin, were much inclined to high notions of the divine agency; or, as they thought, to be followers of *Augustin*. Severity of manners, and great seriousness about the majesty and glory of God, might promote this turn. The doctrines debated on as *Lutheran* in the council of *Trent* are very strong⁵ indeed. But the Church of *England* meant to be much more *moderate*; as appears from the *Necessary Doctrine*; and as is well described by Gloucester *Ridley*, in his *Life of Bishop Ridley*⁶. Nothing indeed can better shew the intention of our church than one short sentence at the end of *the Article of Free-will*, in the *Necessary Doctrine*⁷: “All men be also to be monished, and chiefly preachers, that in this highe matier, they loking on both sides, so attempre and moderate themselves, that neyther they so preache the grace of God, that they take away thereby freewill, nor on the other side so extoll freewill that injury be done to the grace of God.” I do not think there was ever anything said more sensibly on this subject⁸. The *Reformatio Legum* has these words: “Et similiter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum 207 in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo *solo* sine aliâ speciali gratiâ, rectè ab hominibus vivi posse, constituent⁹.”

We have no *homily* professedly on this subject; some few expressions are to be met with in the first part of the *Homily on Salvation*, but nothing in the way of theory, or speculation, or definition. Room seems left by our church for persons of different persuasions: the doctrine is left, as unintelligible; *both Free-will* and *Grace* being established, without any authoritative *solution* of the difficulty arising from their seeming

⁵ See Heylin *Quinqu.* Part. I. chap. iii. sect. 1.

⁶ Book V. chap. vii.

⁷ Our church afterwards got nearer

Calvinism.

⁸ It is like Augustin's, *Si non est Dei Gratiâ*, &c. sect. 6.

⁹ *De Hæresibus*, cap. 7.

inconsistency. I suppose any of *Plaufere's* five opinions might III. be professed in our church.

12. We have before¹ spoken of *Antinomians*, under the seventh Article. All we need say of them here is, that they held grace to be *irresistible*; which tenet would imply that all human *endeavours* are unnecessary. Some who held tenets of this nature were² called *Gospellers*³; but Antinomians were of all countries. These Antinomians opposed the *Anabaptists*⁴, who revived *Pelagianism*.

13. The order of *Jesuits* was founded in 1540. Bower says⁵ that they followed the Semi-pelagians; they have been enemies to the high orthodox doctrines of grace, &c. So indeed have been other scientific men. There is a short history of them, said to have been written by D'Alembert, which seems well worth reading; though I should not think the author a friend to Revelation⁶. He considers the society as only using religion as a means of getting power; yet he considers *Le 208 Tellier* (p. 107) as sincere about doctrine.

The Jesuits might be, properly, religious at first, and when they found the effect of religion in acquiring power, might apply it to that purpose. This, I imagine, has been often done. They *must* take up *some* doctrine about *grace*, &c.; and they took up that which would succeed best, in courts particularly. Either *extreme*, of the Pelagians or their adversaries, would have impeded their progress in the *world*; and thinking men would adopt prudential views most easily where they found they had no clear ideas.

The doctrine of the *Romanists* may be seen in the sixth session of the Council of *Trent*, in the first five *Canons* concerning Justification. I do not see that our Article is incompatible with them.

The Romanists have been, since the Reformation, perplexed to determine what part they should take in controversies concerning grace, &c. They have extolled Augustin so highly, as to think they must be for him; and they must be against the Reformers: yet the Reformers were great admirers of Augustin; and the Jesuits, devoted to Rome, inclined to Semi-pelagianism. This, and the divisions amongst themselves, have been

¹ Art. vii. sect. 3.

² Dr. Jortin's 2d. Diss. p. 96, from Burnet.

³ At first, extolling *Gospel* by setting aside *Law*; afterwards by heightening

Gospel in any way.

⁴ Life of Ridley, p. 344.

⁵ Vol. I. p. 350. Lives of Popes.

⁶ Printed 1765, (no place).

III. the occasion of many inconsistencies, and of many refined strokes of papal policy. What we say of such transactions shall be arranged under heads of different *countries*, rather than in the order of time.

14. *Spain* has produced Molina⁷, or Molinos: he was a Jesuit, and a kind of leader in reconciling grace and free-will by nice distinctions⁸. *Voltaire*⁹ reckons him the original author of the distinctions used in the controversies of the last century; but some persons ascribe their origin to the schoolmen. Disputes have arisen on this question¹⁰, into which it does not seem necessary for us to enter. Molina has been of consequence enough to have his book called the precursor¹¹ of Antichrist, and to be appealed against at Rome¹².

15. *Holland* and *Flanders* have not only produced the famous *Michael Bay*, a divine of Louvain, whose doctrines were condemned at Rome, and afterwards brought forward in order to throw odium on a rival party; but they have been the scene of warm contests with regard to the agency of God, as opposed to the agency of man. Those who had high notions of the divine agency, in the salvation of mankind, were called *Gomarists*, from one *Gomar* born at Bruges. Their opponents were called *Arminians*, from *Jacob van Harmine*, in Latin *Arminius*, born at Oude-water¹³, in 1560.

The Arminians got the name of *Remonstrants*, from remonstrating against the treatment they met with; and on that account the Gomarists came to be called *Contra-remonstrants*. They are now most commonly called *Calvinists*, from *Calvin*; who, though a Frenchman, was principally settled at *Geneva*. The famous *Grotius*, or de Groot, was an Arminian; he was born at Delft; his great eminence in learning did not prevent his suffering for his opinions. In 1618, it was thought proper to hold a synod at *Dort* (or Dordrecht), on account of the contentions between the two parties now mentioned. It sat from Nov. 1, 1618, to April 26, 1619. Politics got mixed with religion; the Arminians were overpowered, Prince Maurice exerting himself against them; and their great support, the Pensionary *Barneveldt*, was beheaded, under pretence of trea-

⁷ Distinguish between this *Lewis Molina*, or *Molinos*, and *Michael Molinos*, a Quietist.

⁸ See a short account of his Book in Dupin's Compendious History, cent. 17. chap. i.

⁹ Jansénisme; Louis XIV.

¹⁰ See Vitringa's Theology, vol. 1. where he speaks "de mediâ scientiâ," under de *Attributis Dei*. (*Sapientia*.)

¹¹ Voltaire, ib.

¹² Dupin, ib.

¹³ Ladvoat.

son, within a month after the council broke up. *Grotius* III. was imprisoned soon afterwards, but escaped out of prison, and became an eminent statesman in *Sweden*, and an ambassador; nay, at last he received honours in his own country. Arminius ended his life in a less fortunate manner: he was cited to the Hague, where he defended his opinions; but he was so harassed by the intrigues of the opposite party, that he died at the age of 49. This indeed was before the Synod of Dort; but after it, his followers were obliged to fly their country. Amongst his followers have been many learned men: Episcopius, Limborch, Le Clerc; and others might be mentioned.

It may be as proper here¹, as anywhere, to mention, that the *points* in dispute between Calvinists and Arminians are reduced to *five*; frequently called the *Five Articles*, or the *Five Points*. *Heylin* has written an history of them, which he calls his *Historia Quinquarticularis*; a very respectable work. The first is *predestination*; the second is the extent of *redemption*; the third, the state of the human *will* before conversion to Christianity,² or what helps it requires to enable it to do right; the fourth, the nature of the divine *assistance* in and after conversion; and the fifth is *perseverance*³. These subjects constitute what we have called the *second part* of our 39 Articles (admitting a sort of digression about works of supererogation); and they all come into the canons of the sixth session of the Council of *Trent*, under the head of *Justification*. We may here read a few expressions, shewing different notions of our present subject; either in *Heylin*, *Mosheim*³, or in *Plaufere*'s⁴ "Appello Evangelium." We may read also a short passage in *Wall* on infant-baptism, 4to, p. 168. 211

16. *Germany* produced both *Luther* and *Melancthon*; great and able men; of very different tempers indeed; *Luther* bold and severe—*Melancthon* mild and amiable; but both greatly instrumental in promoting the Reformation. They lie

¹ "The *quinquarticular*" controversy "is generally supposed to have acquired that name much about the time of holding the synod at *Dort*." Tucker to Kippis, p. 69.

² In the English Articles of 1552 there is one Article *De libero Arbitrio*, another *De Gratiâ*: in those of 1562 there is only one of these, retaining the title of the first, *De libero Arbitrio*. In *Heylin*'s account of the Five Articles, ac-

ording to the doctrine of the Church of England, he puts the second and third as being both contained in our present Article, the *tenth*. Dean Tucker calls the five points, "Predestination, Redemption, Grace, *Justification*, and Perseverance." Letters to Dr. Kippis, p. 69. *Whitby* wrote a book on the *Five Points*.

³ Vol. II. p. 521, 4to; or vol. v. p. 444, 8vo. ⁴ *Plaufere*, p. 28.

III. buried near each other at Wittemberg, where they had both taught divinity. The worst of Luther's opinions have just now been mentioned⁵; but by correcting the errors of Agricola⁶, he moderated his own; and it is thought that the moderate Lutherans in general are, in the doctrines we are now speaking of, very near the tenets of the Council of Trent. The notions of *Melancthon*, on our present subject, are well represented in Heylin's quinquarticular History, from the *Augustan Confession*, which was compiled by Melancthon⁷ chiefly; though Luther is said to have been concerned in it. But for an account of this confession I will refer to Dr. Robertson's History of Charles V. as to a work which will be acceptable. Charles V. confirmed the Augustan Confession in 1555.

17. In *France*, the doctrines of free-will and grace (and the others with which they are connected) occasioned the memorable disputes between the *Jesuits* and the *Jansenists*. Cornelius *Jansen* was born in Holland, but was afterwards Bishop of *Ypres* in Flanders. He was a great admirer of Augustin; and wrote accounts of his works, which made a folio volume. The book was called *Augustinus*; and was published after his death, though left prepared: it is in our libraries. He died in 1638; but a friend of his, the Abbé of *St. Cyran*, spread the doctrines contained in it, in consequence of some directions in his *will*. This gave great offence to the *Jesuits*; who made interest with the Pope to have it condemned as a sequel to the book of *Baius*, which had been condemned before. The court of Rome was perplexed; however they condemned *five propositions*, and ordered all the clergy to sign a condemnation of them. Voltaire gives the conclusion of the form: "Je condanne, de cœur et de bouche, la doctrine des cinq propositions contenues dans le livre de Cornelius Jansenius, laquelle doctrine n'est point celle de Saint-Augustin, que Jansenius a mal expliquée." Now the five propositions, though collected out of Jansen's book, were not expressed in his *words*; nor were any *places* referred to from whence they were taken. So that it may be doubted, 1st, Whether the five propositions were really in Jansen's book; and 2dly, Whether Jansen's notions were really in Augustin's works. Here was a fine field for dispute! and the zeal, numbers, rank, abilities, of the partizans, carried dispute to an enormous length. Miracles were performed on both sides: those of the Jansenists are introduced

⁵ Sect. 11.⁶ Art. vii. sect. 3.⁷ Introduction to Book IV. sect. 4.

into Mr. Hume's Essay on Miracles. When the dispute III. becomes, instead of a comparison of doctrines, a trial of strength of parties, it ceases to be our concern. I had once¹ occasion to mention some of the consequences of the dispute: the rest may be found in *Voltaire*², and the book about Jesuits lately mentioned³. The five propositions are in Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History⁴; and even in Dupin's compendium. Dr. Powell mentions the subject in his Charge on controversy⁵.

18. As we are going on according to *countries*, we may take the *Socinians*, as what they call themselves, *Fratres Poloni*. The *Racovian* Catechism will sufficiently shew us their opinions. There is in it a chapter *de libero arbitrio*, from whence it appears that they hold as follows; Free-will was not taken away from *Adam*, (such deprivation was not mentioned as a part of his punishment) nor from us, by his offence. Man is *weak*, but a *will* remains, and he can do the will of God, "divino auxilio accedente;" and God refuses help to no man. Help is *external*, or *internal*; the latter is when "Deus in cordibus eorum qui ipsi obediunt, quod promisit, obsignat." The *drawing*, mentioned John vi. 44, is by the excellence of God's *promises*. It is true that some men are *incorrigible*, in particular *instances*; God *rejecting them from his grace*. There is also a chapter on the promise of the *Holy Spirit*, in 214 which the *sealing* on the *heart* is also mentioned, as that by which we acquire an *hope* sufficiently strong to make us impregnable to *temptations*; but it is affirmed that the gift of the Holy Spirit is not *previously* necessary to our *believing* the gospel, because none have that gift except such as do already believe.

Dr. *Priestley*⁶ speaks as if what is said of men in common discourse, that they can do all that God requires of them, was to exclude the more strict system of Christianity; as if St Paul, in reasoning from what would be *allowed* by *Gentiles*, said all he would ever wish to say. He allows a "*moral impotence*" to receive "the doctrines of Revelation," owing to "*sensual dispositions*" indulged, and "*habits*" contracted; which is seemingly all that one of our church need own. We conceive such habits to be partly what may be called *hereditary*; but that is a matter belonging to the ninth Article. He considers the

¹ Book III. chap. x.

² Siècle de Louis XIV. Jansénisme.

³ Sect. 12.

⁴ Vol. II. p. 397, 4to; vol v. p. 213, 8vo.

⁵ Page 299.

⁶ Fam. Illust., pp. 1, 4, 5, 10, 11.

III. assistance given by God as consisting in *instructions* and *motives*, or as being *external*⁷; though he allows of *divine influence* “on certain *occasions*,” given to men duly disposed, so as to be “the proper subjects of such extraordinary assistance.” Every one must perceive a likeness between Dr. Priestley’s notion of grace and that of the *Pelagians*.

Dr. John Taylor has made a collection⁸ of texts, in order to shew the different senses of the word *χάρις*. *Pelagius* reckoned⁹ up a number of senses in which he allowed of divine grace; or a number were reckoned up for him. Taylor makes *ten* senses of *χάρις*, and concludes, that it does never “particularly and only signify the influence of the Spirit of God upon the heart, disposing us to believe in Christ, and to practise virtue.” But it may possibly be *included* with “other blessings, in the general notion of the favour or grace of God.” This collection of texts is a posthumous work, and relates only to one word, *χάρις*. In his paraphrase on Rom. viii. 27, or 29, Taylor says, that the Holy *Spirit* inspires good *dispositions*. Writers use the word *grace* as a *technical* term established by custom; and as such we adopt it.

19. We have now brought our history down to the present time; but we have not thought it worth while to mention all particulars: we have rather aimed at giving right general ideas than many particular ones, and have therefore dealt, as it were, by *samples* or *specimens*. I might here mention the distinction between *common* and *special* grace; as Taylor thinks it worth while to prove that such distinction is not founded¹⁰ in Scripture; and it is mentioned by *Voltaire*¹¹. *Common* or *sufficient* grace seems to be such as may *enable* men to become Christians, if they do *all* in their power to become so. It seems supposed that this grace *might* have its effect, but, through the weakness and vicious habits of men, it *has* not. *Special* grace¹² supplies this defect, or is so strong that it not only *might* succeed, but *does* succeed; this is also called *efficacious* grace:—a curious jumble of cause and effect! *Voltaire* says, “ils

⁷ Though the motive impels the *will*, it is to be considered as external. The choice is made in a manner purely human, as any other choice is made, in worldly concerns.

⁸ At the end of his book on Original Sin.

⁹ Wall, p. 163.

¹⁰ Orig. Sin, pp. 249, 252.

¹¹ *Candide*.—Louis XIV. Jansénisme.

¹² *Plaisance*, p. 22. I should think that the jest about Dr. Swift’s degree being given *speciali gratiâ*, was an allusion to this technical expression of theology; as well as to university graces. I see it is “*speciali gratiâ*” in the *Reform. Legum*.

soûtenaient une grace *suffisante* à laquelle la volonté peut III. consentir et ne consent jamais ; une grace *efficace* à laquelle on 216 peut resister et à laquelle on ne résiste pas¹.”

As free-will is opposed to *necessity*, it may be proper to mention, that very worthy and sensible men have favoured the hypothesis of necessity ; as Dr. *Hartley* and Jonathan *Edwards*. I suppose few men have exceeded these two in understanding, information, and Christian piety. Mr. Hume is not to be reckoned amongst the friends of Christianity, but his essay on Liberty and Necessity contains things which seem reasonable. His ideas seem, in some respects, like my own ; how far I may have formerly borrowed my thoughts from his I cannot tell.

Amongst those who own *internal* influence on the mind, there are (or have been) some who hold that such internal influence is *immediately discernible* ; others who say, that it is only *mediately* perceivable ; that is, by means of virtuous disposition and conduct. The former sort are, by the latter, accounted *enthusiasts* ; and perhaps they may not allow such doctrine in the way of profession of faith, or definition, though they are generally supposed to hold it.

20. I have reserved for a separate mention those who have expressly and openly held, that God immediately causes the sinful state of some men's minds, by withdrawing his grace from them. Something indeed to this purpose has been produced out of the Racovian Catechism, because the whole of what we wanted to take from it came most commodiously together ; though, by the way, I cannot at present reconcile God's refusing grace to no man, and his leaving some men incorrigible, by rejecting them from his grace. There are, to 217 be sure, in Scripture, many expressions about *blinding* men, hardening, giving them up to a reprobate mind, not renewing them, &c. Now, when these expressions are made into *theories*, they produce such hypotheses as those we are now speaking of². In the sixth canon of the sixth session of the Council of *Trent*, those Christians are condemned who say, “ mala opera ita, ut bona, Deum operari ; non permissivè solum, sed propriè et per se :” that this is meant of *human* actions appears by

¹ Page 270.

² Martin Luther, in his Table-talk, expresses himself thus : “ When the Deity intends to destroy kingdoms and states, he taketh from them their wisdom, he leaveth them no wise and ho-

nest counsellors ; that is, he *blinds* them, and afterwards he bereaveth them of their power and ability ; they go on in blindness and security, and at last perish.”

III. what follows; “adeò ut sit proprium ejus opus non minùs proditio Judæ, quam vocatio Pauli.” Some ancients are referred to in the margin; but we must not be too particular. It appears from *Irenæus*³, that he was obliged to oppose one *Florinus* for holding that God was the author of sin. This might be conceived to happen either by *decree* or *influence*; the latter only is our present concern. *Heylin*⁴ says, that, after the time of *Irenæus*, the doctrine was not held till the sixteenth century, and then only by an illiterate set of men called *Libertini*⁵, whom all parties disclaimed. *Calvin* gives us their notion in a few words: “Quicquid ego et tu facimus, Deus efficit; nam *in nobis* est.” In the Synod of Dort one *Macorius*⁶ is mentioned as holding a doctrine near this. And the *Manichean* doctrine seems the same in effect. *Jansen* 218 thought that *Augustin* held the *impossibility* of virtue in some men: not only in the *blinded* and *hardened*, but in the faithful and *just*;—*grace*⁷ failing. *St. Peter* was an instance.

21. I will close this history with observing, that it is credible the contending parties might each have a *good meaning*; some being afraid of depreciating⁸ *Scripture*, others fearing to do violence to *right reason*, or destroy the foundation of all *virtue*; or encourage folly and superstition and enthusiasm. The truth is, (though no one party perhaps had a full right to say so,) reason must rejoice in the genuine sense of revelation; and revelation must wish to improve reason. In setting aside revelation, there must always be danger of doing harm to reason; and, in neglecting reason, there must always be danger of mistaking revelation.

22. Having finished the *history* of our tenth Article, we come to the *explanation*; which is, as before, intended to *prepare* the propositions, and clear them of all extraneous matter.

The *title* “*Of Free-will*,” might draw us into difficulties, because there may be some doubt about the propriety of the expression⁹; but every man *feels* what is meant by it. He feels himself *choose* the right hand or the left. He sometimes perceives himself and other men choose with great *difficulty*

³ Heylin, *Quinqu.* 1. 1.

⁴ Heylin, *ibidem*; where are Calvin's words here quoted.

⁵ Antinomians.

⁶ Heylin, *Quinqu.* pp. 529, 533.

⁷ Volt. Louis XIV. *Jansénisme*, pp. 268, 269. ed. Lond. 1752.

⁸ See Dr. Potter's Preface to *Plaifere's Appello Evangelium*: as well as Art. ii. sect. 3. ⁹ See R. Hey on Liberty, p. 22.

that which is right; as in case of inveterate habits, of drinking, III. &c.

23. “The condition of *Man*.” This must relate to *man-kind*, as such; and therefore would best be conceived, in the first place, of those who never were made Christians; though it may be applied to those who call themselves Christians without 219 being really such.

24. “*After the fall of Adam*.” In strictness, this is not the same as saying, ‘*because of the fall of Adam*,’ yet no doubt he would most fully agree with our church who considered the fall of Adam as the first beginning of our depravity, or of the undue prevalence of our inferior passions over our choice; or, as Dr. Priestley speaks, more strongly, of our “*moral impotence*”¹. Nevertheless, as every thinking man will keep in mind the faintness and obscurity of the scriptural history concerning our first parents, it might perhaps be worth while to extend the question, proposed under the ninth Article, to the present. I mean about the expression, “every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam,” signifying only, ‘*every man*’². I should imagine that, had men continued in a state of original righteousness, they would have ascribed their good actions to divine assistance, in some way or other; but that state would have been so different from our present, that we cannot form distinct conceptions about it. We can see, that the more assistance we want in order to be virtuous, the more should we ascribe to heaven when we are so.

25. “Is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself.” —“*Cannot*”—may not this word be fairly understood in the same sense with the *scriptural* expressions before mentioned³; “it is *impossible*,” &c.? If it may, the meaning will be, that it is not at all to be *expected*, on a footing of *probability*, grounded on *experience*. Taking this word *singly*, it seems consistent with a man’s being able, in each *instance*, to turn 220 and prepare himself. And this may point out a sense in which God may command things *impossible*. He may enjoin a number of duties, *each* of which is practicable, though, considering our evil habits, it is not to be *expected* beforehand that we should duly perform them *all*⁴. What is to be *expected*, is a

¹ See sect. 18. ² Art. ix. sect. 19.

³ Matt. xviii. 7. Luke xvii. 1. 1 Cor. xi. 19.—See Art. ix. sect. 12 and 35.

⁴ Council of Trent, session 6, canon

18. If it was thought, that *cannot* rather denotes *strict impossibility*, then the mind must go on to the *end* of the Article; and the meaning will be, can-

III. matter of *calculation*; but such calculations belong only to *spectators*; the *agent* has no more to do with them, than a running-horse has to do with the wagers which are laid upon his winning: his business is only to exert himself, and strive to overcome. Difficulties on this subject must arise from some fallacy; generally, from taking advantage of the different senses of the word *impossible*, and substituting the idea of *natural* for that of *moral*⁵ impossibility. I do not mean to say, that, if any one thought that man cannot *possibly*, in the strict sense, turn and prepare himself to faith, he would dissent from our Article. I would only wish that *others* should see in what sense they may assent. If it is strictly impossible for man to convert himself, we trust that God always affords help sufficient to make it possible, in each particular instance; though it seems clearly a *law* of his government, to punish our giving too much sway to any passion, by giving it still more power over us. Yet, *cannot* without help, at most, means only, if he does 'tis *owing* to help.

221 26. "*Turn and prepare himself.*"—The word "*turn*" is probably an allusion to Jer. xxxi. 18, and Lam. v. 21; passages the more familiar to our ears for having been introduced into our Liturgy. The passages in the *New Testament* are equally necessary to be kept in mind; not only where the word *turn* is used, as Acts xiv. 15; xxvi. 18, 20; but where anything is said about *conversion*; as Matt. xiii. 15; xviii. 3; Acts iii. 19, &c. *Conversion* is the word often used in the *five points*.

The word "*prepare*" is chosen with a view to several passages of Scripture: Rom. ix. 23. Ephes. ii. 10. 2 Tim. ii. 21. Such passages as Psalm. lxxviii. 8, (margin) might have some effect; but Luke i. 17, has both the words "*turn*" and "*prepare*," used much as they are here. *Præparatio Gratia* is used by Augustin⁶, for predestination.

27. "By his own *natural* strength." This expression carries us back to what was said under the *ninth* Article⁷ about the *nature* of man, and the corruption of that nature.

not, without help from above. But this, since all men are to *try* and do their *best*, only means, that, when they succeed, their success was *owing* to Divine assistance. According to this sense, the law of God enjoins what it is *impossible* for mere unassisted man to perform.

See Wall, p. 166.

⁶ Pet. Lombard, Lib. 1. dist. 40, (beginning) where Pet. Lomb. uses, "*præparavit* (Rom. ix. 23) *sanctos ad justitiam percipiendam*;" and "*præparavit iniquos*," &c. See Rhem. Test. on Acts x. 2, mentioned afterwards, Art. xiii. sect. 5.

⁷ Art. ix. sect. 18 and 28.

It implies, that man, taken at *any* time, has *some* natural strength; or that the subordinate propensities do not *totally* overpower those principles which ought to bear *rule*. For, according to what was said under the last Article, our natural strength consists in the comparative force or influence of our conscience and higher principles; and our natural weakness in the comparative force of our lower propensities. What I should wish to submit to your consideration is, whether the “natural strength,” or rather natural weakness, here spoken of, is anything fixed and *invariable*? I should rather conceive, that the habitual weakness of our mental constitution, or nature, is different in different *ages* and *nations*; that, if the intermediate generations, between Adam and us, had been more wicked, we should have been still more *weak* than we now are; and, if they had been more *virtuous*, we should now have more *natural strength* than we have: each generation might do something towards diminishing the natural weakness of man, or increasing his natural strength. 222

28. “*And good works* ;” that is, his *own*, *natural*, good works—in the *Latin*, “*naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus*.” There are, then, *some good works* which man, as mere *man*, may perform; there is a something which may, in some sense, be called natural *virtue*. It may be imperfect, it may be insufficient to serve as the ground of a strict *claim* upon God; but it may nevertheless be a great *recommendation* to God, (as in the case of *Cornelius*), and may deserve the applause and admiration of man. We must not think, from the manner in which natural good works, acts of greatness and generosity, are here introduced, that we are forbid to be *pleased* with them, or even to *weep* over them with sympathetic joy and exultation. All that is said is, that, according to the disorderly state of our passions, they are not sufficient, of themselves, to place us in a state of *Christian perfection*; so that nothing more need be wished for, or attempted. And, though they must naturally make us *inclined* to accept of a pure religion, yet, when we do accept it, we should humbly thank God for enabling us so to do.

29. “*To faith*.”—What *kind* of faith is that which is here meant? There is a faith in *natural* religion; which Bishop Warburton understands to be described in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews: “Without faith it is impossible to please God.” “For he that cometh to God must 223

III. believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him¹." Could our reformers mean to speak of faith *in general*? No, it appears to me that they meant *Christian* faith; such faith as is spoken of in the following *Articles*. The subject in view is conversion to Christianity. The Article sets forth an inability to acquire faith: how is that inability to be *supplied*? by "the grace of God *by Christ*;" the faith which is acquired by *such* help must be *faith in Christ*. This is also implied in the words, "*turn and prepare*." That faith is the *preliminary* to conversion is evident enough, from Mark xvi. 16; Acts xv. 9; and Ephes. ii. 8; where being *saved* means being admitted into the Christian covenant; as Mr. Locke shews in a note on the latter passage², well worth the perusal of every one who is studying our present Article.

30. "And *calling upon God*." This must be considered as a kind of *technical* expression. In its ordinary literal sense it has no force in this place. Any Pagan, surely, can call upon God. The phrase is used here, when joined with faith, as it is several times used in the *new Testament*, for entrance on a course of *Christian worship*. Let any one compare Acts ii. 21, & ix. 13, 14, & Rom. x. 13, with Joel ii. 32: there he will meet with the term just mentioned, "*saved*," which will shew how properly the phrase, "*calling upon God*," is *joined* to "*faith*." I suppose, if we were to go as far back as possible, we should find a more extensive sense for this phrase; namely, worshipping God in an *acceptable* manner³. Acceptable worship must vary with circumstances; but, when Christianity comes to be published, acceptable worship must be *Christian* worship.

31. "*Wherefore*."—This word divides the Article into *two parts*; the former may be considered as *premises*, the latter as *conclusion*. The manner of drawing the conclusion may not seem strictly logical:—we cannot *convert* ourselves to faith and right worship, *therefore* we cannot do *works* perfectly good, without divine assistance⁴. Perhaps the full force of this deduction may not appear till after the thirteenth

¹ Heb. xi. 6.

² Locke on Ephes. ii. 8.

³ See Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, under *ἐπικαλέομαι*,—the second sense.

⁴ There may have been an idea of joining in one Article what is sometimes made the matter of two; and this may

have made the connection of the former part with the latter less smooth than it might have been: yet, throw out what does not properly belong to this Article, and then, I think, the conclusion is well enough connected with the premises. See note², p. 120.

Article; therefore we should endeavour to see what is our **III.** proper business at present. We are not to dwell on the nature of *good works*, for that subject is found in the twelfth Article; we are not to shew how only *Christian* good works are, in strictness, completely *acceptable* to God, for that is the business of the thirteenth Article. It was unavoidable to bring the expressions into this Article; but our proper question is, *supposing* works good and acceptable, to what are they to be *ascribed*? Taking this for the proper matter of the Article, the slavery of the *will* in the former part is rightly connected with the divine *influence* on the will in the latter part.

32. “*We have no power* to do good works.”—Not to repeat what has been said about the word “*cannot*,”—this does not mean that we, as men, cannot *contribute* any thing towards the performance of our Christian duty: nor are we to understand from it that we are to *suspend* the performance of our duty till we are sure that we have that assistance which is 225 here declared necessary. The countryman who requested the assistance of *Hercules*, because he had *no power* to forward his own cart, was not therefore to be excused from exerting himself; indeed, we may be said to have *no power* to do a thing¹, though we come ever so near doing it, if at last we fall short. The latter observation here made results from the *sort* of assistance given: “What *king* going to make *war* against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with *ten* thousand to meet him that cometh against him with *twenty* thousand²?” If, in such a case, he cannot *previously know* that he can procure from allies the necessary aid, he *declines* the combat; but, in *spiritual* difficulties, in “*moral*³ *impotence*,” the assistance is *invisible*—communicated in a manner which we do not comprehend; we are therefore to attempt the performance of our most arduous duties, with our best *efforts*, and in the same manner as if all depended on *ourselves*, only begging of our invisible protector that he would help our infirmities.

33. “Pleasant and *acceptable* to God.”—Good works which are so, are here opposed to our own *natural* good works, before spoken of⁴. The works meant, then, are virtuous

¹ See Bp. Sherlock, vol. 11. Disc. iv. p. 79.

² Luke xiv. 31, 32.

³ The reader need scarcely be reminded

that this is Dr. Priestley's expression, quoted sect. 18, from *Familiar Illustration*.

⁴ Sect. 28.

III. actions performed on *Christian* principles, and regarded by God as done by men in the capacity of those belonging to that 226 *society*, of which his Son is the head⁵—in the relation of *branches* to the *Vine*⁶.

34. “Without the *Grace* of God by Christ *preventing* us.”—Grace is here used in the *customary* sense, for *internal* influence on the mind; more particularly such as is *immediate*. Though the word *prevent* is now most commonly used as synonymous to *hinder*, yet the Latin, and our Liturgy, will make any explanation unnecessary. Indeed we still hear sometimes of preventing men’s *wishes*⁷. To prevent is to *come before*: now, any person may come before another, either so as to seize upon that advantage which the other was aiming at, or so as to provide some benefit or enjoyment; so as to have that *prepared* for him, which it was most probable he should otherwise have been obliged to prepare for himself.

35. We now pass on from explanation to the *proof*. After we have made the proper reserves for the subsequent Articles, we seem to have but few propositions left. The two following seem to comprehend every thing, which is affirmed in the Article.

1. We cannot *convert* ourselves from being heathens (or *as* heathens) to the state of *true Christians*.

2. We cannot perform *good works*, strictly so called, without the assistance of God; without his aid, both in the formation of our good *purposes*, and in the *execution* of them.

227 This is the form into which it is natural for us to throw our propositions in the first instance; but thinking upon them, and imagining ourselves to enter upon the proofs, will make us wish for some alteration. As the propositions now stand it seems to be implied, that we are⁸ first to procure our assistance, and then to begin our task; but it has already been⁹ observed, that the particular nature of our assistance requires, that, at the same time that we own its reality, we should make our attempts and exertions as if we had none. Therefore

⁵ Ephes. i. 22.

⁶ John xv. 5. Jonathan Edwards impresses this idea, I think, in his long discourse on Justification.

⁷ The word *let* formerly meant the opposite to the modern *let*.

⁸ If one was to hear that a man was so ill that he was unable to get out of bed

without help, nothing would seem more clear than that he would lie still till help arrived. See also the misapplication of Ezek. xxiv. 27, (not an exact quotation), in Whitfield’s First Dealing, cited in “The Principles and Practices of the Methodists,” p. 18.

⁹ Sect. 32.

it would be better (on this account, and for other reasons III. which may hereafter appear,) if our propositions stood in some form better suited to the nature of that assistance, which can be most fully conceived on a review of its effects. As thus:—

1. When we *have been converted* to Christianity, we should thank God, and give him the glory.

2. When we *have done* any virtuous *actions* (or what would be commonly called such), we should ascribe them, *as far* as they really are virtuous, to the assistance of God. And we should thank him both for the good *dispositions* and the good *actions*.

It should be observed, that, as the assistance which is given from above is not *understood* by us, as our notions of it are extremely *indistinct*, so should be our acknowledgments. But a Christian is bound to make his acknowledgments *through Christ*; or, to consider all the spiritual benefit which he receives, as coming to him from the Vine, of which Christians are the branches. 228

36. When we have been converted to Christianity, we should thank God, and give him the glory. This will sufficiently appear from the following texts:—Jer. xxxi. 18. Lam. v. 21. John vi. 45, 65; xii. 40; xvi. 13. Acts xv. 9, and xvi. 14. 1 Cor. xii. 3. Ephes. ii. 8. Phil. i. 29.

To which may be added those texts in which the influence of the Spirit accompanies *baptism*; as John iii. 5; Titus iii. 5; for that influence must be requisite to complete the conversion. And, if we compare Titus iii. 5 with Mark xvi. 16, it will appear that the *faith* by which we are *saved*, or admitted into the Christian religion, is a gift of the Spirit. For, in the one passage the requisites are baptism and the *Holy Spirit*; in the other, baptism and *faith*.

37. The second proposition relates to both *dispositions* and *actions*. As to our *dispositions*, several of the texts just now mentioned might be produced again; as those from the Old Testament, and Jer. xxxii. 39; Ezek. xxxvi. 26; and John vi. 44, 65. For though, in the particular circumstances in which they were spoken, their first and immediate view might be to conversion, yet they are expressed generally, and may be applied to men's coming to do right actions at any time. Bishop Hurd has treated John vi. 44, in that sense. We may add Phil. ii. 13; also Eph. ii. 8; and perhaps Acts xv. 9; in

III. both which texts *faith* is ascribed to God—faith being a constant principle of action.

That our good *actions* are to be ascribed to divine grace, is evident from many passages. Phil. ii. 13 may be mentioned again; God worketh in us not only to *will*, but to *do*. Add
229 Rom. v. 5; Rom. viii. verses. 13, 14, 16, 26¹, 27; 1 Cor. iii. 16; Gal. v. 16; Ephes. iii. 16, 17. The doctrine is delivered more at large, 1 Cor iv. 7, and 2 Cor. iii. 5.

Reasonings from Adam, as opposed to Christ, and from Ephes. ii. 2, might here be admitted, in order to shew that the remedy should operate upon our *minds*, because the disorder lies there.—The good derived from Christ is also much *greater* than the evil derived from Adam². And the *number* of the things revealed in Scripture concerning the Holy Spirit should be attended to: such communications must have been intended for some purpose or other.

38. Though our texts shew that the Church, in all ages, has been right in professing some doctrine of Divine grace, yet their precise meaning does not seem capable of being ascertained by attending to the mere expressions. In order to acquire a notion of that, we must recollect some of the *elementary* observations which were offered in the Introduction to this second part of our Articles.

39. *Popular* language, such as the *Scripture* language must be, does not express acts of the mind, as it seems to do, in the way of theory or speculation. It should be construed as expressing merely our feelings³, and our wants, with some view to good. In order to see its true meaning, we must see what *practical* end it has in view.

230 Whatever may have been said by writers about the speculative doctrines of Scripture, if I were to hazard an observation, I should rather be inclined to say, there is no such thing in Scripture as a speculative doctrine, relative to the subjects most commonly controverted: there are expressions which have been collected and extended so as to form such, but that is the work of *man*. I do not conceive that we have in Scripture any *theory* of what is called the doctrine of *grace*. In many *instances* our conversion, our good designs and actions, are *referred* to God; but in every instance the thing really expressed is some good *feeling*, with a view to promote some good

¹ See Short Def. of Atonement, p. 85; quoted by Ludlam, Scrip. Met. p. 5.

² Rom. v. 20.

³ Introd. to Part II. sect. 4.

principle. The good feeling is generally *pious gratitude*; the III. end in view, to promote either that same, or humility, or some virtuous or religious sentiment¹. If *there was* a theory of the doctrine of grace, properly speaking, the propositions concerning divine assistance would be *universal*, and might be used on all *occasions*—*trifling* as well as important, *future* as well as past. Nay, an action inspired by God might be pronounced *good, beforehand*, instead of being ascribed to him *after* it was performed, *as far* as it was good. But we find no such universality in Scripture. When we hear this popular language in *common life*, we generally can see the end which is aimed 231 at, and what is taken for granted. M. Luther would say, ‘It has pleased God to enlighten my mind, and employ me to rescue his religion from popish superstition².’ Cardinal Bellarmine, ‘By God’s help I have restored many to the Catholic faith, who had been seduced into Calvinistic heresy.’ Each taking his own religion for true, refers the protection of it to God, and with a *view* of promoting a zeal for its success. The forming of our *Liturgy* is referred³ to the Holy Ghost. In 1548, the expression “by *the aid of the Holy Ghost*” was used: some objected to it; but others explained it in a manner not very different from ours. The Scripture says, “what hast thou⁴ that thou didst not receive?” we must not think

¹ Here might appear the boyish and flippancy of Leclerc and Jortin to Augustin, for referring a discovery about divine grace, made in reading the Scriptures, to the divine assistance. See Jortin’s six Dissertations, pp. 33, 92. There is no appearance to me that Augustin pretended to revelation in the sense in which these two writers take the word; or that he meant any more than to refer the correction of his error to God; in the manner of the instances mentioned in this section. His phraseology was pious of course; and that is enough to produce his expression. Whether his former opinion was a real error, makes no difference. God only knows that.

Calvin, about his Catechism, meant no more when he said, “in quo scribendo Dominum mihi adfuisse confido.”...I readily allow that both Calvin and Augustin favoured Divine agency.

² There is a passage, in the third part of the Homily of Good Works, which

might be mentioned here: “Honour be to God, who did put light in the heart of his faithful and true minister, of most famous memory, King Henry VIII., and gave him the knowledge of his Word, and an earnest affection to seek his glory, and to put away all such superstitious and pharisaical sects by Antichrist invented, and set up against the true word of God, and glory of his most blessed name, as he gave the like spirit unto the most noble and famous Princes, Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias.” This expression seems no more than a pious and indistinct reference of the benefit of part of the Reformation to the Deity, made by those who took for granted that the Reformation was a real blessing; but not under any presumption of knowing the mind of God beforehand.

³ Burnet on the Reformation, Part II. Book I. (vol. II. pp. 93, 94.) See Book I. chap. xii. sect. 3.

⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

III. we have the right meaning of this question, till we see the *end* aimed at, in proposing it, namely, “lest any man⁵ should *boast*,” expressed in these words, “why dost thou *glory*?” Nor must we think that we *apply* it in the right sense, except
 232 when we use it as a *motive* to humility. Suppose any one used it thus: ‘I have no virtues which I did not receive, therefore it is in vain for me to endeavour to improve my morals:’ the conclusion is not unfair, on a footing of theory; yet every one sees it is a *fallacy*. It is, in truth, a *misinterpretation* of the Apostle, arising from giving too *literal* a sense to *popular* language, and not construing his *words* by attending to his *practical design*.

This observation supplies us with a solution of the difficulty proposed by the Pelagians, which is mentioned in Jerom’s letter to *Ctesiphon*: If we are to refer our virtues to the divine assistance, why not our most *vulgar* and unclean actions? No one can shew a reason, on a footing of mere theory; but it is reason enough to say, because referring such actions to the divine assistance would answer no good *end*, promote no *virtue*. Jerom only *exclaims* against the profaneness of such language.

This objection of the Pelagians reminds one of the Journals of Mr. *Whitfield*, Mr. *Wesley*, &c., who refer almost all events to the divine assistance. Some⁶ have thought that they make pretensions to an extraordinary communication with the Supreme Being. Those who understand them in this sense will take care not to give credit to such pretensions but upon sufficient *evidence*—upon such evidence as they will not be ashamed to produce at “the judgment-seat of Christ.” It seems to me that they may *possibly* mean only to refer plain facts to the Divine agency, from an imitation of the sacred writers. If this be the case, they seem to confound different situations; and sometimes to refer events too trivial to the
 233 agency of heaven—as a shower⁷ of rain, for instance, or a journey⁸ to *Bath*. If they are, as some⁹ have thought, *evasive*; if they wish to run from one of these plans to the other, as they are driven; if they wish to have the lower people think

⁵ Ephes. ii. 9.

⁶ Bp. Gibson. See his 4th Pastoral Letter, p. 261. Also end of sect. 19.

⁷ Principles and Practices of the Methodists considered, p. 17.

⁸ Gibson, 262. References to *Satan* seem much of the same kind, and sub-

ject to the same remarks. Mr. Whitfield refers his idleness at college to Satan, without diffidence. See his First Dealing, &c. p. 67; quoted in Principles and Practices, &c. p. 17.

⁹ Principles and Practices farther considered, p. 29.

them inspired, in a manner different from common men, yet III. express themselves so, that, when they are charged with this, they can give their narrations a different sense; they appear more blamable than either for mere enthusiasm, or for want of discriminating cases somewhat alike. Farther, I have not a decided judgment on this matter.

40. In order to get at the true sense of popular expressions, it should always be remembered, that some words, which have a positive sound, have only a *negative* sense¹. With regard to expressions, by which actions are ascribed to the divine influence, I will only suggest, that every man should watch his own mind, and prove his own thoughts: that he may be aware what it is that he comprehends clearly and distinctly—that he may judge rightly how far his particular conceptions of divine influence on the mind extend. Does our distinct knowledge really extend beyond the following proposition? It would be wrong, impious, irrational, to *exclude* the Deity from power over the *thoughts* of men; or from any *action* on which an human being values himself. Every man surely would be ready to say, ‘As God does influence us, I know not but he may in this particular instance; I see not how far, but to *exclude* him would be shocking; suppose he did, would not such or such a consequence follow?’ And some men may think that this is the chief of what is really meant by saying, God *causes* our thoughts and actions. 234

41. Causes assigned as total are often only² *partial*. Hence, ascribing to God needs not exclude human endeavours; nor needs human agency exclude divine. Either, or both, may be assigned; and which shall be assigned is determined by some *practical good* in view; according to the observation made in sect. 39. St. Paul, in Phil. ii. 12, 13, assigns *both* divine³ and human agency: we are to work out our own salvation with *fear*⁴ and *trembling*, because God worketh in us “both to will and to do of his good pleasure:” because we are *assisted* by one, by a partner as it were, or associate, with whom we may not trifle; who is engaged in assisting us by no views of interest, but assists us from a benevolence which the

¹ Introd. to Part II. sect. 7.

² Hey on Atonement, p. 45, note. Introd. to our 2d Part, sect. 8.

³ *Grotius* speaks as if *civil government* might be referred either to God

(Rom. xiii. 1), or man, (1 Pet. ii. 13). De Jure, &c. l. iv. 7.

⁴ That is, with care and respect, as appears from Psalm ii. 11 (Bible). Dan. vi. 26. Mark v. 33. 1 Cor. ii. 3. 2 Cor. vii. 15. Ephes. vi. 5.

III. greatness and majesty of his character makes deeply affecting. St. Paul also, in Rom. viii. 13, gives much the same idea: "If *ye through* the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Christians are the *agents*, but they perform their duty *through* the Holy Spirit. Nor is this peculiar to the *new* covenant. The *Psalmist* does the same: "Except⁵ the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it: 235 except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." See also Psalm xlv. 3, 4, where it is not to be supposed that the children of Israel did not fight⁶.

And, as it is sometimes most useful to refer things to *both* divine and human agency, it seems, on some occasions, a matter of *indifference* to which they are referred⁷. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 10, first gives a plain relation of his diligence; then immediately gives the same over again, in a way calculated to make a good impression, or raise a religious sentiment. First he says, "*I laboured more abundantly than they all:*" then he says, "yet *not I*, but the grace of God which was with me." It is the *same* relation, as to *fact*, whether he says, "*I laboured*," or "*not I:*" the latter tells us no more than the former. In 2 Cor. xi. 23, he expresses his comparative diligence by the words, "in labours more abundant," without any reference to the divine agency; but his business was not then to encourage pious gratitude and humility, but to maintain the dignity of his own character, which had suffered under aspersion. In an instance before mentioned, things were to be referred to God, lest any one should *glory*; but, in the present instance, St. Paul says, he "must *needs glory*;" he was 236 called upon to support his honour⁸.

It seems to follow from hence, that, when either the divine

⁵ Psalm cxxvii. 1, 2.

⁶ In Shakspeare's *Tempest*, Act iv. scene 1, Prospero says to Ferdinand,

Thus as my *gift*, and thine own acquisition,

Worthily *purchased*, take my daughter. This is natural, popular language. In *strictness*, the same thing is not a *gift* and a *purchase*.

⁷ It might not be amiss here to see the manner in which acts are referred to God the *Father* and to the *Son*, so that one being considered as a cause does not exclude the other. Eph. i. 9, compared with texts in which Christ makes known

the will of *God*. The Father gave his Son, 1 John iv. 9, 10; the Son gave *himself*, Gal. i. 4. See Pearson on the Creed, p. 259, 4to; or p. 130, folio.

⁸ St. Peter says (2 Pet. iii. 18), "*grow in grace*." St. Paul says (Eph. v. 18), "*be filled with the Spirit*;" though in one case the Christian is active, in the other passive, yet they must mean the same thing: we seem to say indifferently, '*I incline* to such a thing,' and, '*I am inclined*;' which should be considered as an *experiment*, shewing how easily the mind changes from the idea of acting, to that of being acted upon.

or human agency is mentioned separately, the other must be III. considered as *implied*. St. Paul, when he speaks of himself as “in labours¹ more abundant” than some other ministers, certainly did not mean to exclude the grace of God; nor when he was told that God’s grace was sufficient² for him, did he understand that he was not to *endeavour* to extract the thorn³ in his flesh.

The strongest expressions of divine agency are those which represent God as *creating* a right spirit, or good works, or causing a *resurrection* of those “who were *dead*⁴ in trespasses and sins.” Yet, from Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27, and Ephes. ii. 10, 237 and v. 14, 15, it appears, that we may be spoken of as *agents*, even under such representations: to *walk*, is the part of one who is *active*⁵.

42. When we wish to get the exact sense of popular expressions, we must always consider in what *circumstances* they are used⁶; for every such expression, being of a practical sort, must be made in order to fit certain circumstances; and therefore missing the right circumstances, is missing the right *sense*. It requires some attention to find out the circumstances to which any saying is adapted; but, if many instances occur, one may discern what things belong to them in common. Let any one then try whether *future* actions are not represented in Scripture as dependent on *human* agency, and whether actions ascribed to *divine* agency are not in some sense *past*⁷. As in the case of *Lydia*⁸, her conversion, as an *effect*⁹, is referred to

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 23.

² 2 Cor. xii. 9.

³ Dr. Rutherford, in a *Concio ad Clerum*, gave reasons for thinking that this “thorn in the flesh,” was the disorder of *sore eyes*. For that disorder a friend once recommended to me Smellome’s ointment, which seemed to succeed: on our meeting after my recovery, I should naturally say, I am indebted to you for being able to read and write comfortably. Were the proprietors of the ointment to ask me after its efficacy, the answer would as naturally be, it cured me when other things failed. Were I speaking with a *religious* view, the natural expression would be, It pleased God, such a night, to relieve me from my “thorn in the flesh.” The *fact* is one only.

Matt. vi. 26, our heavenly Father feed-

eth the fowls of the air—not surely without any endeavours of their own. It is an act of rational piety, in grace at meals, to refer our plenty to God; but such devotion does not lessen the care of those who furnish the repast.

⁴ Ephes. ii. 1.

⁵ Archbp. Sharp’s Sermons, vol. 111. Sermon. 13.

⁶ Introduction to Part II. sect. 9.

⁷ Sect. 35. ⁸ Acts xvi. 14.

⁹ Whenever the *effect* comes, it is as *past*; and the *cause* is prior to the effect. If some declarations of divine influence in Scripture seem free from the idea of time *past*, as John iii. 5; Titus iii. 5, suppose an *instance*, and then this observation applies. Observe also, that ἐλκύσθη, John vi. 44, may be rendered, shall have drawn.

III. the Lord's opening her heart as a *cause*. If this proves to be a *rule*, we have no right to talk of grace *in general*¹⁰; and it should be seen, at some time, that referring our *past good* actions to God makes us *humble* and *pious*; though, to lay our *past bad* actions on God, would increase our wickedness; but referring any *future* actions to divine agency would make us
 238 neglect our own part, would hinder us from doing our best. It might also be gathered, from the scriptural instances of referring events to God, that no *trifling* events are referred to him. The reason of which has been assigned¹¹; but, if we saw *no* reason, the uniformity of the practice would be sufficient to lay a restraint upon us.

It may be likewise observed in Scripture, that where an author is entering into the views of the *agent*, he speaks as if our will was *free*; where he enters into the views of the *spectator*, as if the will was *influenced*: which agrees with what was laid down about freedom and necessity¹²; but, without that, would have afforded a sufficient reason why we should do the same. In this light we may compare, "it must *needs* be that offences come," with Isaiah's description of the age of discretion in man; that age when he knows "to refuse the evil, and *choose*¹³ the good." Or with St. Paul's dilemma, "what I shall *choose* I wot not, for I am in a strait between two¹⁴."

If the Scriptures do, in a constant and uniform manner, speak of *future actions* as depending upon the human agent, it must appear natural that *rewards* and punishments should be proposed without reference to divine agency. Nor does there seem any reason for its being introduced in the grand description of a *future judgment*, contained in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

Some popular expressions, which seem to be affirmative, or speculative, are merely *declamatory*. Readers of Scripture should be aware of this, when they see expressions about divine
 239 *grace*: all which seem designed to excite good sentiments, and belong more to the *heart* than the *head*.

The New Testament adopts Jewish modes of referring *evil* to the divine agency; as when it speaks of *hardening*, *blinding*, &c.; but this, being the most difficult part of our subject, had better be reserved, as the history of it was, to the last.

¹⁰ Wall seems to have felt something of this, p. 168. "It is one thing thankfully," &c.

¹¹ Sect. 39.

¹² Introduction to Second Part, sect. 5.

¹³ Isai. vii. 15. ¹⁴ Phil. i. 22, 23.

43. The *result* of what has been said seems to be this: III. Take a man, in his moral or religious capacity, at any *instant*, and he is to *set out* upon principles of free-will and human agency; these will include *praying* to God for spiritual assistance. When he has proceeded in a course of good living, or what may be ordinarily called such, he is to *look back* upon his conduct with *humility*, and *ascribe* it to the influence of the Holy Spirit, with pious *gratitude*. Thus he sets out a sort of *Pelagian*, and finishes his course as a follower of *Augustin*.

Not that he must be unmindful of the assistance which he receives, as a *man*, from *conscience* and intellect; and from the continual proofs which he may find, in the course of *nature*, of an hatred to vice and a love to virtue, in the Author of nature and Governor of the world. This assistance has been considered as the *first grace* of God¹, and as that by which an *heathen* may be saved.

44. I have now finished what I meant to offer in the way of *direct proof* of the propositions contained in our Article. But some *indirect* proof seems requisite here, as well as on former Articles. There are some *objections* which are of weight enough to deserve an answer.

45. It may be asked, is not this subject too *intricate* and perplexed for the generality of mankind? and does not this manner of treating it make it more so? particularly, is there any such thing as getting a clear conception of the *beginnings* 240 of preventing grace and free-will? We answer, it is not necessary, in order to shew the *truth* of a doctrine, to prove that all men can comprehend it. We have had a whole chapter on unintelligible doctrines; and we have allowed that the doctrines of the first, second, and fifth Articles, are all above human comprehension. But we may believe the *reality* of divine influence, without understanding the particular *manner* in which it operates.

Our manner of treating the subject does require some thought, and some power of distinguishing; but every man makes as many distinctions, and that very frequently, in the common affairs of life, as we require. Whoever will let his mind ply freely to circumstances, only in the same way he does in interpreting common discourse, will make references to divine assistance in a right manner, and with right limitations; and

¹ See Jortin's six Dissertations, p. 84.

III. will understand them as they are really meant, when they are made by others².

If any one asked, in particular, which *begins* first, preventing grace, or virtue? I should not scruple to answer, I do not know. If *our part* is clear, we may safely leave the part of God to himself. Our business is, to profess that God *inspires* us, and that we are to *ascribe* to him our good thoughts and actions. Now, we are not hindered from professing either of these things, by our ignorance of the nascent operations of divine and human agency. No time can be assigned when we cannot thank God for any virtuous act or purpose of which we are conscious. The nascent acts of mutual sympathy, or friendship, are almost as unintelligible as those of divine influence and human virtue.

46. Is not the general *tenor* of the Scriptures as if man was *free*? is it not full of *precepts*, commands, laws, which presuppose freedom? Does not *conscience* imply the same? Are we not *exhorted* to *repent*³ and “grow in grace⁴?” Nay, are we not told, that, “if a man⁵” “purge *himself*,” “he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Master’s use, and *prepared* (the word of our *Article*) unto every good work?” Can the supposition of our being passive, impelled in some mysterious manner, stand against sayings so *plain* and intelligible as these? If our remarks are accepted, I apprehend that an answer has *already*⁶ been given to this difficulty. It is now proposed, in order that, in case they should not, another may be offered. Free-will and grace are opposed; but are they really *incompatible* with each other? why may not they *both* be received? even though no reconciliation between them should be attempted? They seem both to be received by our Church⁷; and also by Augustin. If they both are separately proved to exist, they are reconcilable in their nature, though we should not, at present, know how to reconcile them. Indeed, experience seems to shew that they do exist together, in the minds of thousands. We will, then, grant to our objector, that there is *no harm* in his referring actions to the agent; nay, that it does not imply any *falsehood*: we only desire him to grant, that to ascribe good actions

² See Principles and Practices, &c. pp. 49, 50. “Many distinctions may be necessary now which were not so when his (St. Paul’s) Epistles were written.”

³ Acts iii. 19.

⁴ 2 Pet. iii. 18.

⁵ 2 Tim. ii. 21.

⁶ Sect. 43.

⁷ Sect. 11.

to the Deity is more *pious*; and therefore, on some occasions, III. more *proper*, nay, with a view to religion, more *prudent*; as it will correct and amend our principles, by exciting some 242 good sentiment or affection.

47. It may be urged, that it is inconsistent to say that *past* actions only are the objects of the scriptural sayings concerning grace, when it is certain that we are commanded to *pray* for it; which implies looking forward into *futurity*.

But all the prospect we have of grace, in praying for it, is very obscure; all the notion we have of it then is quite indistinct. That there *is* such a thing may, to be sure, be seen at any time, or without any relation to time. Prayer is an *action* itself, which we may refer, with a retrospective view, to the divine assistance¹. It implies endeavours in active virtue accompanying it. It is itself an *endeavour*—an effort to procure the means of acting well; and in this light it is seen in *future*, as human agency; as well as the end it aims at. There seems nothing unscriptural, when we are using any honest endeavours, in hoping for future assistance, in some indefinite manner. In short, prayer may, in some way, *mix* ideas of divine and human agency; but does not imply any contradiction to our notion, that particular actions are not to be considered as inspired till they are *past*.

48. It has been objected, by a friend² of mine, to my way of interpreting and limiting passages of Scripture relating to divine grace, that it has an appearance of *lowering* their importance, and also the importance of God's revealing the *personality* of the *Holy Spirit*. But it seems to me, that this is only a temporary appearance, which would go off on consideration.

1. It cannot diminish our respect for the Scriptures to 243 look upon them as written in *popular* language: if they were not, they would in reality be written in no language at all; that is, in no words which would convey ideas, especially to such persons as they were addressed to. The connection between words and ideas is *arbitrary*, and wholly dependent on *custom*: sounds to which we are unaccustomed are no language; and, if those sounds were *like* something we were used to, they would confound us the more.

¹ Rom. viii. 26.

² Mr. Twining, the author of the work so well known and so much esteemed

amongst the learned, on Aristotle's Poetics.

III. 2. Though references to divine agency may be *indistinct*, and though the words which express them may require *limitation* in getting at their real meaning, yet they may be ever so *important*: they may be sublime, affecting, and, in short, may warm the heart to virtue and piety.

3. It is surely of great importance to see all expressions about grace in such a light, that they shall leave the efficacy of *rewards* and punishments undiminished, and shall afford no pretence for *remissness* in spiritual diligence. So long as *our part* in working out our salvation is disentangled from mystery, the *part of God* may safely be committed to the clouds and darkness which surround³ his throne.

4. It does not appear that the power of the Holy Ghost is limited by our notions, either upon the understanding of man, or upon his will. On the other hand, it is consistent with those notions to maintain, that virtues may be referred to him with a fuller confidence because his particular office is revealed; though still his influence be only mediately perceivable, and though the manner of referring virtues to divine agency continues as before revelation.

244 5. Lastly, could we flatter ourselves that our manner of extracting the good from different opinions would have a tendency to silence *disputes*, we might venture to say, that it would be the means of making the Scriptures generally respected as they deserve.

49. But, though *Christians* should be brought to respect Scripture, yet still the same objection remains with regard to *infidels*, which was mentioned under the preceding Article⁴. Will not *any* doctrine of grace *disgust* men of plain common sense, or of *philosophical* minds, and make them averse to Revelation? particularly, by taking religion out of the regions of experience and common sense, into those of fancy and enthusiasm? and by establishing a sort of doctrine of necessity, on the ruins of freedom of will?

First, with regard to *experience*. That men are influenced and assisted by the Holy Ghost, we do not learn merely by experience; but there is nothing in the doctrine which is *contrary* to experience. The rational philosopher will allow that there is an over-ruling *Providence*⁵; though the manner in which it rules, in particular cases, is unknown. Why therefore should it be objected to the doctrine of *grace*, that the

³ Psalm xcvi. 2.

⁴ Art. ix. sect. 40.

⁵ See Powell, Discourse xiii. p. 218.

manner of influencing minds is not understood? It is as III. *likely* that God should influence *mind* as *matter*: to exclude him from the former, when his influence upon the latter is allowed, seems a great inconsistency, supported by no philosophical reason. When men encourage themselves in rejecting the operations of the Spirit, because they do not *see* them, they are apt to fancy that they *do see* the objects which excite their passions. The objects indeed they do see, in some sense, 245 but in one that is but little to the purpose; because they see nothing of the manner in which those objects exercise any *power* over their *minds*. They *see* too the *lightning* and the *earthquake*, they *hear* the *thunder*—which they may call, with the Psalmist, “the *voice of the Lord*”¹; but the application of these to the moral government of the world, they understand as little as they do the inspiration of God’s Holy Spirit. Many material things raise or depress *our spirits*—draw us into speculations of a cheerful or melancholy sort, we know not how; nor are we sensible of the effect till experience shews us it on looking back. What presumption can true philosophy entertain against the same kind of secret influence from heaven?

Enthusiasm has², in fact, been owing to presumption. Those who have believed the reality of inspiration, thinking that if they were inspired they must feel it, have presumed that their internal sensations were immediately from God.

And, with regard to the doctrine of *necessity*, if the Christian doctrine of grace did introduce it, I see not that the philosopher need be disgusted on that account: many able men have favoured that doctrine³, independently of Christianity. The scheme of necessity is misunderstood, if it is thought inconsistent with *virtue*, or any part of moral discipline. Hartley⁴ says, “By the mechanism of human actions I mean, that each action results from the previous circumstances of body and mind, in the same manner, and with the same certainty, as other effects do from their mechanical causes.” This, however, he allows to be consistent with each 246 man’s having a power “of deliberating, suspending, choosing, &c., or of resisting the motives⁵ of sensuality, ambition, resentment, &c.” But saying, that certain motives will produce cer-

¹ Psalm xxix.

² Powell, Discourse xiii. or p. 216. Enthusiasm was treated Book III. chap.

xv. sect. 11.

⁴ On Man, vol. i. p. 500.

⁵ Hartley, vol. i. p. 501.

³ Sect. 19.

III. tain volitions, seems something like Sir Isaac Newton's second law of motion, the change of motion is proportional to the moving force impressed; to which, objection has been rightly⁶ made, as being an *identical* proposition; because the force can only be known *à posteriori*, by the change of motion. Waving formal definition, it is easy to conceive the mind *acted upon*, without considering it as acting; the *will* as *passive*, without thinking of its activity. *Virtue* is not excluded by this way of viewing the mind; for that consists in calling up good motives, so as to overpower the bad ones; and it implies a *character*, which is something fixed. *Rewards* and punishments move the mind, and are proposed on purpose that they may do so; *conscience* acts as both reward and punishment; exhortations, and all the parts of education, move the will, and occasion good volitions. The will itself must be supposed to exist, because it is constantly impelled; and therefore a necessary action is still a voluntary one. If any one evaded his duty on pretence that he was a machine, he must be punishable for his inconsistency; as he would not cease, on that pretence, to secure his property and provide his sustenance; and his very evasion would bring on evil, which would act as a motive to reformation. Our familiar use of the word *motives* shews that we really do admit all this, whether we recognize it in systematic form or not.

247 Let not any one think that *I* am particularly a favourer of the hypothesis of necessity. I am, in truth, for *both* freedom and necessity, according to the explanation before given⁷; from which, I think, it appears, that they do not interfere with each other; and may and do exist together. Both hypotheses seem capable of admitting virtue and moral discipline. The phenomena of *freedom*, or the train of thoughts arising in that system⁸, arise from the *agent's* feeling himself free to choose: the phenomena, or train of thoughts in the system of *necessity*, arise from the *spectator's* observing how a man chooses, and according to what rules; and from expecting, on a footing of experience and probability, that the same causes will produce the same effects. From whence it follows, that the *language* of freedom is that which the *agent* naturally uses—the language of *necessity* that which most naturally occurs to the *spectator*. It seems as if it should be remarked, that there is

⁶ Dr. Powell's MS. Lectures.

⁷ Introduction to Part II. sect. 5.

⁸ Book III. chap. xv. sect. 2.

a possibility of some kind of deception in that internal feeling **III.** of liberty which we never dispute. *Brutes* do not *kill themselves*; yet I should think it highly probable that the lion, could he speak, would tell us he *could* tear and kill himself as well as he can his prey—only he *will* not: the necessitarian says, he *cannot*, because he has no *motive*. In like manner, when a *hen* gathereth her chickens under her wings, she would say she *chooses* to do so, for their good; the necessitarian would say, that *instinct compels* her to gather them, or *causes* her choice, and that only just till the brood can take care of itself. There is also to be remarked a considerable degree of *regularity* in the choice made by *men*: else indeed what could 248 be depended upon? what order, government, union, could be maintained? This regularity is much less perceived by the *agent* than by the spectator; therefore, when we speak of the part of each individual, we speak with him the language of freedom: when we speak of men *collectively*, and of disposing or *governing* them, we speak with the spectator the language of necessity. But, if a man would be perfectly free from difficulty, he must learn to pass from one conception and language to the other, with ease and readiness. This will be confirmed if we consider, as accurately as possible, what it is that we really do know of *a volition*. I should think, nothing more than this: several objects of choice offer themselves; each displays its peculiar advantages; we choose one, or one *is* chosen; for our ideas are so faint, that we judge chiefly from the *effect*. There *must* be *choice*; and the *will* must be *influenced*; the volition may be seen in either light. When we *describe* it, or its effect, in *words*, we do it by *comparison*: we compare it to weighing, commanding, impelling, or something which happens in common life. On the whole, disputes on the subject of liberty and necessity, however numerous they may have been, may be pronounced vain and idle; as much so as if you were placed within a *spherical surface*, and I without it, and we were to enter into abstruse mathematical arguments on the question, whether the surface between us was *concave* or *convex*: in my situation it is convex, in yours it is concave.

We may therefore close the present objection with observing, that, though the scriptural doctrine of grace did favour the scheme of necessity, it need occasion no aversion to the Scriptures in any man of a philosophical mind, on that account; but that the truth is, the doctrine of grace is only a small 249

III. *part* of what is contained in the Scriptures ; the language of the whole, taken together, is always the language of *nature*, and therefore varies with occasions and views of things.

The philosopher should remember, that *heathens* have referred even virtues to divine agency ; as we shewed in the second section of this Article.

50. Having then finished our proof, direct and indirect, we come to that matter which was *reserved*—the referring of *evil* to the agency of the Supreme Being. Evil may be ascribed to God as the matter of his *decrees*, or as infused into the *mind*. Decrees belong to the seventeenth Article : all influence on the mind to the present.

The first thing to be mentioned is, God's giving men over to a *reprobate mind*. We have several passages in which something occurs to this purpose. Rom. i. 24, 26, 28, may be reckoned the principal ; but others may be seen Matt. vii. 6 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 38 ; 2 Tim. iii. 13 ; Rev. xxii. 11. It may be permitted to add Ecclesiasticus iv. 19.

Whatever fault there may be in these texts, it is not to be charged upon *Christianity* ; because the Author of *Nature* gives men over to a reprobate mind, and all we want to prove is, that Christianity comes from the Author of Nature. The more a man indulges any appetite the stronger it grows ; artificial or unnatural cravings perpetually gather strength, till recovery from vice becomes *desperate*.

In this case a man is commonly called an *abandoned sinner*. To defend this rule of God's government, is the business of natural religion. But we may observe, by the way, that, as
250 *man* gives up attending, when he has lost all probability of success, it cannot seem unnatural to him that God should do the same. In man indeed this sometimes happens, because the quantity of his attention is limited ; but that is not always the case. At least, we may conceive that sort of punishment will probably be effectual on man which falls in with his received notions and practices. And there can be no impropriety in punishing drunkenness by thirst, or gluttony by immoderate cravings¹ ; nay, it must tend to increase men's caution about the beginnings of all illicit indulgences, and therefore to keep the mind in a state of purity. Then, I do not imagine that any man is ever totally irrecoverable from vice ; only that it is morally impossible, not to be expected,

¹ This is called by Turretin, making a sin the punishment of a sin.

that some should recover. Nor is the Scripture to be so III. understood as if God ever gave men over in any other sense but as it may be said, that God gave a drunken man over to sottishness, or a prodigal to profusion. Men get into bad habits in the common way; and then these habits, considered as a part of God's government, are properly *referred* to God, as in some sense their *cause*. So the Gentiles got into habits of vice, natural and unnatural:—when that became a *past event*, it might, when set in a proper point of view, be referred to the Supreme Being¹.

Some persons seem to have a notion, in some way of *theory*, that God's *grace abandons* some wicked men; and that, without grace, they cannot possibly recover. But this I should 251 call unwarrantable speculation. It is as if there were some act of God *previous* to the worst degree of wickedness, which we could distinctly ascertain, and which put it out of man's power to *avoid* that wickedness; but there is no such thing. Till men confine themselves to referring *past* events to the divine agency, they will ever get wrong. Suppose the *fact*, that a man was *become* thoroughly wicked, and then there would be no impropriety in describing his *state* as one in want of the grace of God; but, in that case, piety would attend as much to the *recovery* as to the *fall*. Again, suppose the *fact*, that a man has made a strong *effort* to rouse himself from his spiritual stupidity; let him be said to have been *awakened* by the grace of God; it is right, pious, and not untrue; but to think a man out of the *possibility* of reformation², because his *actual* profligacy may be ascribed, indistinctly, to his being deserted by the divine grace, is to pervert and mistake the language of Scripture, and to forget the manner in which it was originally introduced and applied.

Not but that we might refer unfavourable events, though arising from faults or vices, to God, in certain *respects*, when it would excite good *sentiments*; for there is no evil of any kind which is *out* of the reach of God's government—none which he does not behold as within the system of things which he has appointed; none therefore which may not be referred to him, when viewed in that light. But what is evil in some

¹ Psalm lxxxvi. 12, 13: "But my people would not hear my voice, and Israel would not obey me; so I gave them up unto their own hearts' lusts, and let them

follow their own imaginations."

² Sect. 18, from Racovian Catechism. Also end of sect. 20.

III. respects, can generally be seen to be good in other respects. If a robber is about to kill me, and a friend of mine, in my
 252 defence, kills him, I may thank God for the *event*; but not as an act of homicide, only as a deliverance. If a *tyrant* acts as a scourge³ in the hand of God, his tyranny may, on some occasions, be mentioned as owing to God; not as tyranny, but as punishment. In almost any evil a reference may be made to God, when the purpose is to make it felt that the most profligate cannot throw off God's government; that, lawless as they may feel, though they may do themselves and others harm within certain bounds, yet that they are limited in doing mischief; and that God is able to turn even their wickedness to the forwarding of his grand inscrutable designs in the government of the universe.

In short, the *good* arising out of evil is generally the thing referred to God, when our imperfect language seems to refer to him the evil at large.

Something has been already said⁴ of the phraseology of the *Jews*. We may add, that they seem to have referred more events to the agency of *Spirits* than we do now. As most men have a general belief of the existence of intelligent beings between man and the Supreme Being (nothing can be more narrow-minded and unphilosophical than to deny their existence), and yet as we know nothing particular of their agency, it is no wonder that men have run into very different degrees of ascribing events to it. At the revival of learning, about the time of the Reformation, many more references were made to
 253 *Satan* than are at present⁵. If our form of indicting criminals were now new, we should not find it said that each committed his crime at the *instigation* of the *devil*. I only mean to suggest, that this matter of referring events to spirits is, in a great measure, *arbitrary*; and therefore the *Jews*

³ "His scourge the tyrant."—POPE.

⁴ Sect. 3, and 20. Also end of Introduction. to Part II.

⁵ The following paragraph appeared in a newspaper in 1791: it may tend to illustrate our present remark. 'The damage, considerable as it is, which has been done to the church at Rainham, in Kent, sinks to nothing when compared with what happened at the church of St. Julian's, in Shrewsbury, about the year 1500, when, as their own Doomsday Book

stateth, "the divelle dyd put his clawe upponne the clapper of the great bell, and from his clawe there yssued a flame of fyre, which dydde melte yverie bell in the church, threwe the spyer upponne the grounde, and meltydde moche of the brasse worke candyl styks,—because an holie and righteous monke hadde in a sermonne spoken tauntinlie offe his power and auctoritte upponne earthe!"—Thus did our pious and philosophic ancestors solve an *electric cloud*.'

might refer many events so, and our Saviour might comply III. with the custom. I should think this enough to account for several things in Scripture, and particularly for the expression a *spirit of slumber*¹, or stupidity.

God is sometimes said to *blind* men, as to their understanding, and to *harden* them, as to their heart². But this, surely, does not imply any *act* of the Deity, which should be allowed by man *before* the blindness or hardness is acknowledged as a *past event*. Eyen Calvin³ observes, “Nec tamen sequitur reprobos, propterea quòd indurantur a Deo, a seipsis *non* indurari.” So far from it, that it is often an *indifferent* matter which mode of expression is made use of, *God’s hardening* a man, or his *hardening himself*—only *one fact* would be described, though both expressions were used: namely, a man’s²⁵⁴ doing some act of wickedness, which may be ascribed, after it is committed, to human agency or divine, as you wish to excite an abhorrence of the *fault*, or *gratitude* to God for bringing incidental good out of that fault. *Pharaoh* was perverse and tyrannical, in not suffering the Israelites to depart out of his dominions. If you speak of this as a *fault*, Pharaoh hardened *his own heart*; if as a part of *divine government*, to which the Jews ought to be gratefully attentive, you say *God hardened* his heart; that is, by granting him respite. Both forms are used in Scripture⁴; but neither implies that Pharaoh’s obstinacy did not arise as that of obstinate men commonly does⁵. There are about four passages in which it is said God *will* harden: but *no new fact* is implied; nor is any fact to be conceived, but “he *shall follow*”⁶—“*they shall follow*.” In like manner, the *numbering* of the people is, in one place⁷, ascribed to *God*, in his anger; and in another

¹ Rom. xi. 8, from Isai. xxix. 10. I suppose πνεῦμα means a *person* here. The Holy Spirit has several names in a similar form. See Parkhurst.

² Πωρός signifies *blind*, also an *hard substance*: hence πωρώω may be translated to blind or to harden. See margin of Rom. xi. 8, and Hesychius. But in John xii. 40, we have τετύφλωκεν for ὀφθαλμοῦς—πεπώρωκεν for καρδίαν.

³ Opuscula, 12mo, p. 314.

⁴ Exod. viii. 32; ix. 7, 12, 34, 35. The forms seem to be used almost *indifferently*; compare ix. 16, with 17. Yet we have no authority for saying, ‘God

hardened *my heart*’—that would promote *sin*. It seems to me that the phrase had grown so *familiar*, that it got to be tossed about, and used in any *tenses*. St. Paul uses it, but to *Jews*; and maintaining the sovereignty of God, against the impertinent claims of Jews, to *election*, &c. We *modern Christians* have no business to use it.

⁵ Quos Deus vult perdere priùs demeritat. Did God harden the heart of Pharaoh more than he hardened the hearts of Vespasian and Titus?

⁶ Exod. xiv. 4, 17.

⁷ 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

III. to *Satan*: the first belongs to the subject of God's *government*, as the context shews, (though the marginal reading is, "Satan"); the last to the subject of David's blameable *distrust*. The difference has no relation to the *head*, but only to the *heart*; that is, the different modes of expression do not
 255 give different *information*, but only excite different *feelings*. If God is spoken of as suggesting a punishable act, it is as *punishment*, which, as a part of good government, demands our devout admiration; if Satan suggests a punishable act, it is as *sin*, which should excite our abhorrence.

51. Having finished what was *reserved*, we come to our *application*—consisting of the same parts as in the preceding Articles.

We are first to see how near an Article of *natural religion* will approach to that before us; supposing us to take care that we say nothing unauthorised. One who was not a Christian might profess as follows, after what was professed under the preceding Article:—

'The condition of man, as described under the preceding Article, is such as would make it *extremely difficult* for men even of the more virtuous sort to enter into the *plan*^s or *association* there proposed, for amending and improving our moral principles; it is a thing, indeed, to be deemed visionary, and beyond rational expectation. If it should be accomplished in any instance, he who finds himself in so happy a state would have reason to think it a great *blessing*, and to *thank* Providence for having conducted him into so desirable a situation. His *virtues* might be expected to flourish there, and his *disposition* to improve continually. He must, however, be careful to see even these improvements of *conduct* and *principle* in^e a *right light*. He must not grow *proud* of them; but still look up to Heaven with a *grateful* heart, and continually *ascribe*, with *warm feelings* rather than with *precise ideas*, all his improvements, both of disposition and conduct, to the gracious
 256 influence of him, who, being the fountain of light, illuminates the human mind⁹ with the rays of his divine wisdom; and, being a God of purity, gives to man, when well disposed, a taste and relish for whatsoever things are pure.'

52. Turn we now from the heathen to the *Christian*. In what sense can he give a solemn *assent* to the tenth Article of our Church? In the following:—

^s Art. ix. sect. 41.

⁹ Leland's View, vol. 1. p. 24, 4th edit. referred to in sect. 2.

‘The condition of man, as described under the preceding III. Article, is such, that even men of distinguished characters for probity and virtue cannot be expected to *convert themselves* to so pure and perfect a religion as Christianity. This is not said in order to prevent their *attempting* it: no, it is only the suggestion of experience and *probability*. Let them exert themselves as much as possible; let them strain every nerve to escape from the slavery of sin: but, if they succeed, the Scripture shews, in many places, that they ought to *thank* God, and give him the glory of their conversion. In the community of Christians their conduct may become more *acceptable* to God; but even here, when they do any thing which is good, it appears from Scripture that they are to *thank* God, not only for the *action*, as far as it was really good, but also for the *disposition* which led to it.’

53. *Mutual concessions* may be mentioned; but so much of what has been said has been calculated to settle controversy, that they need not be dwelt upon.

On our part, some good might perhaps be done by altering the *form* of our Article, so that the doctrine contained in it should not seem to make our endeavours useless, till we knew that we had sufficient assistance. The Article would pretend*²⁵⁵ less to *theory*, if the *conversion* and other *effects* were mentioned *first*; with some words of Scripture about our refusing evil and *choosing* good, and something promoting *diligence*; and if then we were directed to look up to the divine assistance as a *cause*—as a cause of something seen and experienced. And it might suit some men better, without omitting any essential doctrine, if the reference to our first parent was made faint¹ and indefinite.

As to the part of *our adversaries*, it really seems as if every Christian might be expected to assent to our Article, when modified in the manner which has been described²; because no *heathen* would refuse to assent to any parts but those which belong to Christianity *at large*, or to Christians as Christians. The referring should indeed be some way shewn to require no precise ideas. But, if our Christian brethren,

¹ ‘Whenever we do, or design, anything good, we should give God the glory; especially because of our hereditary depravity.’—Would this express every thing essential in our tenth Article?

² Dr. Powell shews, that disputants have differed less than they appeared to do, on our present subject.—Discourses, p. 299.

III. with whom we wish to coalesce, were to scruple assenting, they might, in religious worship, allow us to use devout forms in speaking of God as of him “from whom all holy *desires*, all good *counsels*, and all just *works* do proceed;” and might agree to some extensive forms of doctrine, in which it should be declared, that, as the doctrine of *grace* ought not to prevent men’s *choosing* and *endeavouring*, according to the best of their abilities; so neither ought the doctrine of *free-will* to prevent men from being *humble*, and giving God the glory on every occasion.

*256 54. *Improvements* will chiefly consist in seeing whether these things are so³: whether in natural religion, or metaphysics, circumstances confirm what we have said of *liberty* and *necessity*: whether texts of *Scripture* can be *classed*, as we have imagined, into language of the *agent*, and language of the *spectator*: whether, and how frequently, heathen authors ascribe virtue to the Deity.

For a *conclusion*, I would adopt the conclusion of Dr. Jortin’s first Dissertation⁴; as from that he seems to have had the same feelings with myself, or some of the same, though he does not appear to have analyzed his feelings so as to establish regular *principles*, upon which his notions could be supported.

257

ARTICLE XI.

OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

WE are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith; and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

1. In passing from the tenth Article to the eleventh, we pass from the *closet* to the *tribunal*—from the *principles* of action of each individual, to his *trial* at the judgment-seat of Christ.

³ Acts xvii. 11.

⁴ “Thus do the doctrine of divine grace and the doctrine of free-will, or human liberty, unite and conspire, in a friendly manner, to our everlasting good.

The first is adapted to excite in us gratitude, faith, and humility; the second, to awaken our caution, and quicken our diligence.”

We begin, as usual, with *history*.

III.

The notions of the *Jews* are those of the greatest importance to us; because it was in arguing concerning them that the Apostles laid down all those positions on which the various doctrines concerning Justification have been founded. Two things seem most worthy of notice: their notions of their *hereditary* privileges, and of the sanctity of *character* resulting from a strict conformity to their ceremonial laws.

They persuaded themselves that God could not hate or condemn the children, when he had shewn such favour to the fathers. This notion is expressed with some foolish extravagance, as may be seen in several authors¹. 258

They had a notion of a *perfect character*, formed by a constant attention to niceties of the law:—not only, I suppose, the written law, but the oral, or traditional. This was, probably, a character which, in every instance, admitted of faults, or moral defects; but it was one to which the Jews looked up with an habitual reverence and admiration; insomuch that whoever approached to it had his moral foibles overlooked. A person of this character had the title of צַדִּיק; or of Chasidim, from חַסִּידָה benignus, pius; the word used in Proverbs² for the holy man.

2. I do not give any history of *heathens*, in respect of this Article; only I may mention, that Bp. Sherlock³ makes *faith* to be the principle of *natural* religion; that is, reliance on God's assurances of future invisible good. It is not likely that heathens should have occasion to speak much about any opposition between external actions and internal religious principles.

3. We may come then to Christians. At first it is probable that Christians went on in simplicity and godly sincerity, doing their duty, and looking up to God and Jesus Christ for their reward: so that any mention of faith and works in the primitive writers would be accidental; and it would be practical rather than speculative. I see there is a passage in the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus, which is to our purpose. Archbishop Wake translates it thus: "And *we* also" (compared with the sons of Abraham) "being called by the same

¹ See Nicholls on the Art., and Michaelis's Introd. Lect. sect. 129, 130, quarto.

² Prov. xi. 17, "the merciful man."

³ Discourse, vol. i. Disc. xiv. on Heb. iii. 12, p. 369; also vol. iv. Disc. ii. p. 77, &c.

III. will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by *ourselves*, neither by 259 our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or the *works* which we have done in the holiness of our hearts; but by that *faith* by which God Almighty has justified all men from the beginning⁴." Polycarp mentions, in an artless manner, some who are gone to heaven, "in faith and righteousness⁵." It seems needless to search for more instances. Dr. Nicholls produces two good passages, one from Basil, the other from Macarius; but they were considerably later. It seems as if Christian virtue had at first been plain, simple, and unaffected; but afterwards more ostentatious: when it became so, there was more need of lowering the value of works, and insisting on the self-denying pretensions to reward founded on the merits of Christ.

4. The *fifth century* we have found very busy about original sin and grace; but it was not equally so about *faith* and good *works*. The writers of that age opposed divine to human agency; but did not contend much about the different parts of human agency, when contrasted with each other. Not but we frequently meet with the terms, faith, works, justification; but what is said of them soon slides into something about grace or predestination. Thus Augustin says, "non opera, sed fides inchoat meritum," &c.; but then he is speaking of those "quos *elegit* Deus." (De Predest. Sanct. cap. 3. ed. Ben.) *Justifying grace* was more the topic than justifying *faith*; that is, justifying faith considered as the gift of God. (Eph. ii. 8.) The eleventh canon of the sixth session of the Council of Trent may give some idea of what I mean: "Si quis dixerit, 260 homines *justificari* vel solâ imputatione justitiæ Christi, vel solâ peccatorum remissione, exclusâ *gratiâ*, et caritate, quæ in *cordibus* eorum per spiritum sanctum diffundatur, atque in illis *inhæreat*; aut etiam *gratiam*, qua justificamur, esse tantum *favorem*⁶ Dei; anathema sit." Augustin seems⁷, from Rom. viii. 30, to have settled in his mind, that, as *vocation* preceded *justification*, and vocation was a part of divine agency, so must justification be also; which, with St. Paul's other expressions in the same passage, would make him refer the whole to predestination.

⁴ Sect. 32, Wake.

⁵ Sect. 9, Wake.

⁶ Does not this seem the opposite to Dr. John Taylor's idea of the sense of

χάρις? Art. x. sect. 18.

⁷ On the 5th Psalm; and to Simplicianus 1st Book and 2d question, quoted by Nicholls.

In his book *de Spiritu et literá*, he enters upon a formal III. discussion of the *law of works* as opposed to the *law of faith*; but, at bottom, it is all a proof of the necessity of grace. His book *de fide et operibus* seems written in order to obviate some errors *actually* prevailing, about *baptism* being sufficient, though those who were converted and baptized continued to lead wicked lives.

And what Vossius mentions in his Pelagian history, about faith, chiefly relates to the subject of perseverance; and therefore belongs to the sixteenth Article.

5. The *schoolmen* have their niceties on our present subject, as well as on others. A few specimens may be seen in Nicholls; but the part, which will be most interesting, is that which shews, that, before the Reformation, the Romanists were more moderate about the doctrine of good works than at the Reformation. Indeed, so they have also been since.

6. But the principal era since the complete publication of Christianity, in the history of the doctrine of our eleventh 261 Article, is that of the *Reformation*. *Good works* had then got to imply, particularly, founding monasteries, giving or bequeathing money for masses, prayers for the dead¹, or for shrines, &c. That is, in short, good works had got to signify commutations for sins, and supports of superstition. These works must be depreciated, or reformation could not be effected. And what so likely, in the heat of dispute, as that the Reformers should say very strong things against the strict *merit* of any kind of good works; and should extol, in an unqualified manner, the necessity of founding all pretensions to reward on the merits of Christ? Some of the Reformers are thought to have gone too far in this way; and their adversaries probably represented them as going farther than they really went. Du Pin², in his compendious History, gives this account of Martin Luther: "Upon this principle, that man is justified by faith alone, Luther advanced forty propositions more on the 26th of April; wherein he carried the matter so far, that he took the boldness to maintain, not only that good works are not necessary for salvation, but that, how good soever they might appear, they were mortal sins; that man has no liberty; that all works done without grace are sinful; that invincible ignorance is not excusable; and that the involuntary motions of

¹ Our last Homily (or part) on *Good Works*, throws contempt on these, and ends with shewing what are really good works.

² Vol. iv. p. 16.

III. concupiscence are sins³." On this matter I feel myself most
 262 inclined to observe, that the Reformed have departed so much
 from the rigour of their doctrine about faith, and the Roman-
 ists from theirs about good works, that there seems now very
 little difference⁴ between them. Happy were it if the same
 could be said with regard to all other subjects! But, with a
 view to our Article, we⁵ must attend more to opinions held at
 the time of the Reformation, than to those held at this time.

7. I know not that we can see the notions of the *Roman-
 ists*, at the time of the Reformation, better any where than in
 the acts of the Council of Trent. Some of the set of canons
 before referred to⁵ belong to our present Article. The 9th
 and 12th canons are most immediately our concern. They are
 so cautiously drawn, and with such limitations, that it seems
 hazardous to dispute about them. In the former, will is opposed
 to understanding; in the latter, the word *qua* is ambiguous⁶.
 However, they would be useful to the Romanists in *seeming*,
 at least, to oppose the reforming *innovators*.

263 8. The Church of *England*, at the time of the Reforma-
 tion, was, as usual, sober, candid, and *moderate*. The *Neces-
 sary Doctrine* gives much the same idea of justification with
 our Article; and that the notions it contains are, on our pre-
 sent subject, to be accounted *reformed*, appears by what is said
 in the part relating to good workes, against "munkes, friars,
 nunnes, and suche other." The part relating to *justification*,
 as we may judge particularly by the conclusion of it, seems to
 have been composed with the same general design, as that con-
 cerning *free-will*; namely, to *retain both* the doctrines, which
 are opposed to each other, without attempting a formal recon-

³ One may see here the ground-work
 of some of our Articles, though the ex-
 pressions are those of an adversary. Art.
 xiii. puts heathen virtues on the footing
 of sins. Man's having no liberty, or his
 will requiring divine assistance to make
 him choose rightly, comes into the tenth
 Article. And the sinful nature of vicious
 sentiments, or *concupiscence*, into the
 ninth. That a man may suffer by not
 being a Christian (including in the word
 suffering, loss of happiness), though he
 has no opportunity of becoming one, Dr.
 Balguy forcibly maintains. Perhaps if
 Luther said, that good works are not
 necessary for salvation, he might take

good works in the technical sense just
 now mentioned, for commutations for
 sins, and supports of superstition.

⁴ Burnet, p. 162, 8vo. Principles and
 Practices, p. 75. In which last work,
 p. 73, mention is made of *Sacramental
 Justification*; for which see afterwards,
 Art. xxv. sect. 2, latter end.

⁵ Art. x. sect. 13.

⁶ My idea is, that the Romanists, at
 the time of the Reformation, held that
 works *are* meritorious; but that they
 were *made* so by the merits of Christ.
 Is the difference important? or is the
 distinction one which can be made by
 the human understanding?

ciliation between them. Which agrees with what a very III. sensible writer¹ mentions as the design of the Homily referred to in our Article. It “gives” says he, “no occasion to a reader, who considers the whole with attention, either to magnify too highly the efficacy of faith, or depreciate too much the necessity of good works.”

Our *Reformatio Legum* says, “Nec illi sunt audiendi quorum impietas salutarem et in sacris scripturis fundatam justificationis nostræ doctrinam oppugnant, in qua tenendum est, non operum momentis, justitiam hominum collocari.”

9. The Calvinists and Arminians have held such opinions on our present subject as might be expected. But it did not enter into the famous *five* articles or points. The Arminians are said not to have been quite uniform and ingenuous with regard to justification by faith².

10. *Antinomians* have been of different ages and coun- 264 tries; and we have³ already had occasion to speak of them more than once. Justification by faith is one doctrine by which they are most distinguished. Luther has been called an Antinomian, though he writes against them. They relied so on faith, as to undervalue morality. Their doctrines, at least, have had that appearance; and it has been said, that their teachers have been thought to discharge the whole of their duty, if they inculcated the necessity of *faith*, and displayed the benefits of the New Covenant. The manner in which they express themselves may be seen in a review of Dr. *Crispe's* Sermons by Geree: the Epistle to the Reader will be sufficient⁴. Some of those who have been called *Methodists* have ascribed great efficacy to faith⁵. But we shall meet with Antinomians again under some of the subsequent Articles.

11. “The *Anabaptists*⁶ revived the Pelagian heresy, by preaching up the natural powers of free-will; and thence ran into another dangerous extreme of confidence in their own sufficiency, teaching that they might deserve heaven by their own righteousness.”

¹ Supposed to be Green, Bishop of Lincoln. Principles, &c. p. 69. pp. 66—73, deserves well to be read: might very well be read at Lecture.

² Mosheim, Index, Arminians.

³ Art. vii. sect. 3; and Art. x. sect. 12.

⁴ From this Epistle to the Reader, it appears, that some high Antinomians re-

quired *nothing* on the part of man—not even *Faith*. The work here mentioned being now no longer famous, I may as well say that it is in Sidney College Library, T—5—38.

⁵ Principles, &c. p. 57.

⁶ Ridley's Life, p. 344.

III. 12. Our doctrine may be traced from the Reformation down to the present century. The *Puritans* always wished to depart farther from the Church of Rome than the generality did; and one doctrine, in which they thought this desirable, was *justification* by faith. They were constantly labouring to answer this end; and in the time of Charles I. they got into power. They were not, however, able to get their notions kindly received by our nation at large. They had thrown every thing into confusion; their manners were displeasing; and their doctrine itself disgusted plain reasonable people. The Restoration came on: nothing was more natural than running into the opposite extreme: for some ascribed even the political confusions, previous to the Restoration, to the great stress laid on the doctrine of justification by faith⁷; on the idea, that it lessened men's esteem for virtue, and made them easily give up any duty, of the man or the citizen, when they were earnest in any pursuit where such duty stood in their way.

Nevertheless, though the Restoration was in 1660, men did not fairly get into the opposite extreme until the beginning of the 18th century. The stiff zeal of the sectaries was first softened by those eminent men who were called *Latitudinarian Divines*⁸, from shewing the contending parties that they were narrow-minded, and quarrelled more about words than sense. These men met with unmerited abuse, as men are very apt to do who think for themselves, and adhere to no large party. Ere long, faith came to be refined away into nothing; nay, at length, an attempt was made to prove the perfect coincidence between Christianity and *reason*, by shewing, that our religion was only a *republication* of the law of nature. This attempt was made by a clergyman⁹, an eminent orthodox divine, but gave occasion to Dr. Tindal's celebrated Deistical book; entitled, "*Christianity as old as the Creation, or the Gospel a republication of the Law of Nature*"¹⁰.

13. I will close this history with mention of the *Socinians*. In the *Racovian Catechism* there is a chapter on *Faith*, and another on *Justification*. In that on faith there is a division of faith into two kinds, *saving*, and *not saving*. The latter means mere *assent* or belief of truth; the former includes

⁷ See Bp. Warburton on the Holy Spirit, p. 317, 12mo. | 321, 12mo.

⁹ Warburton on Grace, p. 319.

⁸ Hales, Cudworth, Baxter, &c. This taken from Warburton on Grace, pp. 316,

¹⁰ See an account of it in Leland's View, vol. I.

*obedience*¹. In the chapter on *justification*, we have these III. words, “Per fidem in Christum consequimur justificationem;” and the definition of justification seems to give the same idea with our Article. The rest relates to the justification of those who lived before our Saviour. The *modern* Socinians differ much from us with regard to what is called the doctrine of *atonement*, which is intimately connected with our present doctrine, or may be called a part of it; but, as we propose making that the subject of an *Appendix*, we may defer making any historical remarks upon it for the present.

14. After the history comes the *explanation*. And first, we must take notice of the *title*, “*Of the Justification of Man.*” The sense in which *justification* is taken here, seems sufficiently ascertained by the first words of the Article, “*we are accounted righteous:*” justification is being accounted righteous; but it would be better to get a more enlarged idea of a word so much used in Scripture. The word admits of several different senses; all that we have to do is to see how they are *connected*. What Mr. Hume says of association of ideas in general, seems true of connection of the different senses of the same word in particular; they are connected by *resemblance*, *contiguity*, and *causation*. There may be some doubt which sense is the primitive; but, that once ascertained, the rest may be traced². The primitive sense of the word *δικαιοσύνη* seems to be *goodness*, or *benignity of temper*; and this being the principal ingredient in *virtue*, when spoken of in the complex, or at large, *δικαιοσύνη* takes the sense (as *goodness* does) of *virtue*, in the complex; or, according to the language of our Translation, of *righteousness*; which seems to mean, *ideal perfection* in virtue in general—as *δίκαιος* seems to mean the *ideal model* of a virtuous man. A word which signifies a disposition may easily come to signify an *instance* of that disposition: we speak of *kindness* as in the mind, and as an actual favour; this is a sort of *causation*. But, under the Mosaic dispensation, rewards being conferred immediately, whoever received a favour from God must be conceived in the light of one *accounted worthy* of it, that is, righteous;—hence *δικαίωω* might signify, to confer a *favour* upon, or to account righteous; and *δικαίωσις* and *δικαιοσύνη* might denote either *favour-*

¹ This is like the beginning of our *Homily on Faith*, 2d Part.

² We traced the senses of the word *Spirit* under the fifth Article.

III. *ing*, or *righteousness*, or *justification*³. Thus *Rahab* was said to be justified, when she was delivered from the calamities of a siege; *David* was justified⁴, when he was delivered from his persecutors. *Man* is justified, either when delivered from the *slavery* of *sin*, and put in a *way* of obtaining happiness under the Christian religion—which is sometimes called being
268 *saved*⁵—or when, at last, his *salvation* is fixed for *eternity*. As these two instances of the justification of mankind have been sometimes confounded, and the confusion has occasioned dispute, divines, and our Church⁶, have called the admission into Christianity our *first* justification, and our salvation after death our *final* justification.

The word *δικαιοσύνη*, the Greek for *justification*, occurs more frequently than the English reader is aware of, it is so often translated *righteousness*. Jer. xxiii. 6, “The Lord our righteousness,” might be expressed, the Lord our *justification*; but it seems often a *doubt* which word⁷ should be used.

But, though there may be occasions on which it is useful to distinguish between a *first* and a *final* justification, yet there may be others on which the distinction may be *neglected*; as, I think, it may in the *title* of our Article; so that justification may be considered as being accounted righteous on *any* occasion whatsoever, or without reference to particular occasions. And in this general view it seems to retain its *forensic* sense.

Justified is opposed to *condemned*, Prov. xvii. 15; Matt. xii. 37; Rom. viii. 33. Which agrees with what has been said: being condemned is being accounted unrighteous.

15. “*We are accounted righteous before God.*” This is not the same as saying, we *are* righteous. If, indeed, we are *made* righteous by the righteousness of Christ, we may, or
269 must, be *accounted* righteous; but it may not be certain, conversely, that, if we are *accounted* righteous, we must be *made* so. The doctrine, that the merits of Christ become

³ See Taylor on Romans; Key, Chap. xvi.—Also Principles and Practices, &c. p. 44, about *Rahab* in particular.

⁴ In David's case, *δικαιοσύνη* is generally, or always, translated *righteousness*.

⁵ Locke on Ephes. ii. 8.

⁶ See Necessary Doctrine, &c. Article of Justification. Where there is mention

of *increasing* our justification, and of being *restored* to it. Taylor (on Romans) uses *first* and *final*.

⁷ See Taylor's Paraphrase on Rom. iii. and other parts of his work. In *Latin*, we should be aware that the word *justitia* varies its senses, so as to resemble, in some measure, those of *δικαιοσύνη*.

actually *our* merits, or *his* righteousness *our* righteousness, is III. what Mr. *Ludlam* denies, in his Essay on Justification, against Mr. *Hervey* and others. *Imputed* righteousness¹ is opposed to *inherent*; but righteousness may be *imputed*, though at last we are only *accounted* righteous; but then it is not a personal quality². "*Righteous*" means perfect in our obedience³.

16. "*Only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*"—We must remember the word "*only*," when we come to, "*justified by faith only*;" as we cannot be justified by *two* things, and by *each* of them *only*. "*For the merit*," in Latin, *propter*. "*The merit of Christ*:" this is more general than sacrifice, death, satisfaction, or atonement:—a person who *merits* does more than *satisfy*. However, the death and sacrifice of Christ are expressed in the second and thirty-first Articles.

17. "*By Faith.*"—What do we mean by *faith*? Reliance on the promises and engagements of another; but sometimes *fides*⁴ means *fidelity*, which is a principle of our observing our *own* promises and engagements. And why may not faith, when any one enters into an agreement, or covenant, imply *both* these? both *confidence* in others, and *honesty* in ourselves? It is with a disposition compounded of these that every man of honour enters into every engagement; and that is what I 270 should call the *right disposition* for any agreement. I consider *faith* as most usually, and most properly, understood in this sense: the *disposition* of an honest man entering into any contract, or other business.

"*By Faith*"—in Latin, "*per fidem*," and afterwards, "*solâ fide.*" We must particularly observe, that it is not "*propter fidem*;" but it was "*propter meritum Domini, &c.*" because this shews that the two things opposed are, the *merit* of Christ, and our good *works*. *We are* justified on *account* of the former; we are *not* justified on account of the latter: therefore *faith* has nothing to do in the opposition. To say, we are justified *by faith, and not by works*, is to say what the Article does not warrant. Why then, it may be asked, is any mention

¹ Taylor's Key, chap. xvi.

² Of this a farther account will be given in the Appendix to this Article, sect. 20.

³ Locke's Reasonableness, &c. Works, fol. vol. II. pp. 474, 476, 477; quoted by Jonathan Edwards, Sermons 12mo, p.

80.—See Taylor, p. 120, note; from Theognis.

⁴ Πίστις, in Greek, seems to have the same sense. "Πίστιν ἐπιτιθέναι, fidem dare, jurare." Demosth.—Πίστεισ ποιήσασθαι, "fiduciam promissorum firmare." Xen.

III. of faith introduced? Because man is justified on being admitted into the Christian society, or covenant (to take that instance); and he is not admitted into it as an *inanimate* or as an *irrational* being, but as *man*; and therefore he must have the *disposition* of an human being, in order to his admission—he must have that *fidelity* which every plain man has on entering into *every* society, or on taking upon himself any set of obligations. *God* accounts man righteous for one reason, not for another; this is all the *part of God*; man has no part to act—unless *accepting* be deemed a part. Faith, indeed, is sometimes seen in the light of *virtue*; but, if it was *here*, man would be justified *for* his faith, not *by* it. Our *homily* expresses these things fully and clearly⁵. Mention of *faith* could not be wholly *omitted*, because it is so frequently said in *Scripture* that we are justified by faith.

18. “*And not for our own works or deservings.*”—In
271 the tenth Article *two sorts* of good works were mentioned—*natural* good works, and good works *acceptable* to God, or *Christian virtues*; which sort is meant here? I suppose either; as the mind happens to be attending to the first, or the final justification.

But it appears to me, from the whole Article, as far as we have gone, that, before we can rightly apply the doctrine of this Article, we must be *supposed* to have been in a course of “*well-doing*,” according to the best of our opportunities. The meaning seems to be the same as if it had been said, ‘*though* we exert ourselves as much as any persons in our situation can be expected to do, yet, *after all*, we must be, at our trial, or in the eye of divine *Justice*, considered as righteous, not on *account* of our actions, but on account of the merit of our Lord.’ The words of the Article, taken without this supposition, would mean, that the most wicked man possible is accounted righteous; which is absurd.

If this be true, we may observe, as under the preceding Article⁶, that, in *practice*, we are to set about leading virtuous lives with great earnestness, and on the best principles in our power, just as if all depended on *our own* diligence and discretion: and that it is not till *after* we have pursued our Christian course for some time, that we are either to *look back* on the assistance we have received, or *forward* to the judgment which we are to undergo.

⁵ See book of Homilies, 8vo, pp. 15, 20, 22, 23.

⁶ Art. x. sect. 35.

19. "*Wherefore.*"—This word enables us to compare III. what went before it with what comes after it; and warns us to see there be no inconsistency.

"That we are justified by *Faith only*"—"solâ fide." This 272 expression, from what was just now observed, must mean the same with being justified *for* (*propter*) the merit of Christ. *Faith only* is evidently a *technical* expression, but we have found a way of ascertaining its true signification. In our *homily* the expression is sometimes, "*only faith,*" which seems better, as having a more technical sound; and it is the same in the Article of 1552. In the second part of the Homily on Salvation, it is shewn that such a mode of expression was in use amongst the ancient *Fathers*. And the *meaning*¹ of it is said to be, "freely, *without works,*" according to an expression of St. Paul; and the meaning of, "*without works,*" is declared to be, not that good works are to be *omitted*, but that they are not to be thought the *meritorious* cause of our *justification*.

20. "Is a most *wholesome* Doctrine."—This expression implies that different doctrines were maintained at the time, and that our Church fell in with those who held that men are justified by "*only faith;*" that is, fell in with the *reformed*.

This doctrine is declared *wholesome*, as tending to prevent vain glory, and as generating humility; as inducing men to give themselves up wholly to God², as exciting their devout affections; as making them grateful to God, and kind to all their brethren, the partakers of his protection. The doctrine is not said to be "*certain,*" as in the Article of 1552; yet the former part of our Article affirms its *truth*.

This doctrine is also said to be "*very full of comfort,*" as making us *members* of the Christian religion, and so giving us 273 better *hopes* of the favour of God than we could otherwise have; as shewing us how God makes us "his dear children, brethren unto his only Son our Saviour Christ, and inheritors for ever with him of his eternal kingdom of heaven³."

21. "*As more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.*"—This is a part of our Article which seems to afford us liberty, when it is compared with the Article of 1552. In that, men were required to profess the doctrine of justification, "*in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of Justification.*" So that the whole *Homily* became an *Article*. By the present

¹ P. 19, 8vo, Salvation, 2d part; better p. 22, 8vo, third part.

² Third part on Salvation, end.

³ Homily of Salvation, near the end.

III. form we are only called upon to declare, that the Homily expresses the doctrine more *fully* than the Article; which we might declare, even though we thought that the Homily contained some things which we did not approve.

But one difficulty remains the same, namely, to determine what is meant by "*the Homily of Justification*:" no homily is extant, or ever was, in our Church, bearing that title. Some have thought that the Homily, "Of the *Salvation* of all mankind⁴," in three parts, is the composition meant; or the second and third parts of that homily⁵. *Salvation* is nearly equivalent⁶ to justification. But my idea of *justification*, as a title of declarations of faith, is taken from the canons of the sixth session of the Council of Trent. Under *justification* are included all the doctrines of ten of our Articles, beginning with the ninth. Now, in our first Book of Homilies (and what we
274 want must be in the *first* book, because the Article of 1552 refers to it), after an introductory one, as it were on reading the Scripture, come four on the subjects treated at Trent under the title of Justification—*Human Misery, Salvation, Faith, and Good Works*. These may be called doctrinal, but that which follows about love, or benevolence, or charity, is *practical*; and so seem the rest. The same subjects do not recur. There is a short Preface on Good Works in the second Book, but it is only to introduce a practical discourse on Fasting. My idea therefore is, that the compilers of our Article meant, by "the Homily of Justification," these *four*; which may be called *eleven*, (a long Article!) as the first is in two parts, the rest in three, each. Ridley⁷, in his life of Bishop Ridley, says, that our Church referred to the Homily, lest the short expressions of the Article should occasion their being thought *Lutherans*⁸, in saying we are justified by only faith. He thinks, that "the Homily of Justification" included all that I do, except the Sermon on the Misery of Mankind. He does not give any reason for his opinion in this point; nor does any other writer that I remember⁹.

⁴ Bennet on the Article.

⁵ Principles and Practices, &c. p. 67.

⁶ Taylor on Romans, p. 116.

⁷ Book V. sect. 7.

⁸ Those who professed justification by "only faith," have been called *Solifidians*.

⁹ *Salvation* means so much the same with *Justification*, that I should scarcely dispute with any one who judged the ex-

pression of the Article, "the Homily of Justification," to mean only the Sermon, in three parts, entitled, "Of the Salvation of all Mankind." See the end of the first part on Good Works, where the thief would have *lost his salvation*; which expression might be compared with some in the Necessary Doctrine about losing *justification*.

22. We come now to the *proof*.

III.

The Article before us seems, in reality, to contain but one proposition, '*We are justified by only Faith*;' but the expression "only Faith," or "Faith only," implying a negation of *works*, we might perhaps as well take two propositions, the one *negative*, the other *affirmative*. 275

1. We are *not* accounted righteous before God for our *own works*.

2. We *are* accounted righteous, when at all, for the *merit of Christ*; or, we are justified by *faith*.

The proof of these propositions given *here*, can scarcely be more than a specimen of what is to be found in the Scriptures. It may be *sufficient*, but it cannot well be *full*. A person, to see the full proof, must read the Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians* entire, and that of St. *James*; and must study their *scope* or tendency; and that of several other parts of Scripture. *Taylor's Key* to the Apostolic Writings would be of great use to such an one; we cannot well do more than select a few texts.

23. We are not accounted righteous before God for our *own works*.

What has been said under the ninth Article is sufficient¹ to shew this. And we may examine Luke xvii. 10; Rom. iv. 4, 5; Rom. xi. 6; Eph. ii. 9, and other passages of like import; Phil. iii. 4, 9.

Our Homily² seems to me to describe well the imperfection of our principles, affections, and services.

Salvation is spoken of in Scripture as the *gift* of God, as opposed to *debt* or *wages*: we may consult John xvii. 2; Rom. vi. 23; Eph. ii. 8; 1 John v. 11³.

24. It is the same thing, at least in the sense of our Church, whether we prove that we are justified on account of the *merit of Christ*, or that we are justified by *Faith*. Both however are *true*. 276

We are restrained in our proof of justification through the merit of Christ, by our plan of reserving the doctrine of atonement for an Appendix: we may, notwithstanding, refer to Rom. v. 18, 19, before mentioned⁴; Phil. iii. 9; and Heb. x. 17.

¹ Art. ix. sect. 30. the proof.

² Page 12, 8vo, Second part on Misery of Man.

³ I had not seen the *ninth* book of the

Divine Legation of Moses when I wrote this.

⁴ Art. ix. sect. 29. See also Taylor's Key, p. 45, bottom.

III. Justification by *faith* is expressed in a great number of texts. Mark xvi. 16; Acts x. 43; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. v. 1; Rom. iii. 28-31; Gal. ii. 16; Gal. iii. 11, 12, 26.

25. I shall leave the remaining part of the proof to each person's private reading, for the reason already assigned; and shall proceed to some indirect proof, or to answer a few *objections*.

26. Is there not a *confusion* in the texts now alleged, between the *law of nature* and the *Law of Moses*? or between the *works* enjoined by those laws? It seems to me as if an observation made under the seventh Article⁵ would be a sufficient answer to this difficulty. The Epistle to the Romans may prove that neither Jew nor heathen could be justified by works; and the Epistle to the Galatians, more particularly, that the Jew cannot be justified by his works, which he performs as a Jew; but this can make no difference as to the proposition, that justification is *gratuitous*. Both Epistles must, of course, by the circumstances in which they were written, have the first justification principally in view; but, if our
277 works fall short of perfection, the same reasoning is applicable to *final* justification. The general form of the argument is this: Men are sinners, therefore cannot be accounted just, without an act of *mercy* in the Judge of the world.

27. Is not our doctrine contrary to that of *St. James*? who says⁶, "can faith save him?" No; the most that can be allowed is, that the reasoning of James is intended for different *circumstances* from that of Paul⁷; or that it is intended to supply what common sense would always supply, if no evasion of duty was in view. But I doubt whether even so great a difference as that need be allowed between these sacred writers. Let us suppose them to confer.—*Paul*. We are justified by faith.—*James*. Will he be justified who does no good works? —*Paul*. No, I did not say that; I have said, the wicked will be *punished*.—*James*. You did not mention *works* with faith?—*Paul*. No; but I plainly meant to address myself to Jews and heathens, and to declare to them, that, when they *had performed* what they called good works, their eternal salvation must still depend upon the divine *mercy*: to those who profess to *neglect* good works I have said nothing.—*James*. Then we agree: or, at least, we do not disagree. You say,

⁵ Art. vii. sect. 3. When Luther is called an Antinomian.

⁶ James ii. 14.

⁷ Art. ix. beginning of sect. 38.

such works as Jews and heathens have been found to perform III. cannot save them: I say, *nothing* will save them, if they do not strive to live well¹.

Whatever may be thought of this dialogue, it seems very 278 probable that some Christians had taken advantage of Paul's expressions about faith, to evade their duty; and had pleaded that faith was sufficient to save them². This was a pernicious perversion: Paul might be easily seen to have improvements in *virtue* chiefly in view. Therefore James corrects the abuse; and in doing so³, artlessly and warmly, runs into some expressions seemingly opposite to those of Paul.

Dr. *Taylor* says, that St. Paul speaks of the *first* justification, and St. James of the *last* or *final*. This may be true⁴ in *fact*: that is, St. *Paul* speaks of persons *becoming* Christians; St. *James* of persons *already* Christians: but I think what they *both* say might have place in *both* situations. In both, good works are to be aimed at; in both, good works are incapable of justifying.

The most striking interference between St. James and our Article is in the use of the expression, "*Faith only.*" Both would say, it signifies 'Faith *without works*;' but in James ii. 24, it means the faith, as far as it can be called faith, of a *wicked* man; in our Article it means faith, or an honest principle, at any time, without *antecedent* works *perfectly* good. In James, you look *forward* from faith, as claiming an unmerited reward; in the Article, *backward*, as *having* put us where we *are*; though with a view to see the effect of faith, in both cases.

When faith is spoken of as *producing good works*, the disposition of the faithful may be the same as when it is spoken of 279 as *justifying* men; yet it is seen in a somewhat different light. After an honest Christian has accepted justification, he proceeds to *action*. Even St. James seems to use it in this sense, though the persons he argues with had faith only in a low degree, and of a mean sort; or rather, calling themselves Chris-

¹ This dialogue relates only to some individuals; but the texts about the sinfulness of men, relate (as under the ninth Article) to men taken *collectively*. All men were concluded under sin; therefore, notwithstanding the virtues of some individuals, (who themselves erred and were imperfect) men could only be justified by *faith*.

² I think it appears from Augustin de *Fide et Operibus*, that people did the same in his time.

³ Art. ix. sect. 38, beginning.

⁴ One passage in James looks as if he *might* address an *unconverted Jew*: "Thou believest that there is one God." Though this *might* be said to a converted Jew.

III. tians, they took for granted that they had faith, because they had consented to be baptized. St. James's expression is, "though a man *say* he hath faith" (ver. 14) ⁵.

280 28. Does not Scripture frequently ascribe salvation to *virtue*, or good works? as in Matt. xxv.; Rom. ii. 7; Acts x. 35?—Yes, all this business of admitting men, by favour, into a religious society, is to purify a people zealous of *good works* ⁶. When our Saviour declared the general judgment, his dispensation was not ripe for our doctrine; though even then one who did good was promised a reward as if he did it to Christ: but the doctrine of justification by faith will never supersede ⁷ plain declarations of rewards and punishments for virtue and vice. Declarations of what we are to *do* must always be more wanted than statements of the grounds on which we are to claim reward after we have done well. The more particular mode of our justification is chiefly to be declared when men shew vain glory about their brilliant actions; when they seem to intend to dazzle by noble, great, generous strokes of conduct; when they swell and grow irregular, and neglect internal principle.

Much the same may be said of Rom. ii. 7. It contains a general declaration of what may be called the result of our

⁵ Paul tells a man, our Lord likes *fruit-trees*; the man shews the Lord a parcel of vile trees, some cut down, all *dead*; the Lord takes no pleasure in them. How could you be so absurd? says James: common-sense might have told you that Paul meant good *bearing* trees. You must have some *bye-interest* to make you do such a foolish thing. With this idea, read James ii. 14, &c. to the end of the chapter... Abraham was justified by *faith*, but not by faith that disclaimed *acting* well. So of Rahab. St. James seems to mean, by being justified by works, *not* being justified *without* works: he says, "can faith save him?" that is, faith *without* works, or *exclusive* of virtue. His subject is not, properly, *faith*; but something pretending to be faith, which *excludes* virtue. He commends Abraham's faith, because it was *not* such as he was speaking of.

⁶ Titus ii. 14.

⁷ In the account of the general judgment, the scene, or situation of things, is quite different from what it is when justi-

fication by faith is spoken of. All the world is seen collectively—men of all times; and right conduct is supposed to imply right principles. In teaching justification by faith, the situation supposed is, that some particular people have made wrong claims to eternal happiness, which are to be rectified and corrected: this is temporary; if these mistakes are set right, all things return into their old train: and judgment proceeds upon conduct.

Dr. Taylor speaks of Matt. xxv. as not belonging to *Christians* in particular. See on Rom. Key, paragraph 178. God might go on as long as he pleased, saying, Virtue shall be rewarded, without mentioning why, or how:—there is no contradiction in revealing more *particulars*.

This subject will be more fully treated under Art. xii. in answer to the last objection: sect. 25. Bp. Warburton has something on Matt. xxv. in the ninth book of his *Divine Legation*; Works, vol. 111. quarto, p. 697.

theory. Taylor¹ speaks of it as declaring our final justification; which must always be conceived as depending upon our *works*, while we *look forward* to it with a view to *action*; though, when we are actually *tried*, and so *look back* upon our conduct, we must acknowledge that it cannot be the meritorious cause of our salvation.

As to Acts x. 35, it means no more than that worthy men of every nation will be *admitted* into Christianity—as Bishop 281 Sherlock has fully shewn².

29. Is not the doctrine of justification by faith, remote from our common notions of things? and on that account disadvantageous to virtue? and even to Revelation, by prejudicing men of *philosophical* minds against it? No; our doctrine is not at variance with *common life*; for it is exemplified in different sorts of *institutions*. If we were to take, for instance, *military* institutions—*Faith*, or the right disposition, would be a *military spirit*, with a sense of *honour*. Unformed men are admitted, get into a course of *discipline* and improvement, become *heroes*; and though imperfect get *rewarded*, through *favour*; having exerted their military spirit in a series of gallant achievements. They can, at no time, *claim* admission or reward as a strict *right*; but must always be *endeavouring* to deserve it. They would, at any time be laughed at if they said, that their having been *enlisted* was a reason why they should be *idle* or disorderly. And a man might be favoured by his sovereign, if patronized by an officer of *merit*, especially one intimately connected with the sovereign. And so in other institutions.

Neither is our doctrine unfavourable to *virtue*. Nothing can promote virtue more than right disposition and sentiment³ in the *heart*; or than entering into good institutions and *associations*. Anything may have a few bad effects incidentally, 282 but good institutions are likely to be useful to virtue upon the whole. Indeed, we have no right to interpret Scripture but with a view to the circumstances for which each passage was intended; that is, with a practical view, so as to promote

¹ Key, p. 125.

² Vol. i. Disc. xii.

³ Indeed actions are only virtuous as they arise from virtuous principles. A man who gives alms to the poor only from fear, or from ostentation, is not charitable. What Mr. Erskine men-

tioned as a maxim, in pleading about juries and libels, may, by a parity of reasoning, be applied to our purpose; the maxim, "Actus non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea," cannot be more just than, "Actus non facit bonum, vel pium, nisi mens sit bona, vel pia."

III. humility on a review of our past conduct, without remissness as to our future exertions. Can a real philosopher object to anything planned in such a manner? Besides, it has before been observed⁴, that, when it is said, virtue cannot justify us, it is *supposed* that we have exerted ourselves to the utmost.

30. I will not propose more objections, but proceed to our *application*. And first our Article of *natural* religion.

‘So imperfect are our virtues, that it is in vain to think of claiming rewards as a *debt*, on a footing of *justice*. I will *strive* and *hope* to attain them; but if I am so happy, I will acknowledge them as *given*, in *mercy*. My most important business here is to acquire, by the help of God, an *honest principle*; with that to *enter* upon *plans* and *associations* for promoting religious and moral improvement. And afterwards *constantly* to improve and purify my principle, and make it the *source* of virtue. This must be the most *salutary* method of proceeding; this must afford the greatest ease and *security* to my mind.’

31. A Christian might say thus:

‘I must aim to do my best, and I may *hope*, in some way, to attain happiness; but, whenever I conceive myself on my *trial*, either for admission into Christianity here, or for final bliss hereafter, *Scripture* assures me that I can make no *claim* on a footing of *strict right*. I *may* be saved; but, if I am, I must ascribe my salvation to God, through the *merit* of his Son. No more is left for *me* than to *accept* the bounty, with such a disposition as will make me exert all my powers to act well in future. I adopt this method cordially, as one best adapted to make my *principles* uniformly good, and give me reasonable hopes of eternal happiness.’

32. *Mutual concessions* need not here take up much time.

To *Romanists* we might make our Article more acceptable by softening some expressions seemingly tending to *Antinomianism*, and by strengthening expressions tending to encourage *virtue*, and the hopes of its *rewards*.

To *Socinians* it might perhaps be less exceptionable if we used ‘*as Christians*,’ instead of, for the *merit* of Christ; or interwove some *scriptural* expressions.

From *Romanists* we might expect a concession, that *actions* can only be good when performed on good *principles*; and we

⁴ Sect. 18.

might wish them to be attentive to the difference between *ideal* III. and *actual*, when speaking of perfection and imperfection; and to own, that we mean to adopt no system but that which best promotes *virtue*.

From *Socinians* we might expect, that, as we agree in ascribing salvation to *Divine Mercy*, they would indulge us in professing something indistinct about the *methods* of that mercy, and the *means* which it chooses to employ.

33. The principal *improvement* here must consist in investigating the real intention of St. Paul and other sacred writers, when they introduce any mention of justification: this will include the circumstances and notions of the persons addressed.

I should apprehend, that, when writers treat of Divine Justice and Mercy, they scarcely attend enough to the manner in which the human mind acquires its more particular ideas of the Nature and Attributes of God:—how it begins from *man*, according to what was explained in the *Introduction*¹ prefixed to the *ninth Article*. 284

APPENDIX TO THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE. 285

ON THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

1. WHY the doctrine of Atonement is made a separate subject, will best appear when we have treated of it. I will begin, as in each entire Article, with some *historical* remarks; taking first a *short* historical view of the whole subject, and then selecting out a few eras.

A short account may be the following. Before the Reformation² this doctrine was left to arise naturally from Scripture, as occasion required: at the Reformation it began to be made a means of depreciating the merit of Popish good works, as was the whole doctrine of justification by faith. On this account the Romanists made what opposition to it they could, consistently with their notions of the *mass*, which supposes the death of Christ to have been a real *sacrifice*. They misrepresented it perhaps sometimes; but they were the occasion of its becoming more *definite*, by charging the reformed with bad

¹ Sect. 8.

² Barnabas makes the sacrifices of Ju-

daism to be *types* of the Christian sacrifice.—See his Epistle, sect. 7, 8.

III. *consequences* arising from it, or from what they conceived it to be; which naturally brought on *explanations* and arguments in its defence. During the time when all men were set on
 286 thinking for themselves, by the Reformation, the *Socinians* arose; and their general principle being, to reduce all things to the level of *common sense*—to throw out of religion every thing *strange*³ and extraordinary—they have been constantly endeavouring to give all those texts of Scripture, on which we found the very wonderful doctrine of atonement, an ordinary construction; and to prove that *repentance* is all that is necessary for the remission of sins; and that the death of Christ was not properly a *sacrifice*, but only what he suffered in order to give men such an *example*, and such a *proof* of his Mission, as could not be given by a common departure out of life. The Socinians have not kept precisely and invariably the same notions, from their rise to the present time; but this may suffice for a general account of them. In opposing them, some particular solutions have been hazarded, which the most rational and enlightened of the present age have discountenanced; so as greatly to *simplify* the doctrine of atonement; and leave the redemption of mankind through Christ as a scheme of Divine Wisdom to be *accepted* by man, rather than *understood* in its particulars.

2. Having taken this general view, we may mention, at least, a few particular *eras*. That the *heathens* had *sacrifices*, is well known. Dr. Balguy, in his preface to his Father's tract on *Redemption*, maintains that they were always feasts or entertainments given to the gods; and Dr. Priestley, in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity, maintains the same. Archbishop Potter (Vol. I. 210) shews that the heathens had
 287 *expiatory* sacrifices, or reconciliatory; but angry beings may sometimes be appeased by a good feast.

The *Jews* had sacrifices, by divine appointment: *sin-offerings*, or trespass-offerings of the *expiatory* kind—*peace-offerings* for benefits received or expected. We may add the *paschal* sacrifice, a settled *commemoration*. I feel a doubt about admitting all these to be *feasts*, as so much stress is laid upon the *blood*: (Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 22;) the shedding of which would be quite an accident, if animals were killed merely

³ Dr. Priestley's words might be their motto, "Let us not then look for *mysteries* where no mystery is; and ob-
 | sure the beautiful simplicity of the
 | Gospel, &c." 11th Letter to Dr. Price,
 | p. 157.

to *prepare* them to be offered. An animal killed for food, and III. not used, would be a present equally valuable. Some indeed were allowed to offer something *inanimate*; but this seems to have been a case of *necessity*. With respect to *Christians*, in the present subject, the age of the *Pelagian* controversy may be joined to those before it; and we may remark of them jointly, as before of the earlier ages, that writers express themselves *artlessly*, without any view to controversy, or system; that occasionally they extol either the efficacy of *faith* in Christ's *death*, or of *repentance* and virtuous *conduct*; inso-much that both the defenders and the opposers of the doctrine of atonement may find passages in them to their purpose, just as they may in the Scriptures themselves. Any expression was taken, in the times now meant, which seemed most natural; as *sacrifice*, *ransom*, *price*, &c.; even *satisfying*¹ the Divine *Justice* occurs amongst the ancients as a thought, topic, *illustration*; though it was not occupied, as it were, by the public, and so made what we should call *a doctrine*. The resemblance, or notion, of *redeeming* or *ransoming*, has been carried so far, as to make the ransom to be spoken of as paid to him who held 288 man in bondage; that is, to *Satan*. We have, moreover, amongst the ancients some marks of *diffidence*² concerning some points. These shew that the *difficulty* of the doctrine of atonement was acknowledged, and that men were *sincere* in what they did profess.

Instead of quoting authorities, I will refer to the *Catholicus consensus* prefixed to the *Corpus*, &c. *Confessionum*³; to our *Homilies*⁴; to *Nicholls* on the Article as before; and to *Wall* on Infant Baptism⁵. We must not expect that particularity in the ancients which we find in the moderns. The ancients were as particular as was needful in their case; and it would be unreasonable to conclude that they were not in possession of a doctrine because they had not examined it very minutely;—as unreasonable as to conclude, that a man was not in possession of a plant because he had not examined it with a microscope. Dr. Priestley, in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity, brings some authorities against the opinion, that the Fathers were in possession of the doctrine of

¹ Priestley's Hist. Corr. i. 249.

² *Hieron. ad Pammachium et Oceanum de erroribus Origenis*; quoted in Warb. Div. Leg. Book IX. Introd.

³ Geneva, 1612.

⁴ On Salvation, 2d Part.

⁵ Chap. xix. sect. 9, and 12.

III. atonement. Let them be weighed against those to which I refer; to *my* judgment it seems that the balance would turn in our favour. He takes into that doctrine some particulars which are not now maintained by our ablest writers.

He observes, that our doctrine is not “in any ancient *summary of Christian doctrine* ⁶.” We *might* observe, that *Christian remission of sins* is in the creeds; which can scarcely
289 be expressed in more words, without introducing some scriptural expression to our purpose⁷: but it is enough to answer, there was *no need* of more particulars in short confessions of faith. Doctrines are introduced into creeds only when *wanted*⁸; and every doctrine of every creed has something human in it: a creed is an human composition, for purposes of convenience, which are subject to the judgment of *man*.

If larger confessions of faith are to be blamed for having doctrines not found in the smaller, why may not the smaller be blamed for having more than is contained in a doxology, or in the short confession used at baptism in primitive times? Dr. Priestley does indeed say⁹ that our doctrine was wanted: it might have been opposed to the *Docetæ*, who denied the reality of the body of Christ, and therefore, in some sense, of his death. But I believe they would have maintained, that something took place when Christ apparently died, which answered all the *purposes* of death. And it does not seem so natural for those who opposed the *Docetæ*, to dwell on a doctrine, certainly very difficult, which had not been particularly discussed, as to have recourse to topics concerning the incarnation, which had been more fully debated¹⁰.

This *kind* of reasoning on Dr. Priestley’s work might be extended far beyond our limits: I will only observe farther upon it, that I hold it unfair to take every commendation of good works, or of repentance, as an argument against the doctrine of faith in the merits of the death of Christ. Those
290 who hold the doctrine of atonement imagine that they feel as warmly the beauty and excellence of virtue as either Romanists or Socinians.

3. The *schoolmen* seem rather to surpass, or go beyond others, in the orthodox doctrine, than to differ from them.

⁶ Hist. Corr. vol. I. p. 221.

⁷ See *Corpus, &c. Confessionum*, on the Apostles’ Creed.

⁸ Art. viii. sect. 1.

⁹ Page 226.

¹⁰ See *Catholicus Consensus*, p. 125, column 2, whence it appears that the doctrine was *held* by Tertullian and Irenæus, though not *analysed*.

They commonly used those names for the different sorts of **III.** *causes*, which have since been found convenient; according to which Christ is called the *meritorious* cause of our salvation. We have before¹ referred to a few specimens.

4. Some have conceived merit, not only in the Death of Christ, but in that of the *martyrs*². They thought perhaps they were only using a just or laudable parity of reasoning; but we have no right to conclude by analogy from a singular case. We know too little of the counsels of God, with regard to that stupendous event, the death of his Son, to determine, that any other event is of like nature with it. Besides, the expressions of Scripture are against our putting any man on the same footing with the Son of God; as will be shewn hereafter. Nevertheless we may remark, that whoever made the death of the martyrs meritorious, must have pre-supposed the Death of Christ to have been such: their notion was an *extension* of our doctrine of atonement.

5. But the era of the *Reformation* is the principal. The reformed churches³ at that time, as now, had different confessions of faith; but they are easily compared by means of the harmony prefixed to the *Corpus* before mentioned. I have 291 compared nearly all of them, and find myself most pleased with the two presented to the emperor Charles V., the *Augustan* and the *Argentinensis*⁴. But, what is more to the purpose, they differ in nothing which seems essential as to the doctrine of faith in the merits of Christ—only in some fancies, as it were, or hypotheses; as about the *scene* of Christ's sufferings, about their being *judicial*, &c. So good reason had Bishop Warburton for calling our present doctrine the great Gospel-principle of Protestantism⁵ at the time we are speaking of.

6. We should here take notice, not only of the opinions of the Reformed, but of those of the *Romanists*: they are chiefly to be had from the acts of the Council of Trent. The sixth session contains some canons about justification, as we have already seen; but I do not perceive that any of them mention the *sacrifice* of the death of Christ. The tenth canon affirms, that men cannot be justified without the *justitia*, *δικαιοσύνη*,

¹ Art. xi. sect. 5.

² See Fulke's *Rhemish Test. Index, Martyrs*. (on Col. i. 24.) Also Dr. Priestley's *Hist. Corr.* vol. I. p. 229.

³ The order here would be better thus: Age of Reformation, Romanists—Re-

formed churches in general, England in particular—Original Socinians.

⁴ *Argentoratium* seems to have been a *district*; Argentina, the capital *city* of *Alsatia*.

⁵ On the Holy Spirit, p. 326.

III. righteousness, of Christ, “*per quam nobis meruit* ;” and adds, that we do not become formally righteous by the righteousness of Christ. But the canons of the twenty-second session, about the *mass*, acknowledge, not only the merits and righteousness of Christ, but the *sacrifice* of his death upon the cross ; as do also the decrees preceding the canons : but I do not see any thing in the expressions very remarkable.

292 *Dr. Nicholls*, on this Article, refers to a book⁶, which I have not seen ; and concludes from it, that the offices of Baptism and Visitation of the Sick had once, in the Romish Church, some expressions about the merit of Christ, which have been since *expunged*. As to the merit of Christ as affecting Christians, the Romanists seem to have held, and probably hold still, that, though we are not formally righteous, yet we *deserve* salvation by the *merit of Christ* ; that is, they are against imputed *righteousness*, but for imputed *merit*. This is expressed briefly in the *Rhemish Testament*, on Col. i. 12 : “ We are not only by acceptation or imputation *partakers* of Christes benefits, but are by his grace made *worthy* thereof, and deserve our salvation *condignely*.” On the 24th verse of the same chapter, Protestants are represented as, “ under pretence of Christes passion,” taking “ away the valure of all good deedes.” See also on Rom. viii. 18.

The Church of England held, at the time of the Reformation, the same doctrine which it holds now ; though perhaps that doctrine had not then been considered so particularly as it has been since. I will read to you, in confirmation of this opinion, a few passages out of the Article of Justification in the *Necessary Doctrine* ; and out of some of our first *homilies*, especially that on the *Misery of Mankind*.

7. The *Puritans*⁷ wished reformation to be carried farther than it was ; and so opposed Popish doctrines very strenuously. Their writings, as I remember, express the efficacy of the death of Christ forcibly. But I refer to *Ludlam's* Essay on the doctrine of *Satisfaction*, p. 67.

293 8. *Faustus Socinus* thought⁸ that Christ had such interest in heaven, that he could get his disciples freed from punishment. He considered *redemption* as deliverance from the *guilt* of sin, by good laws and precepts, tending to *reform* us. The Racovian Catechism supplies us with the arguments

⁶ “ Sacerd. Rom. Ven. 1575.”

⁷ Art. xi. sect. 12.

⁸ Priestley, Hist. Cor. i. 273.

of the early Socinians, in the chapter *de morte Christi*. The III. death of Christ, we are told, was chiefly for the sake of his resurrection: our orthodox opinion, “*fallax est et erronea et admodum perniciosa*”¹. Some theory is given of the divine justice and mercy; but, in general, the same arguments are used there which have been since used by the modern Socinians, though no notice is now taken of their being old.

Against Socinus, *Grotius* published his work, called “*Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi*”², to which *Vossius* writes a short Preface, telling us that *Grotius* was the *first* who had written on the subject, so as to make it his proper business; yet the doctrine is called *Catholic* in the title. *Vossius* speaks of *Grotius* as having been induced to write, by *Socinus*’s having held errors *vetustati minus notos*, and by his having gone upon general principles of *morality*. The work is reckoned, I think, worthy of *Grotius*, though not perhaps defensible in every particular: it seems in some respects an instance of the orthodox having taken ground untenable.

The *Family of Love* make the shedding of Christ’s *blood* to mean, the shedding of the Spirit in the hearts of the faithful³.

9. We may now pass on to *modern times*. Bishop Butler, in his *Analogy*, has been of great service in shewing that our doctrine is not liable to any solid *objection*. Bishop Warburton has ably defended it, by shewing that the command given to Abraham to sacrifice his son implied a proper sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind⁴. Mr. *John Balguy*, father of the justly celebrated Dr. Thomas Balguy, has published a treatise to prove that the *sufferings* of Christ should be reckoned as *merits*, and that God *gave* the salvation of mankind to his Son as a *reward* of those merits. Dr. Thomas Balguy has republished this tract, with a preface of his own, which is, like every other thing of his, well worth considering. The reader will see that he calls himself an *advocate*⁵ rather than a *judge*. 294

Dr. Taylor, in his book on the Epistle to the Romans, looks upon the *blood* of Christ as meaning his *obedience* and *goodness*; and upon the worth of Christ’s death as being of a

¹ Page 177.

² A short account of the contents see in *Apthorp*’s *Lectures on Prophecy*, vol. II. p. 73.

³ Rogers on the Article.

⁴ *Div. Leg.* Book VI. sect. 5. Consult also Book IX, which proves the sacrifice of *Christ* to be *real*.

⁵ End of Address to the Reader.

III. *moral* kind. See his *Key*, chap. viii., and his *note* upon Rom. iii. 25.

This is not saying that Christ died *only* for an *example*, and for *confirmation* of his mission; (though he uses the words pattern and confirmation, page 269;) nor is it holding that God's *natural placability* will make him always accept of repentance. Though, therefore, we have called Taylor a *Socinian* under the ninth Article, he does not seem to agree with the modern Socinians on our present subject.

Locke is said by *Michaelis* (Introd. Lect. sect. 133, end,) to have been prejudiced against the doctrine of the atonement; but he seems by no means a Socinian. What he objects to 295 (note on Rom. iii. 24) is rather the doctrine of *satisfaction*, or the notion that in redemption by Christ an *equivalent* is strictly paid.

Mr. *Hervey*, the pious and eloquent writer of the *Meditations*, has written a discussion, in the way of *dialogue*, on the subject of atonement. The characters who debate are called *Theron and Aspasio*. In this, he runs into more *particulars*, concerning the *manner* in which God is induced to forgive men for the sake of the sufferings of Christ, than seem, to some judgments, within the reach of human comprehension. On this account he has been attacked, in a formidable manner, by Mr. Wm. *Ludlam*, the celebrated mathematician and mechanic. By reading Mr. *Ludlam's* Essay, a thinking man may be led to reflect on the subject in a proper manner. His friends, Dr. *Powell*⁶, Dr. *Balguy*⁷, and also Dr. *Ogden*⁸, seem to be of the same opinion with himself. We are only to hold, they think, that the sufferings and death of Christ are a *medium* through which God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, is pleased to confer forgiveness of sins on the race of man; but they conceive that it is not for us to examine minutely into the particular *way* in which this plan appears to the divine mind. It is not our business to carry our opinions farther than *Scripture* and *experience* authorize; or to form any notions but such as result immediately from comparing the *word* of God with his *works*. And I am mistaken if this does not, in a little time, prove the *settled* opinion of improved and enlightened Christians.

I conclude these historical remarks with observing, that the *Moravians* dwell almost constantly, in their sermons and

⁶ In his last Charge.

⁷ Pp. 200, 201.

⁸ Second Sermon on the Articles of Faith.

hymns, on the sufferings of Christ; and that some of those III. called *Methodists* have said such *bold* things, of the efficacy of 296 the Christian sacrifice, as to occasion some danger to good works¹. Yet I believe this danger to be in a decreasing state: some who have written with great calmness and rational argument against Socinians, on the subject of atonement, have been considered as, at some time, attached to Mr. Wesley. Writers who use the bold expressions here meant may be called *Antinomians*, to whatever sect they belong. The examination of *Dr. Crispe's*² Sermons would afford us instances of a *continued language*, referring all spiritual excellence and advantage to Christ.

Jonathan Edwards has published a discourse on justification, which is written with ability, and could scarce fail to improve any attentive reader.

10. Having finished our history, we come next to the *explanation* of some *terms*, which are commonly used in speaking of the efficacy of the death of Christ (sometimes including his *sufferings* and his *virtues*) on the salvation of mankind.

11. Let us first take the word *Atonement*, as that is now made a principal term, and the *name* of the whole doctrine, in which we differ from the Socinians as to our present subject. The meaning of it seems to be, an act which God is pleased to accept *in lieu of punishment*. When an atonement is made, God is supposed to view the person, on whose account it is made, in the light of an *offender*; and to be appeased by the act, as a magistrate is by some fine or imposition, when he forbears to execute the rigour of the law.

*Dr. Priestley*³ says, that atonement means making any 297 person or thing clean, so as to be fit for divine *worship*. And that does seem to be its *particular* meaning in several places; insomuch that, in the LXX., we sometimes find *καθαρίζω* and⁴ *ἀγιάζω*, when we find making *atonement* in the English. But, under the Jewish law, a person might appear in the light of an *offender* on account of *uncleanness*; and, though he had committed no very distinguished sin, he might, if he was going to perform any religious service that required particular purity, make an *atonement* for his *general* imperfection: which notion agrees well with the prayer of David, “Who can tell how oft

¹ See Letter to Mr. B——e from Academicus, pp. 56, 58, and 61, &c.

² Mentioned Art. xi. sect. 10.

³ Hist. Cor. i. 193. ⁴ Exod. xxix. 36, 37.

III. he offendeth? O *cleanse* thou me from my secret faults⁵! I do not see how *cleansing*, as the *primitive* sense of making atonement, can agree with ἐξιλάσκομαι, which is the word most commonly used for making an atonement, and which has no relation to uncleanness except as an *offence*. This Author affirms, too, that “guilt, in a moral sense, is never said to be atoned for by any sacrifice.” But we read of *sin-offering*, and atonement for *sin*⁶; and, not to examine particulars, we read that the *annual* atonement was made for “the errors of the people.” The word is ἀγνοημάτων, which contains an idea of sinning through *ignorance*; and may mean the offences of persons not hardened or void of good principles; but those are the sins which are supposed to be pardoned even on the *Christian* scheme as well as the Jewish. Sacrifice does not, in any religion, take away all punishment whatsoever. Those who are truly *penitent* for past sins, are put upon a footing with
 298 those who have sinned *inadvertently*: they are not void of good *principles*. Under the *Mosaic* religion, where every thing was connected with divine *worship*, sins struck men most in the light of rendering offenders unfit for divine *worship*: “the priest shall make an atonement for you to cleanse you⁷”—from what? “that ye may be clean from all your *sins* before the Lord.” *This* idea of sin cannot be equally strong under the *Christian* dispensation; and we may see, that it is not, on a comparison between Judaism and Christianity, if we read the concluding verses of the ninth chapter to the Hebrews, and a few of the first verses in the tenth.

Atonement occurs only once in our English New Testament, Rom. v. 11; where, as Dr. Priestley rightly observes, it might have been *reconciliation*, the Greek word being καταλλαγή. Indeed I am, at present, *at a loss* to see what could lead our translators to the word “atonement,” in this place, as reconciling had repeatedly occurred in the preceding verse: though I believe the translators knew more of the matter than I do, or than Dr. Priestley does.

12. The next term which occurs is *Propitiation*. It occurs only *twice*, in Rom. iii. 25, and 1 John ii. 2. In the former place the original is ἱλαστήριον, in the latter, ἱλασμός. ἱλασμός seems to require no particular consideration: it signifies that

⁵ Ps. xix. 12.

⁶ Heb. vii. 27, with marginal references.

See also Heb. ix. 7; and compare Heb. v. 3, with Lev. ix. 7.

⁷ Lev. xvi. 30.

person or thing which appeases, or renders propitious. That III. Christ is such a person, it belongs to our *proof* to shew. The *meaning* of such a definition, whether the proposition implied in it be true or false, is no way obscure.

But we shall scarcely have an adequate idea of *ἰλαστήριον*, without looking into the Old Testament. The word is properly an *adjective*, used as a substantive, by having one understood: *ἐπίθεμα* is that substantive. The LXX. use the expression¹ *ἰλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα*; and the Hebrew has *כפרת*, from *כפר* to cover, for the same thing; taking the name rather from *ἐπίθεμα*, which in Greek is sometimes left out. The thing referred to is called the *mercy-seat*; the nature of which will be best seen in Exod. xxv. 17, 22; and *ἰλαστήριον* is rendered *mercy-seat*, Heb. ix. 5². It does not seem to have been the *lid* of the ark, but a plate of pure gold laid loose upon the lid, which was also of pure gold. (In Exod. xxv. compare ver. 11 and 17.) Both Locke's and Taylor's Notes on Rom. iii. 25, deserve to be read; and the way to understand how *Christ* is a *propitiation* in this sense, is, to consider the *purposes* of the *mercy-seat*, the *כפרת*, the *ἰλαστήριον*, in the *sanctum sanctorum*, under the Mosaic dispensation; and then to think how our blessed Lord answers all similar purposes³ under the *Christian*.

We see, that propitiation and *atonement* are nearly connected: *ἰλάσκομαι* comprehends them both.

13. *Reconciliation* seems to be the *effect* of atonement or propitiation; and is sufficiently clear when men are considered in the light of *offenders*; or, under Christianity, as children of *wrath*, or concluded under *sin*; or, as *enemies*, Rom. v. 10.

14. We have already had occasion to speak of *Sacrifice*. *Oblation*, or offering, seems only a more comprehensive term, including every thing presented to any Deity. We shall have occasion to speak hereafter of the difference between proper and *figurative* sacrifices. We may observe here, that in every proper sacrifice, *blood* is supposed to be shed, or *life* taken away. *Sacrifico* does not imply that in its *etymology*, only to perform sacred *rites*, and to do sacrifice *κατ' ἐξοχήν*: but *θύω* in Greek, and *הביל* in Hebrew, signify to *kill*, in general, as

¹ Exod. xxv. 17.

² See an engraving opposite to the title-page of Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon;

where other passages are referred to.

³ This is well expressed in Taylor's note on Rom. iii. 25.

III. well as to sacrifice. Which of these two is the *primary* signification, is not of importance in our present business⁴.

15. We frequently meet with mention of *vicarious* suffering and punishment, or punishment by *substitute*; which may be intelligible without explanation; but, as I have asked myself whether I saw clearly what it meant, I may mention it to others. If a man sold himself to *slavery*, in order to set another at liberty, (his benefactor, suppose, or his prince, or parent), his *sufferings*, as a slave, would be vicarious. If a *deserter* was going to be scourged, and another soldier (his brother, or friend,) offered to be scourged for him, and the offer was accepted, his *punishment* would be vicarious. But a person may prevent the punishment of another, and even by *suffering*, and yet that suffering not be vicarious. Suppose the deserter's brother had, by getting maimed, and receiving wounds never perfectly curable, saved a citadel, or the life of a commander, and was to solicit for a remission of the deserter's punishment, urging that he wanted no gold or silver for his past services, but only that his brother should that once escape pain; if his petition was granted, he would *relieve* another, and, in a good measure, by his *sufferings*; but yet he could not be said to suffer *vicarious* evil, or punishment: his brother's escape might be conceived as owing to his *merits*, or to be given him as a *reward*.

16. *Punishment* is evil inflicted by *authority*, in consequence of an *offence*⁵. But any *evil* is called a punishment in some views; because evil often operates as punishment, in deterring from bad conduct. But evil seems to be called punishment, especially if it arises from any faulty *conduct*;—“delirant Reges, *plectuntur* Achivi.”

17. *Redemption* is buying any thing back again; it is also delivering from confinement, generally from *slavery* or *captivity*, by payment of something valuable to him who holds in bondage the person redeemed. That which is paid is called a *ransom*, in Greek *λύτρον*. Redemption seems to be primarily used (as far as respects the matter before us) for rescuing the Israelites from *Egyptian* bondage; and afterwards it is *applied* to rescuing *Christians* from the bondage of *idolatry*.

⁴ Luke ii. 24. The offering of the birds is called a sacrifice, *θυσίαν*, but that was in lieu of a lamb, as appears from Lev. xii. 8, and Reland says (Ant. III. i. 1.)

the Jews do not allow זבח to be applicable to birds. In such a case, the sense of *θυσία* might be extended.

⁵ See Ludlam's 2d Essay, p. 25.

The *Deity* redeems without actually and literally *paying* a III. ransom. God is always said to use any *human* means, when¹, if man had accomplished the same end, it would have been by those means. And thus the Deity may *purchase* as well as *redeem*.

18. *Salvation* may be mentioned, though it does not perhaps very frequently occur in disputes about the doctrine of atonement. *Saving* seems to imply *evil* or *danger*, from which a person is made safe. The *Israelites* were *saved*² from the Egyptians; and, in like manner, *Christians* are *saved* from the evils of *heathenism*, and from its spiritual *dangers*. In 302 the times of Christ and his Apostles, men were said to be *saved* who were *converted* to Christianity, as has been observed before³; and “*eternal*⁴ *salvation*” may be understood to mean, securing from eternal *evils*, or giving a *security* which shall continue for ever. “*Eternal*⁵ *redemption*,” bears a like sense. Both phrases, being in the Epistle to the Hebrews, have a reference to the history of the *Jews*.

19. A term much in use in discussions about the atonement, is *Satisfaction*. It seems sometimes to mislead. Let us reflect on what passes in our minds, and perhaps we may perceive *how*. Although we acquire our ideas of the qualities of God by ascribing to him human qualities, enlarged and purified, yet we may sometimes be *misled by words* and sounds: we may ascribe qualities to him without properly enlarging them, or duly clearing them from imperfections. The doctrine of *satisfaction* implies that God *must* execute *justice*; so we call inflicting punishment. God has said, “Thou shalt not steal:” a man steals; his punishment, we say, and truly, is *just*. Justice is a good quality, therefore a perfect Deity has it for an attribute; therefore the offender *must* be *punished*. No resource? why, yes; a corporal punishment may be *changed* into a *fine*; and A may bear the fine which B has incurred: why not even a personal punishment? Whichever is punished, the heinousness of the crime is published, and the terrors of justice displayed. All men, even B himself, may abstain from stealing in future, as carefully as if B had suffered. In short, a man may be punished by *substitute*, and then justice will be *satisfied*; *satisfaction* will be made—there will be an atonement to 303 appease the divine wrath. Thus are some men’s thoughts apt

¹ Introd. to 2d Part of Articles, sect. 8.

³ Art. x. sect. 29; and Art. xi. sect. 14.

² Taylor on Romans, Index, *Saved*.

⁴ Heb. v. 9.

⁵ Heb. ix. 12.

III. to run on; and thus is the *doctrine* of satisfaction established. But, I think, some expressions in the train are taken as meaning more than they really do mean. This step is not enough attended to: "his punishment *is just*." It really means no more than that it would *not* be *unjust* if it was to be inflicted—the offender would have no reason to *complain*; but, because it is not unjust, is it therefore *necessary*? not necessary to be inflicted by the *Deity*, that we know of. An human magistrate may be guilty of some sort of injustice by letting offenders escape; but he would not be called unjust to the offenders: his injustice would be against the public, or the prosecutor, who are under his protection. Then, the expression, "*justice is a good quality*," is capable of misleading. It is certainly good to infringe no man's *rights*; and in governors and magistrates it is good to resist *corruption* and partiality, and do nothing from private interest or *favour*. It is good to act with *steadiness* and fortitude, though threatened by combinations of wicked men; to be uniform in executing laws, though after a long *interval*; but, though justice is good in all these views, it does not follow that an all-wise judge must *necessarily* inflict punishment on *every offender* for every offence. We cannot speak of justice so abstractedly as to say universally, *Justice* must be satisfied; though in some situations, and with some views, the expression, 'Justice shall be satisfied,' may not be improper; as when it means, that, notwithstanding some particular escapes, punishment still may be *expected* by all who offend. Indeed, nothing now said, in order to shew that

304 any encouragement to any *offender*. When punishment is only *not unjust*, he has reason to *expect* and to *dread* it; and he will certainly *feel* it, as far as infinite wisdom directs that he should. Whilst we stand in the light of men *liable* to punishment, we should be careful not to reason ourselves out of an apprehension of just punishment; though, in studying the divine nature, we should be equally careful not to tie up the administration of the Governor of the world by the imperfection of our human *language*—by fancying a proposition universally true, when it is but true in certain circumstances. If it seems good to the Deity, he may accept of atonements of very different kinds, and for very different sorts of offences.

The word *satisfaction* is twice used in Numb. xxxv., namely, in verses 31 and 32, in the sense of which we are

now speaking, or in one very near it: the Greek word is III. *λύτρα*¹.

20. The doctrine of satisfaction, the notion of *satisfying* Divine Justice, conceived to be under the necessity of punishing rigorously the sins of mankind, brings on what appears to me a still more difficult doctrine; I mean that of *Imputation* of sin to Christ. If God must punish because he is just, he can only punish *guilt*; Christ is to be punished for the sins of the whole world; therefore he must be *guilty* of them: yet he was perfectly *innocent*; he was the *Lamb* without spot²; he “did no sin³” he “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin⁴.” How are these things to be reconciled? 305 by a word⁵—Christ is to have *real* guilt, but not *inherent*, only *imputed*. In truth, when one comes to examine this matter of *imputed guilt*, it seems to be merely *nominal*. It is a something wholly inconceivable, and only spoken of in order to keep the theory of *satisfying* Divine Justice entire and compact; though, as far as I can judge, that theory which cannot be supported without terms, out of which all meaning must be thrown⁶, should answer some *useful* purpose.

I will not trouble you with any farther *explanation*: indeed some of the terms now explained are not in our eleventh Article; but if they are in any of the others, or in our Liturgy, or Homilies, that is enough. The doctrine of atonement is both introduced into the *second* Article and the *thirty-first*; but, as the former treats of the *Incarnation*, and the latter of the *Mass*, I would not enter upon that doctrine under either of them, nor anywhere but here; and therefore I would explain here any terms which they may contain. In our Communion-office, the prayer of consecration contains several of our terms; but I look upon the number as intended (not as in a law-deed, to bind and confine, but) to give scope and liberty to the mind; and also to guard against the doctrine of the continual sacrifice of the *Mass*⁷.

¹ Bp. Warburton says, satisfaction “carries in it the ideas of a debt *paid* and *accepted* ;” i. e. unites the ideas of *redemption* and *justification*. Div. Leg. Book IX. vol. III. p. 684, quarto. In this sense it may be useful sometimes, if not perverted.

² 1 Pet. i. 19.

³ 1 Pet. ii. 22.

⁴ Heb. iv. 15.

⁵ “Thus we find perfect innocence and real guilt united in Christ.” Ludlam on

Satisfaction, p. 105.

⁶ Book III. chap. x. sect. 6. Imputed righteousness is mentioned Art. ix. sect. 15. The theory is, good Christians have imputed righteousness, though not inherent: yet imputed righteousness is *real*; and yet we are really *guilty*; that is, we have inherent guilt. If all this is only to support our popular notion of *satisfaction*, it might as well be set aside.

⁷ Ludlam, Append. to Satisfaction.

III. 21. We come now to our *proof*: but what is it which is
 306 to be proved? My idea is this: We all *fall short* of doing our
 duty, therefore the *Law*, which enjoins it, serves finally to
condemn us: the *Christian* religion comes in to our relief; it
 does not abolish the Law, for that is divine, and adapted to
 make human nature happy; but it forms us into a *society*, so
 beneficial, that every member is furnished with the *means* of
 obtaining eternal happiness after death. His hopes are not to
 be founded on the improbable supposition, that he will act so,
 "in all points," as to *claim* eternal happiness on a footing of
justice: if he acts from the *fundamental principle* of the
 Christian society, he will be finally happy, notwithstanding
 he may at times continue to fall short of satisfying the law.
 Yet he is always to consider God, not as acting arbitrarily,
 but as the rewarder of *virtue* and the punisher of *vice*; in
 which *character* it pleases his infinite wisdom and goodness
 to give this inestimable privilege to Christians, in a manner
 perfectly *gratuitous*, with some view to the sufferings, the
 conduct, the *merit* of his Son, who is perpetual head of this
 society.

⁸ We should now form one short *proposition* out of this
 statement of the case. It might be something like this:—

22. God will make sincere Christians eternally happy,
 notwithstanding some imperfections of theirs, on account of
 the merits, the sufferings, and the *death* of Christ.

The number of texts, which may be brought in support of
 this proposition, is extremely great; my wish is to produce
 307 them *all*; because every addition to the number must strength-
 en the proof; and each sacred writer must corroborate the
 testimony of the others; but I fear you will have already
 thought me somewhat prolix. On the whole, I will confine
 myself to a *selection*; in making which, we must keep in mind
 what has been already quoted under the eleventh Article.

Consult Isai. Liii. 4—6⁹.

Matt. xx. 28 } life a *ransom* for many.
 Mark x. 45 }
 John i. 29—Behold the Lamb of God.

⁸ Here I first consulted, hastily, the
 ninth book of the *Divine Legation* of
 Moses; but I had first written, though
 not correctly, the substance of the re-
 mainder of this Appendix. Whatever
 references to that book have already ap-

peared in these papers, were added after-
 wards.

⁹ Here see Pearson on the Creed, p. 74,
 folio. Taylor on Romans, note on Rom.
 iii. 25.

- ¹ John xv. 13—Lay down his life for his friends. III.
- Acts iv. 12—No other name whereby, &c. and *salvation*.
 —xx. 28—which (Church) he hath purchased with his own *blood*.
- Rom. iii. 2—26²—and the sense arising from making *δίκαιος* mean mild, candid; (I scarce know which sense to prefer; but our doctrine stands firm upon either.)
- v. 6—10—died for—justified by his blood—reconciled.
 —vi. 23—eternal life through Jesus Christ.
- 1 Cor. i. 30—who of God (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ*) *δικαιοσύνη, ἁγιασμός, ἀπολύτρωσις*.
 —viii. 11; xv. 3—for whom Christ died—with Rom. xiv. 15.
- 2 Cor. v. 18, 19—and reconciling—made him *Sin*. 308
- Gal. i. 4—gave himself for our sins.
- Ephes. i. 7—redemption through his blood.
 —ii. 16—reconciled by the Cross.
 —iv. 32—God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.
- 1 Tim. ii. 6—gave himself a ransom for all.
- Hebrews entire; but particularly chap. ix. ver. 26, 28; and chap. x. 1—14.
- 1 Pet. i. 2. On this text, I presume to differ from Taylor³. I make *five* distinct things:—1. Christians are foreknown; 2. chosen; 3. sanctified by the spirit at Baptism; 4. walk in *virtue*; 5. “*and*” finally are *justified* by the “sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.”
- 1 Pet. i. 19—precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb, &c.
- 1 John i. 7—the blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth* us from all sin.
- Rev. vii. 14—wash—in the blood of the Lamb.

Abraham's sacrifice of his son was mentioned in a former part of our system. Here I must close our *direct proof*; though I do it reluctantly, as every omission prevents our doctrine from being seen in its full force and extent.

23. I now proceed to *indirect proof*; or to the solution of some few *objections*.

¹ It might be better to take more proofs out of St. John's Gospel; as John iii. 14—18; also ver. 35, 36; chap. iv. ver. 42; chap. x. ver. 15, 28, 29.

² With the note in Short Defence of the Doctrine of Atonement, p. 33

³ On Romans, note before cited, on Rom. iii. 25.

III. 24. It is urged, that our doctrine is not laid open in the *Old Testament*, or in the *Gospels*, or in the *Acts* of the Apostles⁴. How it should be expected in the *Old Testament*, 309 though our doctrine were true, I cannot imagine⁵. It is shadowed forth by *types*, and seems to be intimated by *prophecy*⁶; nay, it will be difficult to account for God's appointing *sacrifices* amongst the Jews, except we suppose some end in view relative to Christianity; to that dispensation which was to extend to all mankind. For the Jews, or Israelites, were to be kept as much separated from idolatry as possible; this was the grand purpose of their existence as a people. Was it not very strange that the principal part of their ritual religion should be the same with that of idolaters? On our supposition, this is intelligible; on the Socinian hypothesis, it does not appear so.

With regard to the *Gospels* and *Acts* of the Apostles, it cannot be said that they contain no *traces* of our doctrine. We have already referred to several passages which contain some: more might be mentioned; for every account of *Christian* remission of sins differs from remission through the mere natural essential *placability*⁷ of the Deity.

But it seems certain to me, as has been before repeatedly observed, that Christianity was intended to be opened *gradually*; that converts were at first to be treated as "babes in Christ," and fed with *milk*; and not with strong⁸ meat till 310 afterwards. Taking this thought along with us, we must feel a pleasing admiration at finding, in the *Acts* of the Apostles, an *intermediate* degree of distinctness; something between the intimations of the *Gospels*, and the full declarations of the *Epistles*. Of the 25th chapter⁹ of St. Matthew I have said something already¹⁰. It is not likely that the doctrine should be explicitly declared there; or in the parable of the *Prodigal*¹¹ *Son*; or in anything delivered before the death of Christ, the

⁴ Priestley, *Hist. Corr.* vol. i. p. 154, and following.

⁵ Dr. Priestley says, the *general principles* of our doctrine might be expected to appear in the *Old Testament*. Display of *justice*, and abhorrence of *sin*—are not these in the *Old Testament*? see *Deut.* xxxii. 35; *Psalm* xxxix. 11; v. 5; &c. &c. Also *Psalm* xciv. 1. But, I see, the *Racovian Catechism* says, (p. 181, *de morte Christi*) God is not represented

as *just*, but as *angry*; I hope, at least, His anger is just. ⁶ *Isai.* l.iii. 4—6.

⁷ *Hist. Corr.* vol. i. p. 152. *Famil. Illustr.* p. 48. *Cat. Racov.* p. 180.

⁸ *1 Cor.* iii. 1, 2, with marginal references. ⁹ *Hist. Corr.* i. 160.

¹⁰ *Art.* xi. sect. 28. This will also be mentioned again, *Art.* xii. sect. 25.—*P. S.* See Warburton's *Works*, quarto, vol. III. p. 699, bottom.

¹¹ *Hist. Corr.* i. 159.

event principally to be dwelt upon—the *foundation* on which III. the doctrine was to be built. A sketch might be drawn, but the superstructure could not be built before the foundation was laid. The parable of the Prodigal Son was calculated to obviate the envious prejudices of the Jews against admitting the Gentiles to unite with them in one common religion. It was not natural to introduce our doctrine into such an apologue. Nor was it wanted in order to declare that each man was to expect¹ *mercy* in proportion to the mercy he shewed. That might be declared even *now*, without entering into the doctrine of atonement. In Eph. iv. 32, we have, “even as God, *for Christ’s sake*, hath forgiven you;” which opens an additional motive to forgiveness, but not an essential one. Perhaps still more motives to forgiveness may appear hereafter: that would not prove the invalidity of those we now have. Our Saviour’s expostulations were chiefly intended to beat down Jewish prejudices by each man’s natural feelings and *affections*; any topic occasioning *perplexity* would have defeated his purpose.

25. Suppose something be said, in the Gospels, about the 311 merits and death of Christ, yet does not the general *tenor*² of the Scriptures shew that God will pardon “sinners *freely*,” “whenever they truly *repent* and reform their lives?” In the first place, God will pardon sinners *freely*, if he pardons them when they cannot *claim* pardon³ as a matter of strict *right*. He may annex a *condition* to a pardon, and yet it may still be *free*; else indeed *repentance* could not be requisite. It is no more absurd to speak of a free pardon on account of the merits of Christ, than of a free pardon on condition of repentance. Repentance, I doubt not, always avails something in the sight of God; but can it bring men to the same state in which they would have been if they had continued *innocent*⁴? Does *experience*⁵ shew this; or rather, is not the Socinian idea of the sufficiency of repentance mere *hypothesis*? at least, can repentance be supposed to merit or procure an *eternity* of happiness? As to the New Testament, I think we may observe, that repentance is most spoken of *before* the Gospel-scheme gets

¹ Hist. Corr. i. 159.

² Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 156—168. Fam. Illustr. p. 48.

³ Div. Leg. Book IX. p. 636, 4to; but better in p. 650.

⁴ Dr. Balguy’s Pref. p. vi.

⁵ Powell’s Third Charge, p. 346, mentioned Book I. chap. xix. sect. 13. Div. Leg. Book IX. rather *against* this, in some sense.

III. opened; that, when it is fully opened, there is most said of *faith*. The *Acts* we find here again an intermediate link; where repentance and faith are sometimes joined, sometimes mentioned separately. Indeed, when one is mentioned, the other is *implied*. This Mr. *Locke* has observed⁶; and his
 312 observation agrees with some remarks which we have made about *partial causes*⁷, and divine and human *agency*⁸. So that repentance may avail through Christ, though Christ be not mentioned; and certainly, men may be exhorted to repent, even on a footing of natural religion, without any conclusion being rightly drawn against revealed.

26. It is moreover said, supposing faith in Christ requisite for eternal happiness, as well as repentance, yet do we not make *too serious* and lofty a matter of God's conferring benefits for *Christ's sake*? In support of this objection our adversaries⁹ refer to

Gen. xxvi. 24—I will bless thee, &c. for Abraham's sake.

Exod. xxxii. 13—Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, &c.

Deut. ix. 27—Remember thy servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, &c.

Nothing very great is implied, say the objectors, in these expressions; why should we entertain so high an idea of similar ones in the New Testament about Christ? The passages alleged seem to establish the *general principle*, that God may confer benefits on a number from respect to the merit of *one*: how high our notions shall be, must depend on the greatness of the person, and the importance of the benefit.

The distinction which Abraham had enjoyed, in the sight of God, afforded Moses a good topic in pleading for the Israelites; the better on account of the covenant actually subsisting. I should be unwilling to admit an argument against faith,
 313 taken from the attention paid to the "father of the faithful." All representations of God's conferring benefits for the sake of Christ, must be inadequate; yet we see the principle in common life. You do good to the son of your *benefactor*, for his father's sake; and sometimes a *society* receives benefit as such; so that each member is benefited merely because he is

⁶ Reasonableness of Christianity; Works, vol. II. pp. 630, 631, quoted by Jon. Edwards in his Sermons, 12mo, p. 125.

⁷ Introduction to Part II. of Articles, sect. 8.

⁸ Art. x. sect. 41.

⁹ Famil. Illustr. p. 53.

a member. If a *regiment* is honoured, each recruit enlisted III. into it shares in the honour¹. It is not therefore difficult to conceive that the merit of Christ may benefit every member of that society of which he is the Head.

Nor is it necessary, because God forgives *mankind* "for Christ's sake," that he should never shew any favour to any *individual* for the sake of worth in some one, on whom that individual depends, or with whom he is connected. The divine goodness shewn to the race of Abraham is no argument against the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ.

27. Suppose it were right that we should profess faith in Christ; yet, when his death is called a *sacrifice*², are we not, say the Socinians, to consider the expression as *figurative*, or *metaphorical*? in the same manner, I suppose, as when the Apostle says, "but to *do good* and to communicate forget not; for with *such sacrifices*³ God is well pleased?"

I have considered this matter⁴, but I own I *dare* not say, 314 with Taylor⁵, that the blood of Christ means *only* his *obedience* and goodness; though, at the same time, I would not affirm that, *without* the *moral* part, the blood would have availed. I take the following method: I suppose a teacher to come into the world with supernatural powers⁶; to be diligent in instructing; to be opposed, and put to *death*. I suppose, after his death, his followers to represent it *in all lights* which could convince and persuade; I can imagine them to preserve some drops of his *blood*⁷; but I cannot conceive persons, in such a situation, to use expressions which would come up to the strength of those found in the New Testament. Would they talk of the shedding of their teacher's blood as *sacrificial*? of its cleansing the world from *all sin*? Would they find out some slaughters of brute animals, which had been

¹ See a Letter under Art. ix. from the Duke de Fitzjames to the French monarch, dated 11th Jan. 1791, about the *Irish* regiments having behaved honourably for generations. The *Swiss* were body-guard to the French king, on account of some service formerly done.

² Famil. Illustr. p. 48. Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 182, &c.

³ Heb. xiii. ver. 15, 16.

⁴ At the time here spoken of I was not aware of Dr. Ogden's two sermons on the death of Christ, as prefigured by the Jewish sacrifices. When I first saw them

(after writing on the subject) I was alarmed to perceive that he had divided those sacrifices in a different manner from mine. However, after reading the Pentateuch with care, my alarm goes off. Dr. Ogden's two sermons, are, notwithstanding, excellent.

⁵ On Romans, Key, chap. viii. Note on Rom. iii. 25. See Lev. xvii. 11.

⁶ Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 172.

⁷ The blood of St. Januarius, the patron saint of Naples, is preserved in that city, and *miraculously* liquefied once a year.

III. instituted, and carried on for *centuries*, so as to *prepare* the world for the death of this *one man*? To suppose such language, when not grounded on reality, is to give up all good sense in these followers; and it is to suppose pretensions wholly incredible. And if this language could be used of the blood of one man, why not of the blood of *others*? If there can be any thing in the character and rank of one man to give propriety to such expressions, will the Socinians allow it to be applied to Jesus? They would have Jesus a mere man; and
 315 yet they would suppose expressions to be used concerning him, so as they cannot be, with propriety, concerning the ordinary death of any mere man.

It is urged, that, as some metaphors are used with regard to the death of Christ⁸, we cannot tell when the scripture-language is proper, when metaphorical. This variety may sometimes occasion difficulty; as may appear from our explanation of terms. There is, no doubt, a figurative *creation*, a figurative *resurrection*, *ascension*, &c.; but does this prevent our believing that there has been a *real* creation and resurrection? We sometimes find God called our *Creator*, sometimes a *rock*, or a *shield*; we know, that the first is *not* a metaphorical name, and that the others *are*. It might require many words to mark out the manner in which the mind makes the distinction, especially in some nice cases; but, in this case, every one must own that it is easy to make. Nor does it seem difficult to distinguish between *sacrifice* in Heb. ix. and sacrifice in Heb. xiii. ver. 15, 16. The latter being metaphorical, and very different from the former, seems to *imply* that the former is *proper*.

In one sense, however, it seems as if there might be some kind of *comparison* in calling the death of Christ a sacrifice; but, though every metaphor is a comparison, every comparison is not a *metaphor*. It may be called a sacrifice by way of *accommodation* and condescension to our conceptions; in the sight of God it may be something of which we have no idea. The nearest representation to the truth which *we* can comprehend, may be, that it is a *sacrifice*; but, if that is the case, it must be deemed, by *us*, a *real* sacrifice as far as we under-
 316 stand it; its effects similar to those of a real sacrifice, though higher than we can fully conceive.

On this account it cannot be said, *either* scriptural expres-

⁸ Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 192.

sions must be interpreted figuratively or literally; if literally, III. they “enforce the belief of proper vicarious punishments,” if figuratively, “they will not oblige us to believe the doctrine of atonement in any sense:” we must “abandon all *middle opinions* ¹.” For, if my idea is right, it may be impossible to ascertain the degree in which the sacrifice of the death of Christ is called so in the way of *comparison*; and therefore *middle opinions* may be very *rational*. We may conceive the scriptural expressions neither to be wholly metaphorical, nor yet to be literal in the same degree as when an ordinary human event is described.

The sacrifice of the death of Christ is most fully treated in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. This therefore has had its authority ² called into question; though it is sometimes quoted in the same manner ³ that we quote it, by the same person who at other times depreciates it. But, when we say a doctrine is *scriptural*, we mean that it can be proved by those books which are now commonly understood to be canonical; and there can be no greater compliment paid to a doctrine, than to shew, that, in order to remove it, you must take away some part of Scripture. It has been sufficiently shewn that the author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* did consider the death of Christ as a *real sacrifice* ⁴, and Christ as a *real Priest* ⁵.

If the death of Christ was a real sacrifice, was it *sin-offering*, or *peace-offering*, or what? There seems to be no necessity that it should correspond precisely to *any one* sort. It might be prefigured by them *all*, and so correspond to them all, in one respect or other; as Bishop *Cleaver* ⁶ observes that the sacrament does, which was instituted as a commemoration of it. It might be a *sin-offering*, as atoning for the sins of the Christian church; it might be a *peace-offering*, as supplicating future benefits; and we know, that Christ as “our *Passover* was sacrificed for us ⁷.” Dr. *Priestley* says, that if Christ “had died as a proper *expiatory sacrifice* ⁸, it might have been expected that he would have died on the *day of expiation*.” But, according to our account, this was no way

¹ Hist. Corr. vol. i. pp. 277, 278.

² Hist. Corr. i. 183. ³ Ib. i. 179.

⁴ Short Defence, p. 10.

⁵ Ib. p. 15, and partic. 16. Hist. Corr. i. 184.

⁶ Two Sermons on the Sacrament, pp. 15, 16; and see Dr. Balguy's 7th Charge.

⁷ Ἐθῶθη. 1 Cor. v. 7.

⁸ Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 194.

III. needful. Christ "our Passover was sacrificed for us" at the time of the Passover; and, though the annual atonement might eminently prefigure his death, yet inferior and more frequent sacrifices seem to have prefigured it also⁹.

When I have tried to think without prejudice on this subject, I have found myself attending to the difference between the death of Christ and a common sacrifice of a brute animal, in this respect. A common sacrifice *originated* from the owner of the animal, (that is, from him who was to be *benefited*) either as *offender*, or as receiver of positive *good*, as the sacrifice was a *sin-offering* or a *peace-offering*; whereas the death of Christ did not originate from the person to be benefited, but from Christ (under compact¹⁰ with his heavenly Father) the
318 *Victim* and Priest, or from the "*wicked hands*"¹¹ who put him to death¹². This I mention, not as explaining the subject, but as a *difficulty* which has occurred to my mind. Dr. *Priestley* has much the same thought. Yet one sees that brutes, and things inanimate could not offer themselves to atone for others. If we suppose that a *man* (who was properly such, as being in *his own disposal*;) by being sacrificed, in any case, *could* atone for another, or that a man should "lay down his life for his *friend*"¹³," we must suppose him to offer *himself*, or not suffer¹⁴ at all: what man could *ask* such a favour of "his friend?" *Moses*¹⁵ offers to devote *himself*, and *St. Paul*¹⁶ seems willing to be held as a *curse* for the Jewish people; but could they have been requested to do this? That Christ *did* offer himself *voluntarily*, seems clear¹⁷; yet, you may say, he did not *compel* the Jews to kill him—they killed him "with *wicked hands*;" no; but he *permitted* them to kill him, when he might have saved himself¹⁸.

The permission is also to be ascribed to his heavenly Father. Still it occurs to a thinking mind, that his death was

⁹ See Heb. ix. 13, 14; x. 11.

¹⁰ John x. 18.

¹¹ Acts ii. 23.

¹² Hist. Corr. i. 187.

¹³ John xv. 13. Rom. v. 7.

¹⁴ There have been *human sacrifices* in which the victims did *not* make *voluntary* offers of their lives; but these were *prisoners* or slaves, or something (Potter, i. 218) considered as being wholly in the power of the sacrificers—as having *no will of their own*. *Children* have passed through the fire to Molech (Lev. xviii.

21, & xx. 2), Micah vi. 7.

Our proposition, on this account, might as well be *limited* to persons who are in their *own disposal*: that idea is essential to *devoting*; but it seems implied, in speaking of a *man*, that he must be a free agent. In Div. Leg. Book IX. there is something about human sacrifices.

¹⁵ Exod. xxxii. 32.

¹⁶ Rom. ix. 3, as an *ανάθεμα*.

¹⁷ John x. 18. Heb. vii. 27.

¹⁸ Matt. xxvi. 53.

foretold; and the thought brings difficulty along with it—diff-III. ficulty perhaps insuperable; but not peculiar to this subject—no more belonging to the death of Christ than to any other 319 voluntary action, whilst we are considering it as foreseen by the Deity. We do not know how God foresees, or influences, and so foretells, any voluntary action; but, in all predictions, man's usual freedom of acting, and choice, is supposed and taken for granted. And if, in this way, we reduce the death of Christ to the class of ordinary voluntary actions, though we may not understand their nature, the difficulty with respect to the death of Christ, as being a voluntary act foretold, is wholly obviated¹.

Another thought which has occurred to me, while I have been reflecting on this subject, is this: *suppose Christ had not died*, what would have been the consequence?—if he had done every thing else as he did, but at last yielded to the agony, which he suffered in his human nature, and had avoided death²? This seems a case of which we are not competent judges. *Facts* must first happen, and then man can look *back* upon them, and form some judgment of them, by reason or analogy; but men cannot *suppose* facts, especially of an extraordinary sort—acts of the divine government—and judge what *would have* arisen from them. Yet we cannot conceive, that, if Christ had 320 avoided death, his *merit* would have been either so great or so evident as it now is; and then the Jewish sacrifices, in that case, what would they have been? like the heathen—acts of piety, not wholly unnatural in times of ignorance, with some tendency to quiet the conscience, and draw forth some religious sentiments; but, in themselves, in the eye of reason, foolish and absurd—continually aiming at that which they could not possibly effect. “For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin³.” But consider these sacrifices as a part of a religion which was but to be *temporary*, whose end was to *prepare* mankind to receive a dispensation *rational* and *universal*, and they themselves become *rational*

¹ Phenomena of nature are solved when they are reduced to a class of ordinary events; though many things remain inexplicable after the solution. Something of the same sort was said with relation to the doctrine of the *Trinity*, Art. i. sect. 8.

² If any one says, that this question had better have been omitted, I answer,

I should be of the same opinion if men, who think deeply about religion, would never discuss it. But as I believe it occurs to many thinking men, and often does harm, it seems best to prevent such harm, as far as possible. The solution here given is not particular, but general; or may easily be made so.

³ Heb. x. 4.

III. and *important*; and whatever first proves them to be important, proves itself to be so likewise: in this light the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is *inestimable*. I have before observed⁴, that the Jewish religion cannot but be true. Can that religion be false which makes those parts of it that at first sight seem weak and idle, to appear firm, wise, and worthy to be ordained, in their particular season, by the counsels of the supreme and all-perfect Being?

28. Upon the whole, then, in what light are we to think that the merits, the sufferings, and the death of Christ, appear in the sight of God? Of this only we can be perfectly certain, that we cannot attain to an adequate conception of the matter: all that we can say is, that there is nothing *incredible*, nothing *inconsistent* with what we know of the *word* or *works* of God, in the doctrine, that the Heavenly Father may regard Christ as a good and virtuous being; and may look favourably on
321 frail and sinful men, *on account* of his having *taught* them, and *suffered* for them; and on account of their being formed into a *society*, of which He is the *Head*. And lastly, that he may regard the death of Christ as something which *we*, as far as we are able to conceive the nature of it, should *call* a *sacrifice*; though the sacrifice of the SON OF GOD must be an event, great, transcendent—above the reach, not only of our comprehension, but even of our imagination.

29. In former Articles, and in that to which our present disquisition is an Appendix, we have proposed, as an objection, this question: Will not the doctrine in hand tend to disgust plain *thinking* men, and men of philosophical minds? This objection is not less suitable here than on former occasions.

We may conceive a person of this description to say, 'Surely this matter, about men's being made eternally happy on account of the Head of our religion, is folly and weakness: one man die to save others—how groundless the expectation! The *innocent* punished for the guilty, and that by the immediate appointment of the *Deity*! who could make men happy by a single word, *in a moment*, whenever he pleased, without such a cumbrous *apparatus* of instruments!'

1. The idea of one man's dying to deliver others from destruction or evil, is congenial to the human mind, in a state

⁴ Book I. chap. xvi. sect. 8. par. vi. or vol. i. p. 141.—See also Book IV. Art. vi. sect. 8 and 9.

of simplicity¹. *Curtius*² leaped into the gulf for that purpose: III. we have already mentioned Moses and St. Paul; and we find 322 the high priest of the Jews rebuking the council for not recollecting this truth: "it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not³." He spoke this, indeed, as high priest, and his speech was prophetic; but to his hearers it would, at the moment, appear as an instance of an acknowledged maxim. I do not say that a person may not devote himself through enthusiasm, and without reason. Indeed, reason cannot justify such devoting, in affairs divine or human, but on the known acceptance of him who has the power of remitting punishment; but still I should be cautious of declaring, wholly and peremptorily, against a mode of expiation, into which men, in different ages and situations, seem to have been led by a *natural sentiment*.

The *Decii* devoted themselves. See Kennet's Antiquities, Index, *Decii*; or Book IV. chap. viii. p. 198; with a passage about them from *Juvenal*, Sat. VIII. 254.

2. The *innocent* punished for the guilty: this is a palmary objection⁴. After observing that the sufferings of Christ were *voluntary*, I would ask, what this objection really *means*? Does it mean, that a doctrine cannot be of God which implies that a worthy man suffers, and that wicked men derive good from his sufferings? surely that happens commonly, in the course of God's government of this world; and that inconvenience, which frequently occurs under the Divine Providence, cannot prove any dispensation, under which it does occur, not to be divine. What was said under the ninth Article⁵, on the 18th chapter of *Ezekiel*, might be recollected here. But, when 323 it is said that the innocent are *punished for* the guilty, we are apt to be misled by words. Punishment, in the strict sense⁶, implies *guilt*; consequently, in that sense, it cannot be said that the *innocent* are *punished*; nor is it true that worthy men have evil inflicted on them by *authority*, as no one can have authority to inflict evil on innocence. In all cases, therefore, where it is said that the innocent are punished for the guilty, punishment must be taken in its *popular* sense, and mean no

¹ The story of *Iphigenia* would not have been made a subject for the *drama*, if spectators, auditors, readers, had not been likely to be affected by it. The story of *Coresus* and *Callirhoë* shews the same principle with that mentioned

by the high priest of the Jews.

² Liv. vii. 6.

³ John xi. 50.

⁴ Famil. Illustr. p. 51. Butler's Anal. Part II. chap. v. p. 253, 12mo.

⁵ Art. ix. sect. 38.

⁶ Sect. 16. Ludlam, Essay 2d, p. 25.

III. more than *suffering*. The innocent, then, *suffer* for the guilty. This still rather gives a wrong idea; because it is not the law of God's government generally expressed, but only a particular case of that general law. The law seems to be, properly, *men* suffer for one another—sometimes the more worthy for the less worthy; but sometimes the less worthy for the more worthy: which shall suffer, seems partly accidental. It is plain enough, that whatever ⁷ *unites* men is beneficial to them; and common sufferings must tend to union, as well as common enjoyments. But this need not be insisted on here. We are not justifying the ways of the God of Nature: we are only endeavouring to shew, that what happens according to the doctrine of *atonement*, happens *also* in a course of *nature*. Christ's suffering for mankind is certainly no more contrary to *justice*, than a *soldier's* stepping before his comrade, or commander, in battle, and receiving the deadly stroke of the enemy; though Christ died, "the *just* for the *unjust* ⁸."

324 3. As to God's making men happy when he *pleased*, without the *intervention* of suffering, or of a Mediator, it admits of little or no doubt: as far as we have any idea, he certainly could; and, if he had done so, we could have found no fault. But neither ought we to make any difficulty if he has made use of *intermediate steps*. It is perfectly agreeable to the course of *nature* that this should be done; and therefore doing it might be the effect of the divine wisdom. As Bishop Butler⁹ and Dr. Taylor¹⁰ have written well on this matter, I will read you a passage or two from their writings.

And it has been generally thought that we may go one step farther than saying, that we ought to make *no objection* to God's using instruments in effecting our salvation. According to some thinking men, we may venture to say, that the Christian dispensation, by representing God as using means, points out more strongly the *importance* of virtue, and the danger of vice, than an unconditional pardon would have done¹¹. "This," says Bp. Butler, "has never yet been answered, and is, I think, plainly *unanswerable*."

30. I will mention no more objections singly; but it might not be amiss here, as under the second Article, to

⁷ Art. ix. sect. 30. ⁸ 1 Pet. iii. 18.

⁹ Analogy, Part II. chap. v. beginning.

¹⁰ On Romans, Key, par. 150. Some of the arguments here proposed are urged

and illustrated in my Poem on *Redemption*.

¹¹ Dr. Balguy's Pref. to his Father's Tract, p. vi. Bp. Butler, Anal. II. v. towards the end.

mention a few *cautions*, each of which would enable a reader III. of controversy to solve several objections. Indeed, the same which were there mentioned might be equally useful here; and I can scarcely conceive that any one, who had attentively 325 applied those cautions to the cases by which they are exemplified, could want any farther directions about them. I will therefore content myself with a very few instances. The first, second, and third cautions I will pass over, though they might possibly be of some use with regard to our Saviour's sufferings, and the dignity of his character; but I will mention, as an instance of the fourth, about partial quotations, what Dr. Priestley¹ says of the *scape-goat*, that "The phrase, *bearing sin*, is never applied to the Old Testament but to the *scape-goat*:" whereas those who examine *farther*² will find this observation not well founded—any more than the affirming that our doctrine is not delivered in the *Gospels* or Acts of the Apostles. After what we have seen cited from Scripture about justification by faith, it may appear strange to be told, that the Apostles never once "directly assert the insufficiency³ of our good works alone to entitle us to the favour of God and future happiness." Had any one read such an assertion, and examined no farther, how would he have been deceived!

The fifth caution may be kept in mind, though there does not seem to be so much occasion for it here as under the second Article: it is indeed often applicable with regard to metaphorical expressions; but of these we have spoken separately. The argument of our adversaries here meant is this: because a certain word bears this sense in this passage, it cannot bear another sense in another passage. Any one might try the sense of "*for us*⁴," as equivalent to, "on our account,"—"for our 326 benefit." Or the sense of *bearing* our sins, for taking them away by *reforming* us; any one may ask whether it is natural to say, that Christ *reformed* us "in his own body on the tree⁵."

The sixth caution concerning the particular views, wishes, prejudices, of those who are adduced as authorities, may always be usefully kept in mind, while we are reading controversy.

Of the seventh caution, I will give an *instance*. Read first 1 Cor. i. 12, 13, with 1 Cor. iii. 5, and then *substitute* the

¹ Famil. Illustr. p. 51. Hist. Corr. 1. 203.

² Short Defence, pp. 75, 76. *Barnabas* has something about the *scape-goat*

being a *type* of Christ. Epistle, sect. 7.

³ Hist. Corr. 1. p. 165.

⁴ Ibid. p. 199.

⁵ 1 Pet. ii. 24.

III. name of *Stephen*⁶, or any other martyr, for that of Christ, in the expressions concerning the efficacy of Christ's death; and you will perceive how unscriptural they will appear. Yet we are told that the Quakers have held that "the blood of Christ was no more than the blood of any other saint⁷."

What was just now said about Christ's *bearing* our sins in his own body on the tree, implied a substitution.

31. I have now done with proof of every sort. If we keep up our method, we shall make some kind of *application*; consisting of a form of *assent*, mutual *concessions*, and hints about *improvements*. A form of *assent* can only be a declaration of the truth of the *proposition* which we have been endeavouring to prove. But we might see whether any similar proposition would hold good on principles of *natural religion*. Might not an *heathen* profess something of the following sort—referring to his declaration under the preceding Article?

327 'Howsoever I may labour to form my principles, I must not neglect the religion of my *country*, whether its ordinances consist in *sacrifices*, or in any other modes of worship. It is a *relief* to the mind merely to *attempt* to expiate sin; though I feel the *imperfection* of sacrificing brutes. I have read of people's *devoting* themselves, in order to save others from destruction; I know of no instance in later ages; and all undertakings of such sort must be *vain*, unless they are known to be *ratified* by Heaven. But if any such thing should ever take place, I should feel the plan as one *consolatory* to my mind, as acknowledging the importance of virtue and the danger of vice; and I should embrace it as far as lay in my power.'

32. The *Christian* might make his profession in some form like that before used: 'I believe that God will confer eternal happiness on all sincere Christians, notwithstanding some imperfections of theirs, on account of the merits, the sufferings, and the death of Jesus Christ.'

33. If we consider what mutual *concessions* might be made by contending parties, we may conceive that each might contribute something towards a coalition.

We, possibly, might compile some *scriptural forms*, which we might use in a literal sense, our adversaries in a meta-

⁶ Short Defence, p. 23.

⁷ Leslie's Works, fol. vol. 11. p. 195; and quoted in Jones's Preservative, p. 26.

phorical one. We might acknowledge that of the Counsels of III. Heaven, with regard to the grounds and *reasons* of the redemption of the world, we *know nothing*¹; and that some kind of *comparison* is implied even in what we call *literal* accounts of the Christian Sacrifice. Comparison is not very 328 remote from *metaphor*.

Our *adversaries* might allow us some use of those expressions which we *dare*² not wholly give up. Surely they might bring themselves to own, that our salvation has *some* reference to the merits of our spiritual Lord, the Head of our body. I know a Socinian who will use that language freely—one who has shewn his sincerity by giving up his clerical profession and collegiate establishment.

Both parties are proceeding in *one way*³, though they may be helped forward by different *motives*. Both own the *mercy* of God; both ascribe to it the salvation of mankind; though we suppose it to use some *means* which they do not. But of these means our ideas are so indefinite, as to produce propositions nearly unintelligible; the nature of which, we know, is such as to diminish greatly the difference between affirmative and negative⁴.

34. As to *improvements*, when men differ much on any subject, it is always to be hoped, that some *new views* of the principles, or fundamental parts of that subject, will finally bring about an agreement. In the present subject, perhaps something might be done by giving still more attention than has been given, to the nature of *sacrifices*, heathen and Jewish. It seems as if we ought to go entirely upon *facts*, and not suffer ourselves to run into anything which can properly be called an *hypothesis*. In this cautious conduct we should be 329 much assisted by attending to the *errors* into which divines have already run, who did not ground their researches on *experiment*; in which we include knowledge of the written word of God, as well as of his *works*.

¹ Dr. Balguy, p. 201. Butler's Anal. p. 250, 12mo. Part II. chap. v.

² Warburton on the Holy Spirit, p. 339 (near end).

³ "See that ye fall not out by the way." Gen. xlv. 24. This was said by Joseph to his brethren.

⁴ Book III. chap. x. sect. 9.

III.
330

ARTICLE XII.

OF GOOD WORKS.

ALBEIT that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet they are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

1. We have already said many things which might have been said under this Article. Whatever is said of *faith*, has some relation to good works; they are often opposed to each other, and always connected. As I shall endeavour to avoid repetition and tautology, the *history* of this Article will be short; though I mean to observe the same method as in the preceding.

This Article was not amongst those of 1552. It was added in 1562; in order, probably, to recommend the Reformation to many rational and worthy persons, and to check some mischiefs which had been growing in the preceding ten years. Indeed, it appears that the Reformers, Calvin and Luther, had said some harsh things⁵, which wanted softening, though they have been softened in most of the confessions of the Reformed. Mr. *Ridley*, in his *Life of Bishop Ridley*⁶, speaks of the "wild conclusions of some *Solifidians* and *Antinomians*;" also, of the Antinomians' unoperative faith, and "the *Gospellers*⁷ fond persuasion of being in God's favour without works." And we find it an expression of the times, that "*carnal liberty*⁸" was to be apprehended, from a wrong notion of the doctrine of justification by *faith alone*; and those who ran into abuse of carnal liberty seem to have been called *Libertini*⁹.

⁵ See Nicholls on the Article: he quotes from *Luther de Lib. Christ.* And from Calvin, *Inst.* 3. 14.

⁶ Page 345, and 352.

⁷ *Gospellers* mentioned before, *Art. x.* sect. 12.

⁸ *Ridley's Life*, page 351. *Homilies*,

p. 20, octavo. (2d on Salvation).

⁹ Mosheim, *Cent. xvi.* 3. ii. 33. *Strype's Annals*, vol. II. p. 451. *Dickinson's Letters*. Contents of *Baxter's 11th Conference* in his *Catholic Theology*, Book II. *Libertine* is one of the persons of the *Dialogue*.

2. It is not till very lately that I have read the ninth III. book of the Divine Legation of Moses. The idea contained in it is something like this: Man was first in a state of nature and under *natural religion*; this was before he was placed in *Paradise*. During that time his good moral conduct, or obedience to *natural law*, might get him a reward, though not an *eternal* reward; his *soul* was formed *capable* of separate existence, after death; and his *reason* made him *accountable*; but his hopes of futurity must be *indefinite*. His *repentance* might restore him to favour. But in *Paradise* he was under *revealed* religion; and his peculiar obedience was to a *positive* duty given in *addition* to moral duties; at least, the *peculiar reward* of his situation, which was *immortality*, depended on his abstaining from the *forbidden fruit*—forbidden, not by *natural law*, but by *positive* injunction. On his disobedience he was *sent back* into his state of *nature*, and every thing was as *at first*. At length the *Jewish* dispensation prepared the way, and Christianity, “in the fulness of time,” followed. Again man was under *revealed* religion; again his reward *immortality*—a *free* gift, which was to follow on his *faith only*. Thus faith was enjoined, but by a *positive*¹ injunction; yet this free gift of immortality was not to be bestowed on all indiscriminately, though they professed the faith; there was a requisite *qualification*, that is, *virtue*, or *good works*. Thus justification by *faith* was *founded* on virtue, instead of opposing it. I fear I scarcely do justice to this system, but to have some idea of it will be useful to us. 332

3. It may be proper to have some notion of the manner in which some persons, usually called *Methodists*, have expressed themselves with regard to good works; I will read a passage or two for that purpose².

4. It does not seem needful to go *farther* into historical remarks, on the present Article. I will, therefore, come to the *explanation*.

5. “*Albeit that.*”—These words imply a connection with the *preceding* Article; and, as it seems to me, an apprehension of *danger* from it—a *fear* lest it should be understood, that, because faith is the principle, or disposition, which a person

¹ Faith is a *natural* principle, I think, supposing Christianity; but Christianity not being natural, faith, its fundamental principle, may be called *positive*. I see

not, however, that Bishop Warburton had this idea.

² Letter to Mr. Berridge;—or *Principles* and *Practices*, pp. 56, 58.

III. has when he *enters* into the society of Christians, and by which therefore he becomes *interested* in the merits of Christ, and *benefited* by them—lest, I say, it should be understood that a mere sentiment is all that is required of a Christian.

333 6. “*Good works.*”—We have had *two sorts* of good works before—*natural*³ and *Christian*⁴; and in the thirteenth Article we have “*works,*” without the epithet “*good.*” The good works here meant are of the *Christian* sort. This is implied in the connection between this Article and the preceding; which connection says, or implies, that although *Christians* are justified by faith, *they* must not neglect *virtue*. We find these works, on a solemn occasion, called “*works of grace*⁵ ;” and, in the *Necessary Doctrine*, “*works of righteousness* ;” where these good works are opposed to good works of *penitents* ; and “*al the good workes of a true Christen man*” are divided into *three branches*, according to the exhortation of St. Paul⁶, that we should live soberly, justly, and devoutly—that is, in the practice of duties towards God, our neighbours, and ourselves. The good works here spoken of admit of various *degrees* of goodness : some may be nearer to perfection, some farther off. In some texts of Scripture, absolute perfection seems to be intended ; but then that is *ideal* perfection—something to be *aimed at* ; of which we shall speak hereafter. At present, the idea seems to be, of good qualities not beyond the reach of *probability*—of actions *popularly* called good—not inconsistent with some *sins* which are to be “*put away* :” such actions as are called “*of themselves unworthy, unperfect*⁷, *unsufficient.*”

334 Under these good works are comprehended good *sentiments*⁸—faith, repentance, “*inward spiritual workes, mocions, and desires, as the love and feare of God*⁹,” &c. : as, under the ninth Article, bad sentiments were put upon a footing¹⁰ with *bad actions*.

7. “*Which are the fruits of Faith.*”—These words only seem to be a farther description of *Christian* good works. The comparison will occur again, between good actions as springing from faith, and fruits from a tree.

³ Art. x. sect. 28.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 33; and Art. xi. sect. 18.

⁵ By a dying Papist, Dr. Redman. See Ridley, p. 351.

⁶ Titus ii. 12.

⁷ Necessary Doctrine, under *Good Workes*. Homily, p. 12, octavo.

⁸ “*Keep the commandments.*” *Loving* God is the first and great *commandment*; the second is love of *man*. On these *commandments* hang all the law and the prophets.

⁹ Nec. Doct.

¹⁰ Art. ix. sect. 30.

8. “*And follow after Justification.*”—This expression III. has seemed somewhat difficult; but it means no more than the preceding expression, to characterize *Christian* good works. Our being *admitted* into Christianity is sometimes called our being *justified*, because it was sometimes called so by the *sacred writers*, and because, on our admission, we are put into a *state* of justification—into a *way*¹ of being eternally happy, if all things go on well; we are said to be, even *then*, *saved*². But as we may lose our way, and not be “accounted righteous” at the day of judgment, or *finally*, this justification at admission is sometimes distinguished, when there is need of distinction, (and not else) by the name of our *first* justification; and the other, our being accounted righteous at the day of judgment, is called our *final* justification. This has been mentioned before³, but may be repeated usefully, both here and in 335 the next Article⁴.

That this account agrees with the language used at the time of the Reformation, a few instances will be sufficient to prove. The *Necessary Doctrine*⁵, speaking of Christian good workes, calls them such as “men truly *justified* and so continuing,” do work—“workes of righteousness in *Christ*, whiche he cannot do *afore* he be *justified*.” In the Article of Justification, *Baptism* is mentioned, as the way “by the whiche God hath determined that man beyng of age and commyng to Christendome shuld be *justified*.” In the *Homily* on Salvation (third part) it is said, “Our office (officium, duty,) is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, *after* that we are *baptized* or *justified* :” and in that on *Fasting* (one of the *second* book of Homilies)—“Good workes go not before in him, which shall afterward be justified, but good workes do follow *after* when a man is first justified.” This is taken from *Augustin de fide et operibus*. And immediately afterwards, good workes are spoken of as “*testimonies* of our justification⁶.”

¹ This seems to be expressed, Titus iii. 7: “Being *justified* by his *grace*, we should be made *heirs* according to the *hope* of eternal life.”

² Art. ix. sect. 32; Art. x. sect. 29; and Art. xi. sect. 14.

³ Art. xi. sect. 14.

⁴ Justification, between the first and the final, is supposed *variable*—some-

times increasing, sometimes decreasing. There are several expressions to this purpose in Cranmer’s *Necessary Doctrine*. It is not paged; but in the Articles on justification and good workes the passages are easily found.

⁵ There are two passages to our present purpose in Ridley’s *Life*, p. 347.

⁶ Also see Jon. Edwards, p. 32.

III. There is the more need of this account of justification, as some of our Christian brethren seem to conceive it as giving them a title to *eternal* happiness, which cannot be *forfeited*. All justification must be ascribed to the *grace* of God, in some sense⁷; and the grace of God is connected with the influence of his *Holy Spirit*. Hence an idea seems to have been formed, out of all these things, that when we are received into the divine *favour* we are *inspired*, and so informed or *assured* of our acceptance. And the inspiration is, I believe, called *justifying grace*⁸; and is made equivalent to *regeneration*, or *conversion*. I imagine that all this is a good deal owing to our seldom, if ever, using the word justification as it is used in our Article and Homily, as synonymous to *baptism*⁹.

It may perhaps bear a doubt, whether all the Article, so far, is not a mere *subject*, or *nominative case*; as if it had been said, 'Although *such* good works *as* are the fruits of faith, and follow justification, cannot,' &c. If this be right, there is not here any *assertion* or proposition, that good works *are* the fruits of faith, &c. Bennet and Vener make that a *proposition*. There is no authentic copy of the Articles; on that account conjecture may have the freer scope. In the *Latin*, in Bishop Sparrow's collection, and Bishop Burnet's copy, there is no comma after "Bona opera:" "Bona opera quæ sunt fructus fidei," &c. The more I look at the Article, and compare the beginning with the end of it, the more I am inclined to this construction; and no one, I believe, has any right to censure my adopting it.

337 9. "Cannot put away our sins."—the Latin is, *expiare*. This implies that the Christian is *liable* to sin—a truth which has been disputed. It has been in some measure proved under the ninth Article¹⁰, and will occur again under the fifteenth and sixteenth. This expression also marks the *imperfection* of Christian good works, in the notion of our Church, as before. Yet it is conceivable that some persons might understand, by the sins here spoken of, sins committed *before* admission into Christianity.

⁷ 1 Cor. vi. 11. We have washing, or *baptism*, *sanctification*, (or being set apart as sacred) *justification*, and *inspiration*, all together. But these words mean nothing more than *baptism*, with the *privileges* which attend it, supposing men to do their part faithfully.

⁸ This expression is used Art. xi. s. 4.

⁹ For *conversion*, see opening of letter to Mr. Berridge, Principles, &c. *Regeneration* sometimes is equivalent to *baptism*, as in Art. ix. sect. 24. The Methodical notion of regeneration, see Principles, &c. p. 30. ¹⁰ Art. ix. sect. 32.

10. “*And endure the severity of God’s Judgment.*”—III. When we regard the effects of our good works on our *past* offences, we look *backwards*; when we think of their effects on our *future* life, we look *forwards*¹. In the former case, we perceive sins distinctly; in the latter case, we see that it is *possible in theory*, that we may avoid each sin, and therefore all sin; but it is so *improbable*, that we have no expectation of any man’s being so perfect; and therefore we say, popularly, speaking from our *feelings*, that it is *impossible*². A man’s whole life is judged together. “The *severity* of God’s judgment,” means, “judgment without mercy³.”—Actions might not endure that, which might be favourably received on a footing of *candour* and *indulgence*.

11. *Yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God, in Christ.*—“*Pleasing*,”—we may apply to this word what has been said concerning the *displeasure*⁴ of God. Actions may be *pleasing* to one in authority, which cannot *acquit* an offender. Humanity in a robber, shewn in restraining his associates, 338 must be pleasing to a judge, though the offender must still be considered as a robber. We have had “good works *pleasant* and acceptable to God,” in the tenth Article⁵—meaning the same thing with “pleasing and acceptable,” in this.

“*In Christ*”—on account of Christ, for his *sake*. In Eph. iv. 32, we have, “for Christ’s sake:” in the original it is ἐν Χριστῷ.

12. The rest of this Article must be read *together*: indeed, I know not whether the *Article* might not be said to *end* here.

“And do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.”

It was before said, that good works “are the fruits of faith.” Whether that is *proposition*, or *definition*, it would be idle and unmeaning to say, ‘the fruits of faith spring out from faith, as fruits from a tree.’ The compilers of our Articles were men of sense, and of improved minds. They would not use such language; nor shall we get the *true sense* of the Article till we avoid it. Let us then suppose the main part of

¹ Something like this, Art. xi. sect. 18, end.

² Art. x. sect. 25, and before that; as Art. ix. sect. 12 and 35, end; and Intro. to Second Part, sect. 4.

³ James ii. 13.

⁴ Book I. chap. xix. and Art. ix. sect. 22.

⁵ “Acceptable and pleasant to God,” Hom. on Faith, first Part, p. 27, 8vo, top.

III. the Article to come to an *end* with the words, “pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ;” and the rest to be *added* in order, at the same time, to apologize for the addition of this twelfth Article, and to forward the end and design of adding it. The meaning of the last sentence might then be, ‘What is here expressed was in reality *implied* under the preceding Article; for, if *faith* be taken for that honest⁶ vital *principle* which, in common sense, it must be taken for, it must *of course* produce the *works* which are here required. However, lest hypocritical men should make *pretensions* to a principle of true Christianity, which they really have not, it seems best to *obviate* such pretensions, and to declare, not only that virtue is acceptable to God, but that no man⁷ must *pretend* to be a Christian who neglects it; that if any one has a true Christian faith, it will be sure to work by love⁸, and to shew itself in virtuous habits of every kind. God can know a right faith intuitively, but man can only judge of its reality and its nature by the works which it produces.’ “I will *shew* thee” (says St. James ii. 18) “my faith by my works.” If we take the words in this light, it seems to me that the different parts of the Article are rightly connected together, and form one legitimate logical whole. Christian works, though *imperfect*, are *pleasing* to God; we must not *neglect* them because we are justified by *faith*: indeed, our faith itself will not be what the Scripture supposes, if we do.

13. Perhaps this may appear more plain, if we take notice of a few particular expressions in the sentence.

“*Necessarily*”—does not in itself seem to imply a *strict* or absolute necessity; but only what we call necessity in a *popular* sense⁹. If there is a right faith, virtue will spring out of it in the *common course* of things; yet so as to allow of some variety of *degrees*, and of some *failures*. In the affirmation, a *comparison* is contained: as therefore “a tree planted by the water-side, that will bring forth his fruit in due season¹⁰,” is liable, for a time, to miss producing its proper fruit; and the description is only intended to correspond to the ordinary state of things, to that on which we *act*; so it is with faith.

⁶ Art. xi. sect. 17.

⁷ See opening of Homily on Faith, 3d Part, p. 32, octavo. “No man should think that he hath that lively faith,” &c.; and 2d Part, p. 30, 8vo, every man must (by this criterion) “examine and

try *himself* diligently,” &c.

⁸ Gal. v. 6.

⁹ How common this sense is, has been lately seen under sect. 10, by the number of instances there referred to.

¹⁰ Psalm i. 3.

14. What faith is, we have before defined¹; but what, III. you may ask, is “a *true* and *lively* faith?” Why nothing more than faith, without any epithets. *True*, or *real*, is only used when people are likely to call something faith which really is not such; which no plain honest man would conceive to be meant when we argue about faith; no man who had a common understanding, and was free from all design and perverseness. “*Lively*” is the word which was used at the Reformation for *living*, in opposition to *dead*. “A *lively* sacrifice,” in our communion office, is opposed to the offering of a *dead*² victim. One might say, a *true and lively tree*, as well as a true and lively faith; but every one would think the epithets superfluous, in speaking about *fruit-trees*³, or any trees where growth and produce were implied; and would be apt to cry out, ‘how could you *imagine* that I meant, by a *fruit-tree*, one that was cut down, and fit only for *fuel*⁴?’

In our *Homily*⁵ of Salvation, “*lively*” is opposed to 341 “*dead* :” “That faith which bringing forth” either evil works or no good works “is not a right, pure, and *lively* faith, but a *dead*, devilish, counterfeit, and feigned faith.” The epithet “*devilish*” is used in reference to that fine verse of St. James, “the devils also believe—and tremble.”

15. “*Discerned*.”—To discern is to see the *difference*: a tree may be “*discerned* by the fruit,” should mean, one may tell whether a tree is a *vine* or a *fig-tree*, by its bearing *grapes* or *figs*. According to this, one should judge of the *kind* of principles which a man has by his actions; but the *Article* only seems to intend to say, that you shall judge whether a man has a *living* or a *dead* faith by his doing good works, or *no* good works: as you may judge whether a tree is *alive* or *dead* by its bearing or *not* bearing; so that one need not con-

¹ Art. xi. sect. 17.

² The sentence is taken from Rom. xii. 1, where the word is, “*living*.”

³ See the note about reconciling St. Paul and St. James, Art. xi. sect. 27.

⁴ A gentleman’s porter in London, who used to send parcels into the country, with a bill, put in one of his bills of parcels the article, “*A live dog* :” the epithet *live* was voted superfluous, because no one would think of having a *dead* dog sent by a waggon into the country. And the epithet *lively*, or *living*, would be equally superfluous when

joined to faith, if hypocrisy had never made it useful. Our first homily on faith mentions “the living body of a *man* :” if any one, who promised to send *twenty men*, sent *twenty dead men*, he would scarcely be thought to have fulfilled his promise. This, though not the thought of the homily, is implied in the last verse of the second chapter of St. James’s Epistle.

⁵ Third Part, p. 23, 8vo. See also opening of Hom. on Faith, 2d Part, and p. 30.

III. receive *two kinds* of trees, but only one kind—one tree dead, and another alive. Indeed the Latin word for discerned is only “*judicari*,” and the corresponding word about faith, “*known*.”

16. I put an end to this explanation by observing, that, as a tree may bear fruit *unequally* in different years, or even sometimes *miss* bearing, without being *dead*, so we may perhaps conceive even a *lively* faith to be not wholly inconsistent with some *inequalities* and *deficiencies*. Yet most *usually*, fruit-trees bear fruit; and illustrations by comparison go upon the ordinary course of things. So this comparative excuse must not be carried too far.

17. We come next to our *proof*; the first business of which is always to see what *propositions* will want proving.

1. Good works of Christians cannot put away or expiate past sins.

2. They cannot endure *judgment*, on a footing of strict *justice*.

3. They are “*pleasing* and acceptable to God.”

4. The ground on which they are so is a regard, in God, to *Christ*.

5. When *faith* is enjoined in Scripture it is supposed productive, or *vital*; as much as when a *man* is commanded to do anything, he is supposed to be *alive*.

18. Good works of Christians cannot put away or expiate past *sins*. This seems self-evident; or, no reason can be assigned why they *should*. Suppose an *hundred* good actions, could they make any man innocent who had committed murder, robbery, adultery, &c.? Most wicked men perform many actions, which are innocent, or even useful: even a robber robs but *seldom*. Besides, those actions of Christians which are called good works are in fact *imperfect*, and are allowed to be so. And moreover, remission must be an *act of God*: we cannot see how it can be the *immediate* effect of human *actions*: when they are instrumental to our remission, it must be because they are *made so* by the Divine *Goodness*.

19. Good works of Christians (such as are commonly called so) cannot endure *judgment*, on a footing of strict *justice*.

343 If all men have sinned, and Christian good works cannot expiate sin, this must follow; for a man's *whole* life will be judged *at once*.

But, under the preceding Article¹, we have already shewn III. that we are not accounted righteous before God for our own works.

The judgment here spoken of is understood, I imagine, to be made with a view to *eternity*. Now whatever some men may think our good works deserve, no reasonable man can think that they deserve an *eternity* of *supreme happiness*. This is farther insisted on by Bp. Warburton, in the ninth Book² of his Divine Legation.

20. The good actions of Christians are *pleasing* to God.

This is our *principal* proposition, under the present Article. But, in proving it, I would not confine myself to those texts which mention Christian virtue merely as *pleasing* or acceptable to the Deity. I would also mention some of those which represent it as the *great end*³ of the Christian dispensation; for it is evident, that whatever accomplishes the main purpose of Christianity, must be pleasing to him from whom it proceeded. We may add, that those actions which God *rewards* must be acceptable to him; and so must the *opposites* to such as he *punishes*. The best and *fullest* proof of our present proposition, that I know of, is in *Taylor's Key* to the Apostolic writings: it begins at paragraph 167, and extends to 288. All that I can now do is to select a few of the plainest texts; such as shew themselves to be to our purpose, without any comment; and conclude with his conclusion: though I would recommend 344 a *full* consideration of the proof to each *student*, that he may be the better prepared not only for preaching Christian virtue, but for reading the arguments of Antinomians, and of those who favour the agency of God on the human mind in the greatest degree.

That *our Church* does *allow* virtue to be the *main end* of Christianity, seems true. In the *Necessary Doctrine*, &c. the Part on *Good Workes* begins thus: "All preachynge and learnynge of the worde of God in Christis church, ought to tende to this ende, that men maie be induced, not onely to *knowe* God, and to *beleve* and *truste* in hym, but also to honour and *serve* hym with *good workes*," &c. And our *Homily*, second part on Faith⁴, says, "All Holy Scripture beareth

¹ Art. xi. sect. 23.

² Page 630, 4to.

³ There is, indeed, another great end of Christianity, which ought never to

be overlooked—procuring *forgiveness* of sins, without which virtue could not attain its reward.

⁴ Page 30, 8vo.

III. witness, that a *true lively* (the epithets of our Article) faith in Christ doth bring forth good works.”

But to come to our *selection*.

Matt. v. 16 — Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good *works*.

——— 20 — except your *righteousness* shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes, &c. ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

——— vii. 21 — *doing* the *will* of God is greatly preferred to calling Christ Lord.

——— 23 — Christ tells the workers of *iniquity*, that he never knew them; even though they had *prophesied* and wrought *miracles* in his name.

345 The *parables* of the Virgins, Talents, &c. aim to promote good *works*.

Luke i. 75—gives a *general* idea of *Christians* as serving God in holiness and righteousness.

In the Acts of the Apostles, the thing proclaimed on great occasions—on eminent publications of Christianity, is, God sent Christ to bless you in turning away every one of you from his *iniquities*.

Acts x. 2 — Cornelius, representing the Gentiles, is commended as devout, giving much *alms* to the people, and performing the duty of prayer.

——— ver. 35 — religion and *righteousness* are *accepted*.

——— xvii. 30, 31 — the Athenians are taught, that under Christianity men are to *repent*, and to be judged in righteousness.

——— xx. 21 — the Ephesians are instructed to unite *repentance* towards God with *faith* towards Jesus Christ.

——— xxiv. 16—St. Paul declares to Felix, that his principal aim is, to have a *conscience* void of offence.

——— ver. 25—He reasons publicly to Felix on *righteousness*, *temperance*, and a future judgment.

——— xxvi. 18, 20—He solemnly tells Agrippa, that his commission was, to turn men from the power of *Satan* unto *God*; to call upon them to *repent*, and to do *works* meet for repentance.

Rom. vi. 4, 22—We are persuaded to walk in newness of *life*; to have our fruit unto *holiness*.

- Rom. xii. 1—We are to make ourselves a *living* sacrifice, III. (Liturgy, *lively*.) holy, *acceptable*. 346
- 1 Cor. vi. 20—Christ hath bought us with a price; and therefore we are to glorify God in *body* and spirit.
- xv. 58—We are to be steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the *work* of the Lord: our *labour* will not be in vain.
- 2 Cor. ix. 7—God *loveth* a cheerful giver.
- Galat. v. 6—Faith is to *work* by *love*—or benevolence.
- vi. 9—We are not to be weary in *well-doing*; with future *reward*.
- Ephes. iv. 24¹—The Christian character, (the new man) consists in *righteousness* and *holiness*.
- Phil. iv. 8—enumerates the qualities of *virtuous* actions; with warm feeling.
- 1 Thess. ii. 4—We are to perform moral duties, not as *pleasing* men, but God.
- iv. 7—We are called (or made *Christians*) unto *holiness*.
- 1 Tim. i. 19—Without *conscience* we should make shipwreck concerning *faith*.
- v. 8—He that neglects to provide for his *family* (*οἰκεῖοι*) has denied the *faith*, and is worse than an infidel.
- 2 Tim. ii. 19—Every one that nameth the name of Christ must depart from *iniquity*.
- Titus ii. 14—The *end* of Christ's death was, to *redeem* us 347 from iniquity, and consecrate a set of men zealous of good *works*.
- iii. 8—Believers must be careful to maintain good *works*; *profitable* to mankind.
- Heb. x. 24—Christians must stimulate one another to benevolence and good works.
- xiii. 16—With beneficence God is well *pleased*.
- ver. 18—The proof of a good *conscience* is, a resolution to *live honestly* in all things.
- James ii. 14—26—is capital—celebrated; but should here be read carefully.

¹ In Ephes. ii. compare verse 9 with verse 10, the one against reckoning on works, particularly before becoming a

Christian; the other against neglecting them afterwards.

III. 1 Pet. ii. 20—Patience in the cause of virtue is *acceptable* with God.

———ver. 24—Christ died on the cross for a *moral* purpose; that we should, being dead to *sins*, live to righteousness.

2 Pet. i. 5—We are to add to our *faith* *virtue*.

1 John iii. 8—Christ's *purpose* was, to destroy the *works* of the devil.

———ver. 22—Christians do things *pleasing* in the sight of God.

Though we have made only a *selection*, yet our proof, that Christians are to be virtuous, and may *please* God by being so, is abundant. Nevertheless, it is to be observed, that each Christian is not to pursue what he may call virtue according to his own *fancy* and caprice—without rule or order, without authority, without social regards, without attention to the Scriptures. Our service is to be a “*reasonable service*,” 348 (Rom. xii. 1,) which it certainly cannot be if we neglect the word of God.

21. The ground, on which the good works of Christians are pleasing to God, is a regard to the *merit of Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ).

In the preceding Article², we have proved that we are *justified* by faith, or by the merits of Christ; and in the Appendix³, we have shewn the efficacy of the merit, sufferings, and death of Christ, in removing out of the way our *transgressions* and imperfections; so that they shall not act as impediments to our avoiding the displeasure, and gaining the favour of God. Yet perhaps something might be mentioned which affirms more directly that our good works are accepted through Christ. If, indeed, we are *accounted righteous* through his merits, that is *sufficient*⁴ for our purpose; yet a few passages may *confirm*, and *illustrate*.

Whenever any good is mentioned, which arises from the virtues of men, considered as members of the Church of Christ, or, as it may be expressed, as *members of Christ*, that good must be ascribed to a regard, in God, for Christ. Thus, as we are *branches* of a *vine*⁵, our fruit would be of no value but on account of the stem to which we are united. And

² Art. xi. sect. 24.

³ Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 22.

⁴ Jonathan Edwards speaks to the

same purpose, page 70, on Justification.

⁵ John xv. 4.

members, or limbs, have their proper¹ useful functions through III. their union with the *head*, from whence the nerves proceed. The *endearing* connection marked out Eph. v. 25—33, should not be overlooked. See also Eph. ii. 20, 21, the idea of a *building*.

Again, those virtues which we practise in *imitation* of Christ, must be supposed, when they are accepted, to be 349 accepted on his account. To this purpose we may consult Matt. xi. 29; Eph. v. 2; 1 Pet. i. 15; ii. 20, 21; 1 John ii. 6; iii. 3; and other texts of Scripture. Indeed such conduct as these texts prescribe is something more than mere imitation—it is putting ourselves upon a footing truly Christian.

There are several texts which speak of Christians as *created* unto good works *in Christ*, or *ordained*, &c.; that is, of Christians as *intended* to be holy or virtuous. These works must be accepted; how? surely through Christ. See Rom. viii. 1, 29. Gal. v. 6. Eph. i. 4, 6. Eph. ii. 10. Eph. v. 8, 9. Phil. i. 11. Titus ii. 11, 14.

Christ is called the *Author* of *salvation* unto all them that *obey* him, Heb. v. 9. (Captain, in Heb. ii. 10.)

Rom. xii. 1, must be understood of acceptance on a *Christian* footing, from the argument: and see Rom. xiv. 17, 18. He that in righteousness, &c. “serveth Christ, is *acceptable* to God,” &c.

Our *thanksgiving* and *praise* seem accepted through Christ, Eph. v. 20; Heb. xiii. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 5. And both thanks and services in general, Col. iii. 17.

In Matt. xxv. 40, acts of beneficence, as they are virtually *done to Christ*, must, surely, be accepted by his Father, on his *account*.

Not to multiply passages², I will only refer to 1 Cor. xv. 58; Col. iii. 17, 24; and recommend 2 Pet. i. 11, with what goes before, to consideration; particularly ver. 5.

I conceive this set of texts to be *important*, on account of their tendency to give our *good principles* a right *direction*; to put our *virtues* upon a right *footing*; to make us continually act with *Christian views*, and consider ourselves, not as 350 separate *individuals*, which too many are apt to do, but as connected with other Christians, and with the *Head* of the Church.

¹ Ephes. iv. 15, 16.

² See Homily on Faith, 3d part, latter half.

III. 22. When *faith* is commended in Scripture, it is supposed to be productive of good works.

This is expressed in several of the texts quoted under the third proposition: Matt. vii. 23; Acts xx. 21; Gal. v. 6; 1 Tim. i. 19; Titus iii. 8; 2 Pet. i. 5; and in the second chapter of St. James's Epistle: but our proposition is frequently *implied*³, where it is not expressed. Sometimes the *term* *faith* is not made use of, but some *other word*, importing much the same thing; as in 1 John ii. 3—6. From comparing 1 John v. 1, with 1 John iii. 9, one may *infer* that *faith* doth not commit *sin*. The *faith* spoken of in Heb. xi. may not properly be *Christian* *faith*: of whatever *sort* it be, it was abundantly *productive*. Heb. x. 22—24, is to our purpose; because *faith* is mentioned as affecting, first the *heart*, and then the *actions*.

23. I here put an end to *direct* proof; but it may be proper, as before, to take notice of a few *objections*.

Is there no impropriety in calling works *good* which are acknowledged to be *imperfect*? I see not that there is. To speak so is only to use *popular* language, which the sacred writers themselves do. Anything may, in such language, be called *good* which excites *approbation*; and all actions are approved which are better than might have been *expected*, or as
 351 well. As arts advance, we approve what may hereafter disgust us; and the same is true of *morals*, and virtue, or *good works*. At no stage of the progression could it be said that a man's virtues could, in strictness, *justify* him; yet one man's conduct is greatly preferable to another⁴ man's; and so may be his condition after death⁵. The Deity may, at any time, *accept* our crude and imperfect virtue; something in the same way in which a parent accepts a faulty *drawing* from his child, if it has been done with a good *intention*, and is tolerable for the youth's time of life and *opportunities*. Such imperfect, unformed, good qualities, a parent accepts *as* a parent, from a *family* principle—not as a *judge*: or, at most, as a judge free from *severity*. The *intention* must be deemed the main thing; *actions* are good as expressing good *affections*⁶. God is called “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole *family* in heaven and earth is named” (Eph. iii. 15); and Christians are sometimes called *brethren* of Christ (Heb. ii. 11).

³ As in St. Paul's account of Abraham's faith, Rom. iv. 1—3. See St. James's comment, James ii. 21.

⁴ Homo homini quid præstat! TER.

⁵ Ludlam's Fifth Essay, p. 14.

⁶ Ludlam, Essay vi. p. 33.

24. Another objection we may take as proposed by *Dr. III. Priestley*¹. Some, he says, define faith “by its *effects*”—“in *figurative* language, which conveys no *determinate* ideas, and therefore leaves the mind in great uncertainty whether it be possessed of it or not.” This seems to be an objection levelled at several of the reformed churches. As to ourselves, we have given a plain definition of faith², free from any figure, metaphor, or comparison; nor did our definition turn upon the *effects* of faith. We have, indeed, spoken of its effects as of 352 use in *practice*, to enable a man to judge, not what faith *is*, but whether in fact he *has* the faith meant in Scripture or not; and, one would think, no method of scrutinizing our principles would be more agreeable to the *Socinians*, or tend more to relieve their “uncertainty.” We use virtue also, or the effect of faith, as an help in judging whether any *other man* has faith; at least, so far as to determine that no man must be allowed to have faith, if it produce *no* good effects.

This method leaves a man in no *uncommon* uncertainty about his own principles. In order to know whether he has benevolence, *loyalty*, &c., or deceives himself about them, he must follow the same course.

It is true our Article *compares* faith to a *fruit-tree*, and good works to the fruit; but there seems to be high *authority* for such a comparison, as it is made repeatedly by our Saviour himself³. The vegetable, or vegetative life, answers to the *principle*; and the *fruit* to the *conduct* arising from that principle. The intention of the compilers of our Article in adopting this comparison, seems visible enough: it is to convict *hypocrites* of disingenuousness: and the similitude proves that all, who pretend to faith without being virtuous, are as disingenuous as one who promised to send a dog, and sent a *dead dog*; or a *fruit-tree*, and sent one cut down, and deprived of all its power of vegetation. A comparison, so introduced, is an *argument*; because neither the similarity of the cases can be denied, nor the disingenuousness in the case introduced.

It will seldom happen that we need go deeper than this; 353 yet, to say the truth, we may sometimes be driven, by obstinate cavilling, to descend one step farther. If a man will not be contented with the rational account now given, but will still

¹ Hist. Corr. i. 264.

² Art. xi. sect. 17.

³ Luke vi. 44, referred to in Homily

on Faith, third Part, p. 34, 8vo. John xv. 2.—See also Matt. vii. 20; xii. 33; xv. 13.

III. persist in saying, you take your *idea* of faith, not from *faith itself*, but from some *effects* of what you describe and define; the answer *then* must be, *all active principles*, such is the confined knowledge of man, may, in some cases, oblige us to have recourse to their *effects*, merely to describe or define them. What is *gunpowder*? At first, we only, in answer, define gunpowder by its *ingredients*, nitre, with a little sulphur and charcoal: this will generally serve to describe or define gunpowder. But suppose you try this composition, and it makes no *explosion*? then you say, immediately, this is not *right* gunpowder: what? did it not answer to your definition? I do not care how it was mixed, says a plain man, but I am sure that is not *right* gunpowder, which will not go off when you touch it with fire. And some inquisitive spectators might go farther, and say, perhaps the *nitre* was not *right* nitre, nor the *sulphur* right sulphur, &c.; and then our difficulties multiply upon us. Here is, no doubt, a perplexity; we have not determinate ideas; but yet the perplexity is one under which we should make ourselves very *easy*, as a matter of speculation; and for practice, we should contrive the best *methods* we could to *cure* our gunpowder; but we should never rest contented till it had its usual *effects*. Nor is there any good reason why perplexity should occasion greater uneasiness, if we were obliged to quit our definition of faith, and say, this is not *right* faith, because it has not the *right effects* of faith.

354 25. It may be asked, does not the doctrine of our Church make *virtue* to be only of *secondary* importance? I may answer in the negative. Under the tenth Article it was shewn, that though Christian virtue is to be ascribed to divine assistance, yet we are not to *wait* for that assistance⁴, but to aim immediately at the best of conduct, with the greatest earnestness. And under the eleventh, it was shewn, that when it is said we are not justified by our works, it is supposed⁵ that we have exerted ourselves, and been diligent to come as near perfection as possible. By Bishop Warburton's account, justification by faith only⁶, has its very *foundation* in good works. And how can virtue be better *secured*, than by a man's acting from Christian principles? In proving the doctrine as *we* profess it, we have shewn that a main *end* and design of Christianity was to restore and improve *virtue*. The other main end is, to

⁴ Art. x. sect. 35.

⁵ Art. xi. sect. 18.

⁶ Art. xii. sect. 2, and Div. Leg. Book IX. vol. 111. p. 689, quarto.

effect remission of sins, in order that our improved virtue might III. be effectual in procuring eternal happiness. The latter may indeed be conceived as comprised in the former.

Can any one mean that the dignity of virtue is lowered because we cannot be *justified* by it, but only can do things “*pleasing* and acceptable to God?” What can be higher in its nature than pleasing God? the all-perfect Being! that Being by whom we were created and redeemed! by whom we are perpetually preserved, and sanctified! What ideas and feelings must any one have to murmur as if his virtue was not sufficiently honoured, when it is capable of effects which may be described in such a manner!

But lastly, I would ask, will not, after all, our *sentence* at 355 the day of *judgment*¹, depend upon our *works*? The *Scripture*² declares it will, and therefore it will; but is such declaration agreeable to our theory of justification by *faith*? This is a question which seems to have occasioned some trouble to several³ advocates of Justification by Faith only; therefore I will hazard an observation or two upon it.

When it is said, our sentence will depend upon our *actions*, actions must include the *principles* or affections by which they are performed. The same action may proceed from benevolence and selfishness, or ostentation—from piety and hypocrisy.

The merits of Christ supply imperfection; but imperfection admits of *degrees*: the merits of our Lord do not supply in such a manner as to make all men, who are imperfect in very different degrees, to be upon the *same footing*. I make these two remarks chiefly to prevent our proceeding under the influence of wrong notions.

Faith must produce *good works*. Without recurring to the scriptural proof just now given⁴, we must think, that, if a man has an honest principle of doing his own part, and an ingenuous confidence in God, it must impel him to action. One cannot conceive such a principle to exist in a Christian, and not to set him upon good works. It seems therefore much, or entirely the same thing, in a general view, whether *faith* is to be rewarded, or *virtue*. And any difference will be rather 356

¹ Art. xi. sect. 28; and Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 24.

² Rom. ii. 6—11, &c. Matt. xxv. 31—46.

³ See Jonathan Edwards on Justification, 95, 101. Dickinson's Letters, particularly p. 315.

⁴ Sect. 22.

III. a difference of modes of expression, than of doctrines—rather of *words* than *things*. Nay, if it should sometimes occur, in *Scripture*, that we are to be rewarded for faith, and sometimes that we are to be rewarded for works, there would not necessarily be any inconsistency—any more than there would be in saying, at one time, peace was effected by *bravery* and military skill; and at another, peace was effected by the demolition of a *citadel*; or, to keep to morals, in saying, at one time, a man was rewarded for his *generosity*, and saying, at another, that he was rewarded for his *generous actions*: whenever one of these things was *said*, the other would be *implied*⁵. Faith is the key to virtue, and to reward; for it admits men into the society of which Christ is the Head; the natural effect of which is, both to make them virtuous, and to gain a superior reward for every particular degree of virtue. The *key* may often imply the treasures to which it gives admittance.

All then that we have to see is, that it may, on some occasions, be reasonable to use the language, that virtue, or good works, will be rewarded, rather than that faith will be rewarded. To say, that different *degrees of faith*, or of a faithful principle connecting us with Christianity, will be rewarded, cannot be so *popular* a way of talking, as to say, that men will be rewarded according to their *conduct*, or morals. This latter is what we continually experience. It falls in with our common
 357 notions and apprehensions; and as the sacred writers suit these, we must expect to find them using such language. A youth binds himself to a master, with a right *disposition*: how do men *try* or settle whether he is a good apprentice? by determining whether he *behaves* well.

It may be more proper to *say*, that works will be rewarded at the day of judgment, than that faith will; because that judgment is to be *witnessed* by men and angels. They cannot discern degrees of faith, but they may, in some measure, judge of works; at least much better than of faith: they do it every day.

In the *present life* it would be more *useful* for men to say, and feel, that their actions must come into judgment, and produce their happiness or misery, than that only their *faith*

⁵ See general elements about *partial causes*, Introduction to Second Part, sect. 8. Also Locke's Reasonableness, &c. Works, vol. II. pp. 630, 631, quoted by

Jon. Edwards on Justification, p. 125; and Short Defence of Atonement, p. 45, note.

would be considered. A man would more easily deceive him- III. self about his faith than about his actions; he would not be so good himself, nor do so much good to others, if the trial of his *actions* did not dwell upon his mind. I do not mean that a man must never examine his *motives*: even they will be better examined if actions are performed in a spirited manner; and so we reason from *experiments*.

We once spoke of a military¹ spirit as being, in some respects, analogous to faith. More must not be concluded from illustrations than is intended by them. All we aim at is, to make the thing understood, which we illustrate by comparison: earthly things will not correspond with heavenly, in all particulars.

A man enters into a regiment with a true military spirit, and a sense of *honour*: the commander of it performs some great and useful exploits; the regiment, as a body, receives honour; the man is more likely to behave well for being admitted into such a body, and more likely to be well rewarded for any particular degree of merit. If indeed he proves a coward, he may be shot; but if he distinguishes himself as a good soldier, he may be rewarded. *For what*, in such case, would reward be said to be conferred? for his *spirit* or his *actions*? it might be for *either*; but if one was expressed the other would be *implied*. 358

In *Scripture*, it seems most natural to speak of man as to be tried for his *actions*, when *all mankind* are in view, and the subject is natural religion²: (then expressions should fall in with notions and feelings of all mankind:) but as to be tried for his *faith*, when there is a danger of a particular set of men being too proud of some revelation, and of some holiness presumed to result from it—or when they are called into a new society, separated from the world, and made a *peculiar people*, merely through *favour*.

Jonathan Edwards describes³ the rewarding of good actions as *real*, but their “*rewardableness*”⁴ as being a consequence of justification; that is, *after* men are justified, by admission into the Christian covenant, one privilege of that covenant is, that their good actions are proper objects of reward. And the fitness of such a covenant, of our being *so* justified, arises from

¹ Art. xi. sect. 29.

² Art. xi. sect. 28.

³ On Justification, p. 100.

⁴ This is a word which Baxter *wishes* to use; but it seems to him too far from custom. Catholic Theology.

III. hence, that such a covenant will promote *virtue*. This may be *safe ground*—I scarcely feel it *firm* enough.

The *Necessary Doctrine*, and other writings which favour
359 justification by faith only⁵, speak of the *day of judgment* as that day in which “every man shall receive according to his *workes*.”

26. I will mention no more objections. Therefore we now proceed to our *application*; consisting, as before, of forms of *assent*, according to *natural* religion and *revealed*; of mutual *concessions* of contending parties; and of hints relative to *improvements*.

On a footing of *natural religion*, a man might declare something not unlike our present Article, in the following terms; referring to what had been declared before⁶:

‘Although my improved conduct cannot but continue *imperfect* in the sight of God, notwithstanding my care to *purify* my *principles* and engage in virtuous *associations*; although it be still incapable of *expiating* my former offences, and of standing a *severe* judgment; yet can it scarce fail of being *pleasing* to my indulgent and merciful heavenly Parent: the more so, on account of the *measures* which I have taken to improve myself. However, what is the real *value* of those measures, I can only judge with safety from my *actual* improvements.’

27. A *Christian* might assent in some such form as this:

‘Although, as was *before* intimated, the better sort of actions which I perform under the Christian covenant, as a member of Christ, that is, from *faith*, cannot *expiate* my past offences, or stand in judgment, supposing God rigidly just and *severe*: yet I trust they are *pleasing* and acceptable to his goodness; not so much for themselves, as from a regard to my Lord and leader, his beloved Son. Imperfect as they are, I must rely on them to hinder me from deceiving myself about
360 my faith: I must never imagine that I possess that sacred principle as I ought to possess it, unless it be continually productive of good affections and virtuous conduct.’

28. We come next to *mutual concessions*. It is much to be suspected, in disputes on faith and works, that men have not perfectly understood each other’s expressions; and that they have not differed in reality, so much as in *appearance*⁷.

⁵ See Dickinson’s Letters, p. 315.

⁶ Art. xi. sect. 30.

⁷ See conclusion of Jonathan Edwards on Justification.

The *Romanists* and Protestants give different accounts, III. not so much of the efficacy of Christ's merits, as of the *manner* in which those merits become efficacious. The *Romanists* seem to hold that our actions¹ *have* real strict merit; but that they receive that merit :—from Christ we seem to hold that our good actions have *not* any real strict merit, but that they are accepted *as if* they had, through Christ. Does this amount to more than that they conceive merit to be conferred on our actions *here*, we at the day of *judgment*? a point perhaps at present beyond our knowledge.

In like manner, though some say that men are justified by faith *and* works², and others mention only faith, yet all these may have much the same meaning; as the latter do not exclude works, but will even call them *necessary*³.

Even the *Methodists*, who say such strong things against *works*, seem, the generality of them at least, to make a good life a *necessary*⁴ condition of justification at the last day.

But what is to be said of the *Socinians*? do not they reduce all about justification to mere *natural religion*? Dr. 361 Priestley affirms that “nothing is requisite to make⁵ men”... “objects of his (God's) favour, but such moral conduct as he has made them capable of;” but then he *seems* to own, just afterwards, that he cannot “*at present*”...“explain all particular expressions in the Apostolical *Epistles*,” &c. “In *time*” he hopes to “be able, without any effort or *straining*, to explain” them all. All we can ask for therefore *now* is a *suspension* of hostilities; but what, from an adversary, can be more full to our purpose than such expressions, if we really mean to draw the doctrines of our religion from *Scripture*?

29. Nothing now remains except the subject of *improvements*; but it seems best to defer that subject till we have examined the thirteenth Article.

¹ Rhemish Test. Rom. viii. 18.

² Ludlam, Essay v. p. 16.

³ Jonathan Edwards, pp. 97, 98, &c.

⁴ Principles and Practices, &c. pp. 52, 56, of the first Letter.

⁵ Hist. Corr. I. 279.

III.

362

ARTICLE XIII.

OF WORKS DONE BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

WORKS done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

1. This Article has so harsh a sound, that I wish to be indulged in a few words by way of *Preface* to it. Something of the kind of thought which it contains seems to be required in our body of doctrines, as resulting from the preceding Articles. From the ninth Article, it appears, that men, as men, are in a state of enmity to God; and that their propensities are such as are likely to carry them into actual sin. From the eleventh and twelfth, it appears, that *Christians* are released from the state of enmity; that they are no longer under condemnation, collectively; that they have assistance given them for the performance of good actions; and lastly, that, though their better sort of actions are still imperfect, they are accepted
363 as pleasing to the Supreme Being, on account of the relation in which the agents stand to the Head of the Christian society, who has obeyed and suffered and died for them. If then men are under displeasure, and even Christian virtues are only accepted through Christ, what must be the consequence with regard to *heathen virtues*? They cannot recommend themselves, on account of the unhappy situation of mere men: they have nothing to recommend them: can they, then, be accepted as pleasing to God? must they not appear to Him *faulty* and *deficient*?

If the preceding Articles be right, this consequence seems unavoidable. But then another thing is to be considered:—*sin*, of any kind, can only be declared to *men*, or laid before them, for two purposes:

1. In order that they may *punish* it:
2. In order that they may *avoid* it.

In the present case we can have no concern with *punishing*, III. because we cannot judge of the merits and demerits (“I speak after the manner of men”) of the heathens, in any manner which could qualify us for such a business. We are then to leave the heathens, properly so called, to God:—“how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard¹?” We are to receive the notice of the sin mentioned in our Article, as those whose concern is to *avoid* it. Thus we see, that the declarations which the Article contains must be supposed to be addressed to those who are *nominal Christians*, or who have *opportunity* of weighing the evidence which Christianity offers in its own support. To these alone, indeed, *scriptural* arguments can be proposed.

Both parties therefore, those who *make* the declaration of the Article, and those *for whom* it is made, ought to be *Christians*, (as Augustin and the Pelagians were); or at least to be within *reach* of reasonings and representations *from Christians*. Indeed, scriptural authority may be alleged, to those who are not Christians, thus: we Christians affirm such and such things concerning our religion; we have such and such arguments in our favour; we *warn* you not to neglect to examine those arguments. Dr. Balguy puts this kind of warning with great force in the former part of his ninth Sermon. 364

I hope these two observations will make us think this thirteenth Article rational and pertinent: nay, it cannot but appear *important* also, if we read a part of Dr. Paley’s Charge²; and a few passages out of Dr. Balguy’s ninth Sermon, and Mr. Ludlam’s Essay on Justification³.

I now proceed to *history, explanation, proof, application*, as usual.

2. *History*.—In the *Apostolic Fathers* I do not perceive any expressions which strongly mark the imperfection of *heathen virtues*. They seem to write to *Jewish* converts, making use of authorities out of the Old Testament. We have not any thing, that I remember, (but I have not lately read them with care) addressed by them to *heathens*, as persuasives to conversion. And probably they had not many of those *nominal Christians*, for whom our Article seems calculated: those whom they had to deal with would be either *real* Christians, or professed heathens. *Justin Martyr*⁴ and *Tertullian*⁵ expose

¹ Rom. x. 14.

² Pp. 15, 21, quarto. ³ Near the end.

⁴ Cohortatio ad Græcos, A. D. 140.

⁵ Apologia, A. D. 200.

III. the imperfections of heathen worship and heathen philosophy, and describe the superior worth of Christianity; but what was
 365 wanted, in order to draw forth sayings exactly to our purpose, was that kind of person, to whom the writings of the *New Testament* might be alleged as authority, and who, at the same time, thought heathen principles of morals all that he need cultivate.

The conclusion of *Ignatius's*⁶ eighth section of his Epistle to the Ephesians might be read; as also *Irenæus's* application of Rom. xi. 24, jointly with John iii. 5, 6, or 1 Cor. xv. 50.

Dr. *Nicholls*, on this Article, tells us, that *Clemens Alexandrinus*⁷ was the *first* who highly extolled heathen virtues and heathen philosophers. It appears to me, from the passages produced, that Clement did not mean anything inconsistent with our doctrine; that he meant only to justify the ways of God to man, or to illustrate revealed truths. He uses expressions more strong than could have been prudently used after controversy was started; such as, that *philosophers* were to heathens something analogous to *prophets* amongst the Jews; and that philosophy *justified* the heathens; but then he is speaking only of the times *before Christ*—he was not saying that the same thing would hold good *under Christianity*. *Chrysostom*⁸ was much later: he lived after controversy on our subject had arisen; yet he says⁹, that it was enough for heathens to know *God* (meaning that *idolatry* must always be bad), but *now* (in Chrysostom's time) they ought to know *Christ*.

This is not commending heathen virtue in comparison of Christian. It is only saying, men should *now* be Christians,
 366 though before the coming of Christ they could not be so. God is good at all times, and to all men; Christians are justified by faith; but salvation, such as natural religion bestows, could only be given to heathens according to their obedience to the law¹⁰ written in their *hearts*. This only amounts to much the same with what Dr. *Paley*¹¹ says—"they will be accepted, together with those who are instructed in the law, and obey it."

Dr. *Nicholls* gives, as opposed to these passages from Clement of Alexandria and Chrysostom, some from Cyprian

⁶ Vener quotes this passage, and that from Irenæus Adv. Hær. 5. 10. Welchman also has these passages, but the student would do best to consult the Fathers themselves.

⁷ A. D. 194.

⁸ A. D. 398.

⁹ See Nicholls on the Article.

¹⁰ Rom. ii. 15.

¹¹ Charge, p. 17.

and Jerom. They say that *heathen virtues*¹ are not, or might III. not be, *right* virtues; as, for instance, heathen *patience* was, or might be, *apathy*, stupidity, &c.; heathen fortitude, rashness; heathen prudence, cunning; and so on². I only mean to shew the general nature of the remark. Let us be *chaste*, says *Jerom*, by *faith*, that is, on *Christian* principles; and, in like manner, *wise, brave, temperate*. This I take to be exceeding good sense, and worthy of our most attentive observation. It might be partly the result of experience; but we can see that the bravery of a robber only enhances the injury he commits. If all the virtues of human life were performed from faith, (meaning the Christian principle of action,) the man who performed them would approach much nearer to the character of the *δικαιος*, or perfectly virtuous man³, than any one who attempted the same on heathen principles: and this seems to 367 be the idea which some of the Christian Fathers had, when they used the expression of the prophet, several times quoted in the New Testament, “the just (*δικαιος*) shall live by his faith”—shall *conduct* himself *through life* on that principle⁴. St. Paul seems rather to apply the saying of Habakkuk as meaning, that the just shall enjoy *eternal* life through his faith—his faith shall *save* him.—(Luke vii. 50, or xviii. 42.)

3. I mention next the age of the *Pelagian Controversy*—the fifth century. We have seen⁵ that the Pelagians were against the doctrine of the necessity of grace for acting well. In arguing on this doctrine, they⁶ used a plea, which led to the subject now before us. Why, they urged, should we have internal assistance, in order to our performing good actions, when some of the *heathens*, who had no such help, performed such great exploits, and displayed such admirable virtues? They instanced in Fabricius, Fabius, Regulus⁷, Scipio. The orthodox Augustin, always vigilant, replied, that the heathens were not virtuous as a Christian ought to be; that, if they performed actions good in their kind, they performed them *ill*—from inferior *motives*—not with a view to the *glory* of

¹ Cyprian, A. D. 248. de con. patient. Jerom, A. D. 392, on Gal. iii.

² Augustin mentions the prudence of the avaricious, with a reference to Hor. Ep. I. 1, “per mare,” &c. The justice and fortitude (cardinal virtues) of *Catiline*, with a reference to Sallust’s account of him.

³ Art. xi. sect. 14.

⁴ Hab. ii. 4. Rom. i. 17. Gal. iii. 11. Heb. x. 38.

⁵ Art. x. sect. 5.

⁶ Vossii *Hist. Pelag.* Thesis x. of Lib. III. Part 2.

⁷ Aug. *contra Julianum*, Lib. IV. sect. 17. Ed. Antv.

III. *God, &c.* Their conduct, though well meant, was, in strictness, deficient, *faulty*; nay, considering the nature of perfect Christian virtue, it might even be called *sinful*. What there was of good in it might indeed lessen future punishment⁸, or even procure temporal rewards; but could by no means have
 368 the effect of Christian virtue to gain *eternal* happiness. If that great end could be effected by the religion of nature, if mere *men* could attain to perfect righteousness, then Christ died in vain.

Whoever wishes to examine more minutely into this controversy, may consult *Vossius's Historia Pelagiana* before mentioned: the third part of his third book is on this subject, and is entitled, "*De virtutibus Gentilium*⁹." I have consulted the fourth book of Augustin's work *contra Julianum*, but I do not find myself always satisfied with the reasoning of that great Father, or with his application of texts of Scripture. Dr. *Priestley* has a short passage¹⁰, which may be read. I will only add a few expressions from the ancients, which may serve as an *history* of that particular expression, which seems so harsh, and with which our Article concludes, about heathen virtues having the nature of *sin*.

Jerom concludes his passage on Gal. iii. with these words, "sine quo (Christo) omnis *virtus in vitio est*." Augustin¹¹ says, "illud quod *minus est quam debet, ex vitio est*." And, to Julianus, "negare non potes eum *peccare qui malè quodlibet facit*¹²." One might read Vossius's contents of his 12th Thesis, Lib. III. Part iii;—and under it Bellarmin's account of Augustin's taking *sin* in a *large sense*, as meaning whatever has not all the perfection of which it is capable¹³.

4. We will next take notice of the *scholastic* ages; and, as the "*school-authors*" are particularly mentioned in this
 369 Article, I have before¹⁴ said that I would here give some account of them. They have been the *admiration*, and now seem to be the *jest*¹⁵ of Europe. I wish, at least, to speak of them without copying the language of any age. The *Scholastici* used to mean *rhetoricians*, who declaimed¹⁶, not about

⁸ Vossius, p. 677.

⁹ See also a little, p. 667, fol.

¹⁰ Hist. Corr. i. p. 300.

¹¹ Ep. 29, *ad Hieron.* quoted by Nicholls on Article xv.

¹² *Ad Julianum*, Lib. IV. sect. 30. Ed. Antv.

¹³ Vossius, fol. p. 680.

¹⁴ Art. ix. sect. 11; and Art. x. sect. 10.

¹⁵ See Warburton, quarto, vol. III. p. 630. Dr. Balguy, pp. 193, 330.

¹⁶ Those who *taught* rhetoric used, at one time, to be called *Sophistæ*; such were

business, but for improvement. They were ἐν σχολῇ, in III. *leisure*, as opposed to the hurry of real causes; but the word, from denoting declaiming rhetoricians, came to signify *barristers*, or *advocates*; yet it seems to have had its primitive meaning when *Charlemagne* instituted seminaries of learning, in monasteries and cathedrals, and *schools* properly so called:—only the *scholastici* extended the subject of their instructions to *philosophy*¹; which they refined and made complex by eagerly improving on one another, and especially by commenting upon *Aristotle*². And then they mixed this philosophy with *Christianity*; applying it particularly to the set of subjects now before us. A very subtle *logic* was necessary, in order to carry on very subtle disputes in metaphysics.

I have mentioned *Charlemagne*, who died A. D. 814, at the age of 72; but the *origin* of scholastic divinity, like that of other things which sprang up in times of ignorance, is very obscure and uncertain. *Three periods* are mentioned³; its *infancy*, its *maturity*, and its *old age*. Its *infancy* may be 370 dated early in the twelfth century. *Lanfranc* died in 1089, and *Peter Lombard* in 1164; and they are said to have lived in its infancy. Its *ripe age* may be said to have begun in the year 1220, and to have continued to the time of *Durand* of *St. Porcian*, (who died in the year 1333,) or, we may say, an hundred years; and its *old age* may be said to have begun from 1320, and to have ended, with *Gabriel Biel*, in the 15th century. It might be expected that a kind of learning much admired should produce other authors after this time, whilst the admiration continued. *Suarez*, who died in 1617, is reckoned a schoolman: he is very voluminous in his comments upon those who went before him. But it may be as well to mention one or two names in particular.

Peter Lombard, called *Lombard* from his being born at *Navarre* in *Lombardy*, wrote a small book of *Sentences* compiled from the *Fathers*, on different points, in a manner adapted to reconcile their seeming differences; from whence he was called the *Master of the Sentences*. The number of folios which have been written upon this book is astonishing—itself only a small quarto. *Peter* was particularly eminent at *Paris*,

were *Libanius*, &c. *Eunapius* wrote the *Lives* of *Philosophers* and *Sophists*. *Sophist* is sometimes an *artist*, in almost anything; or a *philosopher*, &c.

¹ Scholæ philosophorum.—Cic.

² Dr. *Balguy*, p. 330.

³ In the *Encyclopédie* may be found several things here said of the schoolmen.

III. where he was preceptor to the royal family, one of whom declined the archbishopric of Paris in his favour.

We may next mention Thomas, commonly called *Thomas Aquinas*⁴, because he was of the noble family of the counts of Aquino, near Naples, which family has produced some famous
371 generals: he is often called, in books, *St. Thomas*⁵. He lived in the thirteenth century, in the middle, or ripe age, of scholastic learning. He was very highly esteemed, and called at Paris *Doctor Angelicus*⁶. His *Summa Theologiæ* is accounted by the authors of the *Encyclopédie* (or by some persons, whose judgment they think worth recording,) a capital work of its kind; yet they are not reckoned great favourers of theology, such as it has been in general. Though he travelled much, and taught every where, and only lived to the age of 48, he has left works which fill eighteen volumes folio, and which shew such intensity of thought, as to make it very probable that they were all written with a mind on the full stretch.

Lastly, we may mention *Suarez*. Though he died so late as 1617, yet I am more inclined to mention him than to dwell longer on the times before him. He was a Spaniard, of Grenada, a Jesuit, a teacher of theology, and usually reckoned among the schoolmen, notwithstanding the time in which he lived. We have his works in twenty-three volumes folio, abridged by Noel in two volumes folio. He was reckoned to state opinions well; but, though he wrote against the Reformation, in defence of Popery, yet his book on that subject was burnt at Paris by the common executioner, as encouraging sedition and rebellion. There are five volumes folio of his works, in which are forty-three Dissertations, all on the third part of the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas.

I will mention no more facts relative to the schoolmen; but
372 some were necessary as a ground for some judgment concerning their merits. My idea is, that they have shewn great intellectual powers, and that they did not run into all their disquisitions without some view to utility; that is, they wanted very nice distinctions, in order to keep their ideas from running

⁴ Thomas Aquinas died in the year 1274, at the age of 48. His native place, Aquinum, was the same as Juvenal's; whence Juvenal is called Aquinas by the writers of his life. See before, Art. x. sect. 10. See also the third Satire of Juvenal, near the end.

⁵ Thomas à Becket is also sometimes called St. Thomas.

⁶ Titles of this sort were given to several schoolmen. Durand was Doctor Resolutissimus. One schoolman was Doctor Irrefragabilis.

together; and in order to explain all the acts of the mind, III. without leaving anything to the judgment of common sense. Thus all their distinctions might be founded in nature, yet they might be too minute to be really useful. Men may explain a thing; and yet the explanation shall be more burthensome to the mind, than one less full and perfect would be, which left more to the quick operations of reason and sense. If a man was to describe, with the greatest possible minuteness, a common act of vision, he must become very abstruse and hard to understand. If he undertook to describe all the properties of the different surfaces of which the surface of an human body consists, he might pass his whole life in the work, and do little good; or, on the whole, do harm.

A man may write with some view to clearing up things, and yet may run into an intolerable multiplicity of words; especially if he runs on in an analytical method, and indulges himself in prejudice and hypothesis. The Categories of Aristotle used to be studied for bishoprics: any one may now easily form his own judgment on that work from consulting Mr. Harris's Philosophical Arrangements.

I would not have it understood that I think researches are to be given up the moment we find ourselves at a loss to perceive particular uses to which they may be applied. If speculation only enlarges the mind, and strengthens its faculties, it may be continued for a time; though only so long as reason and experience dictate that it will be useful upon the whole. 373 As some bodily exercises shew, to our surprise, what the body is capable of, so may some mental exercises do with regard to the mind; and both may point out the way to improvement. It is not clear to me that we should at this time have had such reasoning powers as we have, if no great efforts, no passionate exertions, had been made by the *schoolmen* ¹.

5. But to proceed with our history. We may, for anything I recollect, pass on to the age of the *Reformation*. Let us begin with the *Romanists*. Under the eleventh Article ², I read a passage from a Popish historian, in which *Luther* is introduced as affirming, that "good works," "how good soever they might appear," "were *mortal sins*." I suppose Luther must mean good works of *heathens*. In the sixth session of the

¹ Dr. *Waterland* gives an idea of the schoolmen in his account of the *argument à priori*; his notion is also mentioned

in his life, in the *Biographia Britannica*.
² See Art. xi. sect. 6; and Du Pin, *Compend.* vol. 1v. p. 16.

III. council of *Trent*, the seventh canon anathematizes those who say that all works done before justification, however performed, are really *sins*; but the first canon affirms that no man can be *justified* either by works of nature, or of the Law of Moses, without divine grace by Jesus Christ. (By the way, can those works be otherwise than faulty by which a man cannot be accounted righteous?) In the decree preceding the canons, which expresses doctrines, with reasons on which they are grounded, all merit in those who are candidates for justification seems fully disclaimed. In the fifth chapter, we have “nullis eorum existentibus meritis:” in the eighth, “nihil eorum quæ justificationem præcedunt, sive fides, sive opera, ipsam justificationis gratiam promeretur.” Nor do I see any distinction of merits into different sorts; but it is found in the works of Cardinal *Cajetan*³, who was a great ambassador and divine at the time of the Reformation: and in the *Rhemish* Testament on Acts x. 2, we find mention of *congruity*. I imagine what our Church opposes may be found in this passage: “Such workes as are done before justification, though they suffice not to salvation, yet be *acceptable preparatives*⁴ to the grace of justification:”—he adds, “such workes preparative come of grace also; otherwise they could never *deserve* at God’s hand, of *congruity*, or any otherwise, towards justification.”

The *reformed* churches, in general, I think, agree with the Church of England. In the twentieth Article of the *Augustan* Confession we have, “nec *placent* Deo opera secundæ tabulæ, nisi *fides* accedat, quòd propter *Christum* placeat hæc inchoata et imperfecta obedientia.”

Mr. *Hume*’s account might be introduced here, of *Cranmer*’s framing the Articles. Mr. *Hume* understands our Articles to mean, “that no heathen, however virtuous, can escape an endless state of the most exquisite misery⁵.”

With regard to the Church of *England*, the *Necessary Doctrine* does not seem to enter much into our present subject. In the part relating to good works, it describes moral acts, done without faith in Christ, as what it does *not* profess to treat of; yet adds, by the way, that they are good in their

³ This cardinal’s name was Thomas de *Vio*; he was born at *Gaieta* (not far from *Naples*), and was afterwards bishop there.

⁴ In our tenth Article we have, “can-

not turn and *prepare* himself.” See the explanation, sect. 26 of that Article.

⁵ *Hume*’s *Hist.* 4to, vol. III. p. 334, 1st Ed. The passage is quoted by *Gilpin*, p. 159, of his *Life of Cranmer*.

kind, and sometimes followed with *temporal* rewards, though III. not available to the attaining of everlasting life. In our *Reformatio Legum*, we find an intention to proceed against those who hold that by free-will alone, without any other special *grace of Christ*, men may live well¹. In the life of Bishop *Ridley*², it is observed that our *Homilies* deny the value of “those specious works, apparently good, but done without faith, in opposition to the *Anabaptists*.” The place where this subject is mentioned, is the first part of our Homily on Good Works. In general, I respect, sometimes admire, our Homilies; but I know not whether the expressions on the present subject are not somewhat too strong³ for me; though they may be chiefly borrowed from Chrysostom and Augustin. Yet the expressions of Jonathan Edwards seem stronger than those of our homily; he talks of man being “*infinitely* guilty”—“beheld of God as infinitely the object of his displeasure⁴ and wrath, or *infinitely* hateful in his eyes.” And *Antinomians* must of course be inclined to speak harsh language against the virtues (so called) of mere men. *Baxter*, in a Dialogue⁵ in his *Catholic Theology*, introduces a *Libertine* or Antinomian saying, “They (the wicked) must be *first* made *godly*, (that is, made *Christians*,) and the heart renewed, that the *life* (or conduct) may be amended:”—and “without faith it is impossible to please God, or do anything which is not *abominable* to him.” The famous Antinomian, *Dr. Crispe*, gave an odd turn to virtue before justification. Instead of disputing whether well-meaning men had any title to justification, he dwelt upon justifying the *wicked*, as wicked, “while they were in the most desperate devillish condition of all⁶,” &c. This is one way of ending all dispute about men’s deserving “grace of congruity.” It may perhaps have been intended, not only to edify and comfort, but (as Bayes says) to “elevate and surprise.” 376

6. With regard to the *Socinians*, we have lately seen⁷, that God’s favour is, according to them, to be obtained “in all situations” by moral conduct. The *Racovian Catechism* affirms⁸, that justification by faith has no concern with the

¹ De Hæresibus, cap. vii.

² P. 345.

³ Homily on Good Works, Part I.

⁴ On Justification, p. 31.

⁵ Pp. 258, 260. See Art. xii. sect. 1, of this.

⁶ See Geree’s Epistle to the Reader, not very far from the end. Sidney Coll. Library, T—5—38.

⁷ Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 279. Art. xii. sect. 28.

⁸ P. 212.

III. times before the coming of Christ. Mr. *Graham* holds⁹ that good works are of *themselves* acceptable to God; but I do not know whether he makes any distinction between works done before justification and after it.

7. I may here close my historical remarks, and proceed to *explanation*.

The *title* is, “*Of works done before Justification* ;” that is, works done before a person acts as a member of the Christian covenant. This will sufficiently appear from what was¹⁰ said under the *twelfth Article*, about works which “follow after justification.” Several phrases may express our becoming Christians; because, if all goes on in due course, as planned, several things take place at that time: but we shall come to some of these phrases very soon. From the title we pass to the Article.

377 8. “*Works*.”—Again¹¹ we ask, what *kind* of works may be here meant? the answer is, the same kind which is called in the tenth Article our own “natural *good works*”¹². The epithet “*good*” is indeed here omitted; but the same kind of actions must be meant: no one would require to have it declared that heathen *vices* are not pleasant to God; or the actions of heathens in general, without distinction into well and ill-meant. It seems not improbable that the epithet “*good*” has, in this Article, been purposely omitted by the compilers, in order to avoid the seeming contradiction which there would be in affirming that *good works* have undoubtedly the nature of *sin*. If we connect this Article with the preceding, we see the *two sorts* of good works, Christian and heathen, compared with each other; the former declared to be *pleasing* to God, the latter *not* pleasing:—*both imperfect in themselves*; but the former pleasing “*in Christ*,” the latter not pleasing, because seen *only in themselves*.

I do not think, that, in strictness, our Article represents heathen good works as *displeasing* to God.

9. “*Done before the grace of Christ*” —another phrase for before becoming Christians. We find this used in the Acts of the Council of Trent, session vi. canon 1. It may be preferred here to other equivalent phrases, as opposed to what has

⁹ See Short Defence of Atonement, p. 38.

¹⁰ Art. xii. sect. 8.

¹¹ Art. xii. sect. 6; and places there referred to.

¹² Art. x. sect. 28.

been sometimes called the *first grace* of God¹—that assistance III.
 which he may have been pleased to give to heathens. We
 have seen something near this phrase as used by Dr. Redman².
 In Scripture, it is well known, the phrase used in our Article 378
 occurs; as we conclude our public prayers with, “the grace
 of our Lord Jesus Christ,” &c. (2 Cor. end.)

10. “*And the Inspiration of his Spirit.*”—This phrase
 seems to me equivalent to the last: there was, no doubt, some
 reason for adding it. The “*Spirit of Christ*,”³ at least, is a
 scriptural expression. Perhaps *grace* might seem too *general*
 a word, as meaning *favour*, of any kind—help *external* as well
 as *internal*. But we can see that both this phrase and the last
 give, by intimation, some *reason* for a doctrine which may
 seem harsh; that they tend to take off, or to soften prejudices
 against it. As our inability to please God before we become
 disciples of *Christ* is the thing to be impressed, those expres-
 sions of Scripture which have the nearest relation to Christ
 must be preferable to all others, both in point of propriety and
 utility. Afterwards, in the sixteenth Article, *receiving the*
Holy Ghost is spoken of without any mention of the Spirit
 being the Spirit of Christ.

Our explanation might be confirmed by *comparing* the
 title of the Article with the part of it already mentioned: from
 such a comparison it must appear, that “works done before
 Justification,” must mean the same with, “works done before
 the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit.”

These two phrases, expressing the ratification on God’s
 part, of our admission into Christianity, might seem particu-
 larly proper; more proper than *Baptism*, as the Article is
 chiefly intended for *nominal* Christians; that is, for those who
 had been baptized, but did not act on *principles* properly
 Christian. Such persons do works after *baptism* which are on 379
 the same footing of works *before justification*; or works after
 becoming *nominal* Christians, and before becoming *real* Chris-
 tians.

In *different confessions* of faith, or different authors, we
 may expect to find this same thing expressed in a variety of
 phrases. Persons not yet become real Christians may be called

¹ Art. x. sect. 43, from Jortin’s Six
 Dissertations, p. 84. See also Art. x.
 sect. 19.

² Art. xii. sect. 6; or Life of Ridley,
 p. 351.

³ Rom. viii. 9.

III. the *unregenerate*⁴, or in Latin, *irregenti*⁵, and *non-renati*⁶: their *state* may be called that before justification, or before *vocation*—or the justified may be called *converted*⁷.

In *Scripture*, we find the same variety: consult 1 Cor. vi. 11⁸; Titus iii 7, (where our being put into a *way* of salvation is expressed by “*heirs*” and “*hope*”). In Eph. ii. 8, we are *saved*; in Heb. vi. 4, *enlightened*, (from whence those who had been catechumens, and were completed Christians, used to be called *φωτισζόμενοι*). *Vocation* and *called* are common,—chosen, or *elect*. See Taylor’s *Key*, chap. vi. or a short expression⁹ in paragraph 167.

All said against such good works as we have described must apply to well-meant actions in a state of *apostasy*, à *fortiori*. Works before attaining to a state of justification must, at least, be as pleasing to God as works after renouncing such a state.

380 11. “*Are not pleasant to God:*”—they not having the property which makes Christian good works pleasing. Of the meaning of the word “*pleasant*” enough was said under the twelfth Article. Perhaps some persons might be willing to allow that certain actions are *not* pleasant to God, who would not call them *hateful* or offensive to him.

12. “*Forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ.*”—Here is a particular reason openly assigned why heathen virtues are not pleasing to God. The consequence is, that, if we thought the same for *other reasons*, such opinion, though it might be just, would not belong to this *Article*; and, if we did not admit *this reason*, our admitting the opinion upon other reasons would be insufficient.

13. “*Neither do they make men meet to receive grace.*”—The *grace* here meant must be the same with that before mentioned, the *grace of Christ*, or that given peculiarly to Christians.

“*Meet*,” signifies proper, *fit*. In Cooper’s *Thesaurus* it is English for *aptus*; as *meetness* is for *congruentia*; and

⁴ Baxter, *Cath. Rel.* p. 258.

⁵ Vossii *Hist. Pel.* i. 3. part 3, versus finem.

⁶ Ellis on the Article.

⁷ Art. xii. sect. 8.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Taylor seems to mistake (*Key*, chap. vi.) in some degree, when he makes *regenerate*, &c. &c. apply to *all* Christians,

good and *bad*. I think some terms are used so as to seem to include the *bad*, only because it is taken for *granted*, as a matter of course, that the *internal* dispositions will answer to the *external* signs and professions. Titus iii. 7, “*heirs*”—“*hope*,” belong to *all* Christians in this way.

aptus and *congruus* are used, seemingly, as synonymous. *Fit* III. implies a sort of *coincidence* of different things, as of a key with the wards of a lock, and so does *congruus*. The *fitness of things*, which with some is the criterion of virtue, seems the same with *congruity* or *propriety*. Cooper lived in the time of our Queen Elizabeth—in the same reign in which our Articles were published. In some sense I should think, that a man who meant well would be more *fit* to receive Christianity, than one who lived ill; but the idea of the Article seems to be, that a man, by living what might be called well, under *natural religion*, would not be, on that account, a *fit object* for God to confer the benefits of Christianity upon, in such sense, that if God did *not* confer Christianity upon him, he might be *blamed* 381 as missing or overlooking a fit object. If a man is a *fit object of charity*, some blame is always supposed to rest upon us if we do not relieve him. A fit object of charity would, in the language of the Article, be called one *meet* to receive alms. This observation will be confirmed by the next.

14. “*Or (as the School-authors say).*”—This seems to make the expression, “*meet to receive grace,*” equivalent to that which follows, “*deserve grace of congruity*”—the one expression *popular*, the other *scholastic*. The Latin does not mention “the School-authors:” instead of, “as the School-authors say,” it has, “*ut multi vocant:*” but the English and Latin are equally authentic.

“*Deserve grace of congruity.*”—I used to want a *comma* after “*grace.*” The words sounded as if “*grace of congruity,*” was some *kind of grace*, instead of, deserving “*grace, of congruity,*” being a *way of deserving* grace: other people may not have been so simple¹. A man may deserve any thing either *ex condigno*, or *ex congruo*—either *of* (to use the preposition “*of*” in the old sense) *condignity*, or *of congruity*; that is, either of *strict right*, or according to all *fitness* or *propriety*. A *servant* deserves his *wages ex condigno*: he may deserve a support in *sickness* or old age, *ex congruo*, “*of congruity*”². Sometimes instead of *ex congruo*, the phrase 382

¹ Whilst I was revising this for the press, in November 1796, I accidentally met with some popular Sermons on the Thirty-nine Articles, by *Boys*: as I remember, he seemed to want the *comma* here mentioned. And I have fancied that Bp. Burnet did not rightly conceive

the meaning of the words under explanation in the present section; or indeed the meaning of the thirteenth Article at large.

² I do not find this distinction in Peter Lombard; I see it frequently mentioned in Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa*; but I do not readily find a *definition* of it.

III. "*ex proportione*" is used; and then some *dispenser* of rewards and emoluments is conceived to give them in *proportion* to the merits of different men.

We should consider what idea we have of a man who does *not grant* that which is deserved, "of congruity," as fit, or proper. We certainly always *blame* such a person; nay, his conduct excites our *indignation*: we conceive him as denying that which he would have been compelled to grant, if *laws* could have been made to suit all circumstances. And his *mean evasion* of the spirit of the laws, by the imperfection of the letter, increases our disapprobation and abhorrence.

15. "*Yea rather*"—is best understood by the Latin, *imò—nay*: the word *rather* sounds more *comparative* than it is here. When it is said that a thing is *rather* this than that, the meaning may be, that it is *not either* one or the other; but here the word *rather* does not prevent the assertion, which follows it, from being *absolute*.

16. "*For that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done.*"—Here is another *reason* openly assigned, to which the observation before³ made is applicable. Of any particular *man* it can scarce be said that he does things differently from what God has commanded, if he has never *received* the command, nor had a power of receiving it. In strictness, a servant may do contrary to what his master has commanded, though *he* has received no command—has not heard of the orders which were given out; but this must be through *ignorance*. The servant, in that case, is not thought to be at all concerned with what the master has ordered. God *winks*⁴ at ignorance, when it is *involuntary*; though he may
383 reward, in the highest degree, those who both *know* his will and *do* it.

17. "*We doubt not but they have the nature of sin.*"

The *history* of this expression, already given, will serve, in some sort, for an *explanation* of it; but something must be added. The same kind of expression has occurred⁵ in the ninth Article. Concupiscence was said to have the *nature* of sin, because it comes of sin, and leads to sin; that is, it is distinguishable from sin, strictly so called. "*We doubt not*"—odd as it may seem, this expression, and others resembling it, imply some *doubt*: we do not use such expressions in things quite free from doubt.

³ Sect. 12.

⁴ Acts xvii. 30.

⁵ Art. ix. sect. 12, 23, 26, 30.

Sin.—ἀμαρτάνειν means *aberrare*, to miss a path, or a III. *mark*: we may be said to sin whenever we miss the right path which would lead to the mark—whenever we deviate from *rectitude*, though ever so *little*. In Hebrew נטה has the same significations: it implies an *aim*, natural or moral. But when we have continued a while in rectitude, and *apostatize* from it, no *mark* is then supposed to be in view; *deviating* is then expressed¹ by מעל; and going *beyond* bounds, that is, *transgressing*, is expressed by פשע. Whenever we do *any* of these things, in ever so small a degree, we *sin*²: *mere man*, especially as described under the ninth Article, must be continually doing some of these. Indeed, every one, who falls short of *perfect virtue*, may be said, in strictness, to sin; which in fact every man does; for *established virtue*, though it may 384 *approach* nearer and nearer to perfect virtue, has, in no country, hitherto *reached* it; nor perhaps ever may. No wonder we should miss a *mark*, if we do not *see* perfectly where it is placed. This *gradual progression* and advancement towards moral perfection, seems acknowledged by Christianity; as appears from Phil. i. 9, 10; Phil. iii. 13; 2 Pet. end. Even *Christian virtues* have, in *themselves*, “the *nature of sin*,” for they are confessedly *imperfect*; only they are *accepted* through Christ, (as before, sect 8).

Some sins are called *venial sins*³: some actions, owned *wrong* in certain respects, are *rewarded*. If you saw a child pick a pocket, though he thought little or no harm, you would own the action had “the *nature of sin* :” and would influence him to *desist* from such conduct. *Cyrus’s* giving the longer cloak to the taller boy⁴, had the nature of sin; and so had the *Spartan’s* exposing his child, and the *American’s*⁵ destroying his parent. Every action is *rewarded* according to rules of *established* virtue, however faulty.

Indeed, the sin, of which heathen virtues have the nature, cannot be sin of every kind; it can only consist of abuses of the *moral faculty*. Actions *well intended* cannot be wrong but by some wrongness in that faculty. Well-meaning men

¹ See Parkhurst’s Lexicon under ηγρ.

² In *English*, we use *deviating* and *transgressing* in both a *natural* and *moral* sense: have we nothing like ἀμαρτάνειν? to *miss* a mark and *miss* our duty? I have done nothing *amiss*—is this used chiefly in *negative* phrases?

³ 1 John v. 17. Ἔστιν ἀμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον.

⁴ Xen. Cyrop. Book I. p. 24, 8vo.

⁵ Robertson’s History of America. The custom of destroying an infirm child, with religious ceremonies, is still prevalent in the East Indies.

III. will often be wrongly *informed* “concerning the nature and consequences of human actions;” they will often have wrong
 385 “*objects* of approbation and disapprobation⁶ ;” and will often approve and disapprove in wrong *degrees*—either too much or too little. In any of these cases, their actions have the *nature of sin* : but if any one reflects that these are the kind of faults of which our Article treats, he will not feel much shocked at its *harshness*.

While men continue under the influence of a misinformed or perverted moral faculty, even involuntarily, their *actions* may be said to have the nature of sin, however God may be pleased to accept their *persons* ; but, if they continue in such a state *voluntarily*, when they might avoid it, their case must be much worse ; and we have supposed our Article to be, properly, aimed at such. Considering what has been *done* and *suffered*, in order to make men act on Christian principles, refusing to act upon them is not only presumption, perverseness, and rebellion, but hardness of heart and ingratitude.

Let then the brilliant actions of the heathens be applauded, when such applause will best warm the human heart to virtue ; but the real nature of their imperfection must be fully exposed, whenever the applause due to them makes men negligent of higher and purer principles than those on which they were performed. But we must not forget that we are now only explaining : however, let our explanation close here.

18. We come now to our *proof*.

The matter of the Article may be divided into *three propositions*, which need not be proved very fully, this Article being a *corollary* from the ninth and two following ; as was shewn at the opening of it.

386 1. Christians ought not to consider *heathen* virtues as, in strictness, pleasing to God ; because such virtues have not that right *Christian* principle to recommend them which is intended for all mankind.

2. Good actions, popularly so called, of men not yet admitted into Christianity, cannot *entitle* them, even on a footing of propriety, to such divine assistance as may effect their admission.

3. The good actions of mere men, who have no connection with Christianity, may, in strictness, be considered as having

⁶ Dr. Balguy's MS. Heads of Lectures in Morality, Part III. Chap. ii.

the nature of sin; because they do not answer perfectly to the III. *will*, or to the *laws* of God.

19. In the first and third propositions the *reasons* make part of the propositions, according to what was laid down in the explanation.

It will be owned, that while we are speaking of strictness, those actions which have the nature of sin, cannot, in themselves, be pleasing to God; therefore if we prove the third proposition, the first will be proved of course. And in the explanation of the word "*pleasant*" (sect. 11), we have already given the reason suggested by the twelfth Article; and have spoken to the same purpose in the preface to this Article. Only we may keep in mind, that, as Christianity is intended for *all mankind*, it must seem a *failure*, and be, if one may so speak, a kind of *disappointment*, whenever men are not influenced in their actions by a Christian principle. Let us now take the *second* proposition.

20. Good actions, popularly so called, of men not yet admitted into Christianity, cannot *entitle* them, even on a footing of propriety, to such divine assistance as may effect their admission.

The benefits of the Christian covenant are always represented in Scripture as matter of *mere favour*. This has been sufficiently shewn before¹: *Taylor*² shews it more at large. On a footing of common reason, one may say, that, if good actions, performed under natural religion, can claim any reward, they can only claim the *rewards of natural religion*—surely not an *eternity*³ of supreme happiness.

Again, to say that a man *deserves* any thing, is the same thing as to say—if he has it not, the person from whom he deserves it is unjust, or acts improperly. Shall God be considered as *culpable* because he does not bestow inestimable blessings on certain imperfect moral agents? nay, because he does not bestow them on some, who might obtain them by observing the gracious conditions which he is pleased to propose!

21. The good actions of mere *men*, who have no connection with Christianity, may, in strictness, be considered as having the *nature of sin*—because they do not answer

¹ Art. xi. sect. 23.

² *Key*, prefixed to Romans, par. 167—169, p. 58.

³ Art. xii. sect. 19. Warburton, Div. Leg. Book ix. p. 630, quarto.

III. *perfectly* to the *will*, or to the *laws* of God. If the ninth Article is just, this proposition must be so too. If men are all, as men, concluded⁴ under sin, their actions must have the nature of sin; and what was said of the *φρόνημα σαρκός* not being subject to the Law of God⁵, must still hold good⁶. Indeed, it was scarcely possible to *explain* what was meant by heathen virtues having the nature of sin, without giving reasons for our present proposition: only we may now add, 388 that the *will* of God can be satisfied with nothing short of *perfect virtue*; and that his *laws*, or commands, must enjoin perfect virtue, though it is by experience that mere man gradually finds them out.

22. But perhaps it is not so much to our purpose to consider the good actions of those who are involuntarily mere men, as to take notice of the virtues of those who are *heathens by choice*. Yet that their conduct must have the nature of sin, has been already observed⁷, and indeed is self-evident⁸. Mr. Ludlam concludes his Essay on Justification with some expressions much to our purpose⁹; and Dr. Balguy's ninth Discourse is well worth taking into our proof; as well as the part of Dr. Paley's Charge before mentioned¹⁰; and the passage of Bishop Warburton's Doctrine of Grace, mentioned at the same time.

Whoever acts from *lower motives* when he can act from higher must *offend* the Deity: this every man does (we are now taking the divine authority of the Scriptures for granted) who prefers principles merely *moral*, to *Christian* principles. It is, no doubt, on many occasions, praiseworthy to act from a desire of esteem, and of feeling satisfied with ourselves—from a sense of honour and decency, from a sentiment of benevolence, or from a veneration¹¹ for the sanctity of the laws; but whoever considers the nature of Christian faith, must surely regard it as a much *higher* principle than these; especially when acknowledged as of an original immediately divine. Its views take in 389 all time, past and future; it cannot be exerted without sentiments of the most tender affection, the most ardent gratitude, and the most exalted admiration.

⁴ Gal. iii. 22.

⁵ Rom. viii. 7. Art. ix. sect. 26.

⁶ Life of Bp. Ridley, p. 346, from Necessary Doctrine.

⁷ Sect. 17.

⁸ John ix. 41.

⁹ See also p. 13.

¹⁰ Sect. 1, where all these are referred to.

¹¹ See Diderot's Dedication of his Père de Famille.

The *duellist* has, no doubt, some virtuous *feelings*, of fortitude, abhorrence of injury, and delicacy about reputation; he is willing to brave death in defence of honour. *Chivalry* made men pitiful and courteous¹; made them give honour to the woman as to “the *weaker vessel*”²; and whoever has the true spirit of chivalry possesses some qualities which are nobly amiable: but, when fine sentiments, or fine qualities, are maintained, or applied, in a manner differing widely from that which “*God hath willed and commanded*,” they have not the effects of virtue; nay, may be considered as *faulty* in themselves, or as having the nature of *sin*.

Though this may be a sufficient proof of our proposition, I would wish not to close it without a few passages of *Scripture*: the more, as some texts are used, even by *Augustin*³ himself, which do not seem to me to have weight in the present question. Heb. xi. 6 seems to relate to *natural religion*⁴; and to imply, that no Christian can reasonably object to faith being made the principle of Christianity, because it must be the principle of *all* religion: Rom. xiv. 23, appears, from the context, to mean, that, in doubtful cases, it is wrong to do any thing which one *thinks wrong*, though it may be right for another to do the same thing if he thinks it right: and Titus i. 15 seems to express much the same thought—all things are innocent, generally speaking, in him who, from habit, acts innocently; though this, like most general expressions, implies some tacit limitations; else indeed, in this sense, it would rather make against our proposition than for it. 390

As these texts are introduced with a view to eating things *indifferent* by nature, they should not be understood without some reference to that; though it be a general fact, that a good mind is so far a compound of good purposes, that a good man acts well generally without thinking of it; and, in like manner, a bad man acts ill. Even when the better principles of a bad man exert themselves, they produce something wrong, (like the fortitude of a robber); nay, his *moral* faculty shews itself in some perversion or excess. But our present Article does not treat of a bad man—only of a virtuous one.

But I will now produce a few texts which seem to have real weight. Matt. x. 15.

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 8.

² 1 Pet. iii. 7.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 29; and Art. xi. sect. 2.

³ Ad Julianum, L. 1v. sect. 24. ed. Antv.

III. John iii. 17, 18, 36; John vi. 28, 29; Acts xvii. 30 (for we never are said to *connive* at that which is not faulty); Acts xx. 21; Rom. 1. 18⁵; 1 John iii. 23; and v. 17⁶, where *ἀδικία*, “unrighteousness,” may be⁷ a negation of *δικαιοσύνη*, righteousness, or perfect virtue⁸. Bishop Burnet uses Rom. vii.; but the sense of that chapter does not seem agreed upon.

If it be proper to take in actions done in a state of *apostasy*, we must add Heb. vi. 4—6; and x. 26, 38; and xii. 16, 17.

23. Having finished our direct proof, we may now propose an *objection* or two.

391 24. Some will be ready to ask, Is not the doctrine that heathen virtues have the nature of sin, a *cruel* one, with regard to a great proportion of mankind? And is it not contrary to Rom. ii. 14, 27? We might express this more fully, by asking, Can the unshaken honesty of *Aristides* have the nature of sin? or his patriotic co-operation with his enemies for the public good? what shall we say of the unremitting beneficence of *Titus*? or the youthful continence of *Scipio*? When the pious daughter fed her ancient parent from her breast, was not the act *pleasing* to our Father who is in heaven? But what shall we say of *Socrates*! who almost copied by anticipation him whom we have for an example⁹; who laboured to bring life and immortality to light; who suffered in the cause of pure religion; and who employed his last hours in speaking favourably of his accusers—of those through whom he suffered an unjust death? The answer is, this objection relates to those who were *heathens unavoidably*. You say that virtuous heathens, who were heathens *involuntarily*, will be happy. I do not say they will *not*¹⁰: *may* they be happy! Some parts of Scripture seem to say that men shall not be condemned¹¹ for being heathens, who have not heard of the Gospel; how much they may¹² *miss* I know not, nor is it my business to determine; but they *may*¹³ *miss* *Christian* salvation. *Actions* may be wrong¹⁴, and
392 yet the *agents* may be made happy. We men say of one another, sometimes, ‘what that man did was not the right *thing*;

⁵ Rom. viii. 1, *implies* that there is condemnation to those who are *not* in Christ Jesus.

⁶ 1 John iii. 4, might also be read.

⁷ 1 Pet. iii. 18, we find Christ called *δικαιος* (*χριστός*) *ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*, “the just for the unjust.”

⁸ Art. xi. sect. 14.

⁹ Notice should be taken of 1 Cor. v. 13, that *God* is the judge of heathen virtue; and on his judgment all may rest secure.

¹⁰ 1 Pet. ii. 21.

¹¹ Mark xvi. 15, 16. Rom. x. 14.

¹² Luke xii. 48.

¹³ Rom. x. 13.

¹⁴ Sect. 17.

it was not the etiquette; it was not attentive, &c.; but the man III. meant no *harm*; I like the *man*: had one done the same who had enjoyed more advantages and *opportunities*, I should have certainly *resented* it.' In like manner, might not the Deity take notice that heathen worship is *idolatry*, &c.; that every *sin*, however run into, makes confusion, and retards the advancement of the general happiness; but that a *parent*¹ may accept what a *judge* might not *pardon*?

Most thinking men² seem to allow that *natural* virtue may meet with *some rewards*; and why may not the benefits of the *Christian Sacrifice*, of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world³," extend, in some degree, to those who lived virtuously *before* the Incarnation of Christ?

St. Paul says, (Rom. ii. 14, 27,) "*When* the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." And he tells the Jews, that the Gentiles, *if* they fulfil the law, shall *judge* them. But it does not seem to be plainly affirmed, either that the Gentiles have a *perfect law*, or that they *act perfectly* up to that law which they have: they were "a law unto themselves." But would that be a *perfect law*? They acted conformably to it in some things, and "*when*" they did so they were to be commended; and they then *judged* the Jews, as *any* ignorant good man judges any learned wicked man. *Sodom* and Gomorrah were *preferable* to those who 393 rejected sacred truth⁴; that is, who chose to act on *lower* principles than they might have had to act upon: but *Sodom* and Gomorrah were not *spotless*; nor even *accepted* by God in his mercy. Dr. *Balguy* speaks not as if he thought the Gentiles certainly blameless, on account of St. Paul's saying, *when* they do the things contained in the law; though he speaks indulgently: "*When* they, who are strangers to the Gospel of Christ, fulfil the precepts of the Gospel, they will doubtless, *in some degree*, be entitled to its privileges, and *share* in its rewards."

25. An objector might say, Is it not somewhat strange that Christians should be required to supersede the *finer principles* of human action? I do not see that they *are* required

¹ Art. xii. sect. 23.

² Sect. 3, about Augustin; and Art. xii. sect. 19, about Warburton; and Art. xiii. about Necessary Doctrine, sect. 5.

³ 1 Pet. i. 19, 20. Rev. xiii. 8.

⁴ Matt. x. 15. Dr. *Balguy*, p. 158, alludes to this.

III. to do so. I do not understand that men, by becoming Christians, cease to be *men*. They acquire a new *ruling* principle, as men do in every new state; but every ordinary principle may co-operate with it. The Christian principle must be the *supreme*; but every principle of *virtue* may act, in subordination to it.

According to what was before observed⁵, from the ancient Father, let us be just, prudent, brave, temperate, by *faith*. Compare Phil. iv. 8, with the principles before enumerated⁶, and no material difference will be found. In other parts of Scripture, inferior motives to virtue are occasionally recommended, though no where insisted on as *new*. *Praise* is proposed⁷ as an incitement; the powers of *conscience* are described⁸; and Jesus himself is said to have increased in *favour*⁹.
 394 In each condition of life, I say, there is a *ruling* principle; but with it *secondary* principles mix and assimilate. The *justice* of the *soldier* mixes with his ruling principle of *honour*, and becomes more noble than the selfish and niggardly honesty of the lower tradesman or mechanic. Suppose then honour, decency, love of order, harmony, beauty, to be in a Christian mind; would they degenerate? God forbid! no soil could suit them better.

In fact, I rather fear, that some whose minds have been intent upon the higher parts of religion, whose devout affections have been much inflamed, have neglected the plainer moral duties; but this only shews that all our affections must be guided by reason and conscience¹⁰. Such neglect is wilful, and blameable; but no more to be laid to the charge of Christianity, than the fanatical follies of the crusaders, or the pious cruelties of the inquisition.

26. In the last place, something, for the sake of illustration, may be supposed to be objected to that part of our Article which declares that heathen virtues do not *deserve admission* into Christianity. Let then the case of *Cornelius* be proposed; as it seems to be a sort of standing objection. Was not Cornelius made a Christian because he feared God, and worked righteousness¹¹? I look upon it that the sacred

⁵ Sect. 2.⁶ Sect. 22.⁷ Rom. xiii. 3. 1 Pet. ii. 14.⁸ Matt. xiv. 2. John viii. 9. Rom. ii. 15. Heb. xiii. 18.⁹ Luke ii. 52.¹⁰ Here is an appearance of giving su-

premacv to both *faith* and *conscience*; but they are supreme in different ways—*faith* as an *active* principle, *conscience* as *judicial*. *Faith* is a commander, *conscience* a judge.

¹¹ Acts x. 35.

historian certainly meant to *commend*, as well as to record, III. his virtues; and it does not seem inconsistent with any thing which has been said, to suppose that those virtues might be, in some measure, the *occasion* of God's dispensation to the 395 Gentiles *originating*¹ from him; nay, might be a *personal recommendation*². In conferring benefits, you may prefer a man for his *moral* worth, and yet the benefits you confer may be wholly *gratuitous*. You may leave your *fortune* to one whom you *prefer* on account of his good *character*; and yet his virtues may give him no *claim*, of any sort, to your kindness. The proper question to be asked is, would God have been *culpable*³, or would he have acted *improperly* to Cornelius, if he had not assisted in his conversion? Every one must be too much *shocked* with the question to think any answer necessary. The *alms* of the worthy centurion would have brought in good interest if they could have purchased a *title* to *eternal* happiness! And, if blame would have fallen on the all-pure and perfect Being for not admitting Cornelius into the Christian covenant, it must now fall on him for *every* heathen, equally worthy with Cornelius, who continues in heathenism.

27. I will not propose any more objections; but proceed immediately to our *application*, consisting of the same parts as before.

On a footing of *natural religion*, a man might, referring to his former declarations, say something of this sort:—

‘I am now in an improved state: if my *improved* actions are only *pleasing* to God, in any degree, because they are recommended by the measures which I have taken, I ought to consider my *unimproved* actions as *not* pleasing in his sight. I thank Providence for the opportunities afforded me; they were wholly *gratuitous* and *unmerited*; if I *now content* 396 *myself* with such virtues as I practised before I enjoyed them, my best actions must be worse than they *need* be; their imperfections must on that account become less excusable; though, in truth, if I conceive what they would be, supposing God to express his perfect *will*, and publish his all-pure *commands* without reserve, I may fairly say, that, in their present state, they, at best, are not only imperfect, but *faulty*.’

28. On principles of *Christianity* the declaration might run thus:—

¹ See Ludlam's 5th Essay, p. 15.

² Art. x. sect. 26.

³ Art. xiii. sect. 14, end.

III. ‘ If the virtues I practise *since* I became a *Christian* are *only* acceptable to God *in Christ*, those which I practised *before* ought now to be looked upon by me as *not* acceptable; for want of something out of themselves to recommend them. That *they* should give me any *claim* to the transcendant benefits of Christianity, it is absurd to suppose: those benefits are mere matter of *favour*; nor could I have *blamed* any one if they had not been conferred upon me. Now I am a Christian, my righteousness must exceed that of my natural state; nay, I must constantly keep in mind, that my virtues (as they would be called) in that state, having no way to get rid of their faults and imperfections, must, in the eye of the all-perfect Being, appear to have the nature of *sin*.’

29. With a view to *mutual concessions*, we must consider with whom we have any difference of opinion on the subject of our present Article. We may have dispute with those who are shocked at our seeming to deny salvation to heathens⁴; with Romanists; and lastly, with all those who lightly esteem our notions of acting as Christians, be they called *Pelagians*, 397 or *Socinians*, or be they without name, only *nominal* Christians, or unbelievers.

With regard to those who condemn our seeming rigour to *heathens*, I should hope we had made them sufficient concessions, under the first objection, to prevent any dispute. And the Romanists, I should hope, would be contented with what we have said in our explanation. I do suppose that Luther, in opposing error, had expressed himself too strongly; but our Church is always moderate and rational: to convince all moderate and rational men of that, she need but be rightly *understood*. As to the third class of adversaries, who content themselves with acting as what they would call virtuous *men*, without acting as *Christians*, to them we have no concessions to make: we have reasoned with them in order to make them acknowledge, that it cannot be an indifferent matter whether such a dispensation as the Christian is neglected or not; and in the preceding Article we gave a pretty copious account of the texts which mark out true Christians as united to their *Head*, and as acting in the capacity of members. Here we must rest the matter: the affair is as much *practical* as speculative.

30. We have then only remaining the subject of *improvements*. It seems as if the *language* of the Article might be

⁴ See sect. 5, about Mr. Hume, &c.

made more *perspicuous*; and, perhaps, if the *scholastic* expression were now omitted, no great harm would ensue; though it does refer to certain remarks made by our adversaries. The *construction* also of the Article seems as if it might admit of some improvement; as the middle proposition, about meriting grace, separates two which are nearly alike in meaning.

But the improvements of the Article are not so important as those to which it *leads*.

It *tends* to make men act *as Christians*; to relieve them from the state of *criminals* in the sight of God, and to set them in the light of *adopted sons*; to make the idea of what Christ *taught*, did, suffered—of the *society* which he formed, and continually supports—not only an idea acknowledged, like others, when particularly attended to, but the ground of their *habitual* purposes, views, and behaviour.

It unites the *Christian* with the *man*—revealed religion with *natural*. It *arranges* things so that *faith* shall have the *superiority* intended it; but that *reason*, *conscience*, love of praise, and every finer sentiment of the human mind, shall have free scope and full encouragement.

It effects that, in the natural connection, sometimes rivalry, between *virtue* and *religion*, neither shall be neglected; and, by pointing out the manner in which their provinces may be defined, it prevents them from *interfering* with each other, so as to cause confusion:—affording to *virtue* the office of a *guide*, and making *religion* to act as a *motive*, or *incitement*; so that religion shall not degenerate into blind zeal, nor virtue into cold worldly selfishness¹.

All things seem in *progression*. I will conclude this Article with submitting to your consideration two passages of Scripture, as pointing out the way to improvement, the one in *virtue*, and the other in *religion*. Phil. i. 10 seems to acknowledge the gradual improvement of our *moral* faculties. Join to it the preceding verse, and that which follows it, and consider them altogether. 1. We have ἀγάπη, now most usually called *benevolence*, the *source* of good actions: this must produce much praiseworthy conduct; but it may grow *wild* and disorderly. 2. We have next, therefore, ἐπίγνωσις, a *knowledge* of “the nature and consequences of human actions².” this may occasion too great *coldness*:—we have

¹ See Dr. Balguy, p. 204.

² Dr. Balguy's MS. Heads of Moral

Lectures, Part III. chap. ii. referred to before, sect. 17.

III. therefore, 3. In the third place, *αἴσθησις*, an improved *sensibility*. These together may generate a right *moral faculty*—*εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ἡμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα*, so that we “may approve things that are excellent.” When we have got so far we must be aware of *hypocrisy* and *self-deceit*; *sincerity* is then important, and an *inoffensive* disposition: we must aim at being *εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι*. Let the disposition, thus formed, then proceed to *action*: our good qualities, whether respectable or amiable, will *grow* upon us, and produce *fruits* in abundance, both of natural virtue, and Christian righteousness—we shall be *πεπληρωμένοι καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης τῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*: and, at last, our character will assume a *celebrity*, and will flourish *εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον Θεοῦ*. Let any one make this the subject of a sermon: I never yet have; but it could not fail to produce a discourse interesting to all rational Christians.

The passage, pointing out the way to improvement in *religion*, is the conclusion of St. Peter's *second Epistle*.

“Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” On this I have discoursed before this University.

ARTICLE XIV.

OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

VOLUNTARY Works besides, over and above God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

1. The *history* of this Article needs not be long; especially as the subject of it is so connected with the subjects of the twenty-second Article. The Romanists wish to find something of the notion of Supererogation in the fifth century, particularly in the works of Augustin; but what he says wants

one essential, the *transfer* of merits. Bishop Porteus, in his III. brief confutation of Popery, extracted, in a good measure, from Archbishop Secker, (Part II. chap. viii.) says, that *indulgences*, except as mitigations of ecclesiastical censures, were not “known for at least 600 years, perhaps much longer.” Works of supererogation might be much longer still before they were definitely taught. I have a memorandum of their appearing *first* in the twelfth century—that century in which 401 the Popes established their sovereignty, and in which the remission of certain sins¹ was reserved to the Pope and bishops; but, when I looked last into *Forbes*, he did not give me a distinct idea on this head. I suppose distinct knowledge is not easy to be had, and the matter is not important; so I am not accurate about it. Mosheim places the rise of the doctrine of supererogation in the thirteenth century, which will be authority enough for us².

The principal thing to be observed is, that the Romanists spoke of Christ as having suffered (independently, I think, of the redemption of mankind,) more than he *needed* to have suffered; and therefore part of his *merits* might, according to them, be considered as laid up in a *treasury*. Now in whose *disposal* should this treasure be but in that of the *Church*? and who should act *for* the Church but its earthly head, the *Pope*? But not only Christ had a superabundance of merit, but some of the most eminent of the *saints*. They might have enjoyed this world innocently; therefore all their self-denial and voluntary suffering was so much *more than innocence*—it was *merit*; and merit which might be *transferred* to poor ordinary, sinful Christians. Such was the merit of performing acts of supererogation.

The spiritual treasury of merits, thus amassed, was sometimes said not to have the power of delivering from *eternal* punishment, but only from that temporary *purgatory*, of which we shall have occasion to speak something *hereafter*³; yet it is thought, that, in the minds of the common people, eternal 402 punishment and temporary, being both after death, were sometimes confounded; and that such confusion was rather encouraged⁴. But how was any one to get any of this treasure to

¹ Dupin's Compendium, 12th Cent. last chapter.

² See 13th Cent. Part II. chap. iii. sect. 1; or octavo, vol. III. p. 242.

³ Under the twenty-second Article.

⁴ See Bishop Porteus, Part II. Chap. viii.

III. be applied for his own benefit? by *charity*, either done in his life-time, or by will. “Charity shall cover the multitude of sins⁵ ;” charitable bequests must by no means be discouraged ; they would generally be larger than charitable presents ; some expedients must be found to make them efficacious. Here was great scope for *traffic*, or sale of spiritual goods for temporal ; and the *abuses* run into were so great as to occasion the beginning of the *Reformation*. The Council of *Trent* itself made decrees against them ; yet candour must remember, that the gains arising were not applied to the enriching of private individuals—chiefly to the enriching of some religious *order* ; and some, probably, to advancing the honour of religion.

The Council of Trent seems to avoid the term Supererogation, though it calls *indulgences* “*cælestes Ecclesiæ Thesauros* ⁶.” This conduct favours the idea, that the Romish Church rather wishes to have the doctrine of supererogation believed by the *people*, than precisely *taught* to all men of improved minds. The Rhemish Testament, which was intended for those who understood English and not Latin, speaks plainly⁷ : “Holy Sainctes, or other vertuous persons, may in measure and proportion of other mens necessities and deservings, allotte unto them, as wel the *supererogation* of
403 their *spiritual* workes, as those that abound in *worldly* goods may give almes of their superfluties to them which are in necessitie.” The *Necessary Doctrine* seems to have adopted *reformed* notions in this particular ; for here reformation began. It uses the *text* (Luke xvii. 10) which is in our Article, and exhorts men to keep continually *advancing* in virtue ; and represents them, the farther they advance, as being the more *indebted* to God for his grace, which enabled them to advance. It also represents our duties as being enjoined, not for any benefit to God, but merely for our *own good* ⁸. The third part of our *Homily* on Good Works turns to ridicule the *lamps* always running over, the markets of merits, the works of overflowing abundance, of supererogating Papists ; and by so doing, shews how necessary it was, at the time of the Reformation, to expose the corrupt practices and superstitions of the Romish Church to the *people*, and to declare against such corruptions in the new body of doctrines.

⁵ 1 Pet. iv. 8.

⁶ End of twenty-first session.

⁷ On 2 Cor. viii. 14 ; and see Index,

under *Works* and *Counsels*.

⁸ Of good works ; not very far from the end : the pages are not numbered.

As the subject of works of supererogation is intimately III. connected with the subjects of the twenty-second Article, you may ask, why is it placed *here*? Because it is in the midst of Articles which shew the absurdity of it, and even on the principles of the Romanists themselves. It relates to the actions of *individuals*, and to their being accepted and rewarded by the Deity.

2. We may now proceed to *explanation*. The chief thing to be explained is the *title*, “*Of works of supererogation.*”—*Rogare legem*, is to propose a law, or *ask* the people whether it may proceed. *Erogare*, is properly to make a law, or an order, for paying any sum out of a public *treasury*; but the word is used also for *paying*, or laying out. In Luke x. 404 35, προσδαπανάω, to spend over and above, is translated, in the Vulgate, by *supererogo*; which, as one single word, does not seem perfectly *classical*, though it might be really in *use* at Rome; but that is the case with several expressions, taken from common life, which are found in the Vulgate¹. Now here are *two acts* of beneficence mentioned as done by the good Samaritan—one definite, the other indefinite; the definite, giving two denarii; the indefinite, saying, “*whatsoever* thou spendest more (*quodcunque supererogaveris*) when I come again I will repay thee.” The Fathers, in pressing duties, determinate and indeterminate, though not belonging to acts of beneficence, had sometimes recourse to this passage of Scripture. I do not wonder at their dwelling on anything so excellent. They would compare definite commands, or prohibitions, to the two pence²; and things left to *expedience*, to the unlimited order of the Samaritan: and sometimes, (perhaps more frequently) *any commands*, though not very definite, such as *duo præcepta caritatis*, (the love of God and man, I suppose,) to the sum paid; and mere *advice*, such as St. Paul sometimes gives, to the indefinite commission. Hence the famous distinction of *precepts* and *counsels*, “*præcepta et consilia;*” or *commands* and *advice*³. An *ordinary* good 405

¹ Book I. chap. ix. sect. 8.

² See Nicholls on the Article. I see in Cave's Hist. Lit. that one part of Fulgentius's 2d Book *ad Monimum*, is, *de S. Pauli Supererogatione*.

Monimus had been puzzled about Augustin's comparison of Paul's *advice* 1 Cor. vii. 25, to the unlimited commission, “*quodcunque supererogaveris;*” &c.;

especially when he compared that comparison with others, arising out of the same passage, by Ambrose and Optatus; he applies to Fulgentius to reconcile them. Fulgentius labours at it; but I have not examined nicely. He says, interpretations *will* be different; but I find no idea of *transferring* merit.

³ See 1 Cor. vii. 6, 25, 26, 40; also

III. Christian, the notion is, obeys all *precepts*; but he must be something great and *extraordinary* who aims at *counsels*—which are sometimes called *evangelical perfections*. He who obeys precepts will have *some reward*; but he who obeys *counsels* will be rewarded much more nobly. He who *disobeys precepts* (I speak as a Romanist) will be *punished*; but he who does not comply with *counsels* will suffer no punishment, merely on that account.

I see nothing farther to explain. The word “*arrogance*” may arise from the idea of man’s being sinful, and yet pretending to dispose of the rewards of God; “*impiety*,” from the idea of our being *indebted* to God, and yet making him, as it were, our debtor. Our Church says nothing, in this Article, of the merits of Christ; but only of the merit of *human* creatures⁴.

3. We may therefore immediately begin upon our *proof*. I do but perceive *one proposition*; but it must be framed with a view to the sense of supererogation at the time when our Article was made: “which they *call* Works of Supererogation”—call so, at *this time*, say our Reformers.

‘We may not suppose any one man to have so much merit, that some of it can be transferred to lessen the punishment of another man.’

406 This might be left as proved by the eleventh, twelfth, and fifteenth Articles. If we are not justified by works, we cannot be *more* than justified by them. If our Christian virtues are in themselves imperfect, and are only accepted through Christ, we can have no merits in our *disposal*. If all men are *sinner*s, they want all their merit for themselves, and more than all⁵. In the Lord’s prayer, we desire God to forgive us our trespasses. We are commanded to love God with *all* our heart; to do *all* to the glory of God; can we do more? We are bought with a *price*⁶; have such persons any *services* to give away? There is no abiding place where we may stop as

2 Cor. viii. 8, 10. In the Vulgate, “*de Virginibus autem præceptum Domini non habeo; consilium autem do,*” &c. *Counsel* is an English word for *advice*, which cannot be said to be antiquated: Gay says, of courtiers,

They give you good *counsel* themselves to defend.

⁴ “Voluntary works *besides*, over and

above,” &c. Could one see an instance of this use of the word “*besides*,” in any author about the time of the Reformation? The word *besides* occurs in Art. xx.; but, if it has the same force here as there, it is a preposition as usual, and the words “*over and above*” are synonymous to it, or explanatory of it.

⁵ Ludlam’s 5th Essay, p. 10.

⁶ 1 Cor. vi. 20.

though we were¹ already perfect, and say, Here I am, I need III. make no further advancement in virtue: we are to press *forward*; we are to *run* so² as to obtain—to *strive*³ to enter in at the strait gate. And, as we must take our idea of works of supererogation from the practice of the Romanists at the time of the Reformation, we may reason from the human commandments as censured in the New Testament, in Matt. xv. 9, and Col. ii. 18. 20—23, to the still more foolish and corrupt human commandments of the Romanists. I think our Homily reasons thus with great force⁴.

4. The proofs of the eleventh, twelfth, and fifteenth Articles, are proofs of this Article. If, after such proofs, any difficulty remains, it will be best cleared up by answering *objections*. Bishop Burnet concludes his exposition with saying, “the thing is so plain, that it has no sort of difficulty in it.” But it seems to me that an acute Romanist might give us some trouble; if not so as to affect our opinion, and hinder our assenting to the Article, yet so as to perplex us about extricating it from all confusion, and setting it clear of snares and entanglements. Let us then suppose such an one to make the following objection:—

‘Can a man do nothing beyond bare duty? is all virtue to be measured by rule and compass? are no noble effusions, no generous exertions, to be encouraged? are we to aim at nothing great, nothing graceful?’ It will be more easy to examine these questions, if we proceed methodically. Suppose then the objector to say, to the same purpose, ‘Take a man that you would *just not blame*; cannot another *excel* him? may not you coolly esteem and like the first, and feel much towards the other—love, approbation, high esteem, admiration? And yet,

¹ Phil. iii. 12, 13, 14.

² 1 Cor. ix. 24, where the context is in our favour. See Locke’s Paraphrase and Contents. ³ Luke xiii. 24.

⁴ Although Hammond gives a favourable interpretation of *ἐθελουθησκέα*, Col. ii. 23, (which it may bear), yet that does not affect the *scope* of the passage, Col. ii. 20—23, which is against superstitious restraints on natural liberty, imposed by man. My idea of the passage, after reading Hammond, is this: If ye be dead with Christ from [Jewish ordinances] worldly elements, why do you dogmatize, as if you still lived in the world [under

such slavish ordinances]? [why do you dogmatically enjoin,] touch not, taste not, handle not, [meats, and wines, and women]; all which [prohibitions] turn to corruption, by abuse, [to unnatural indulgences], according to the injunctions and teachings of [superstitious] men; which [abstinences] have an *appearance* of prudence, in the way of voluntary religion, and humility, and mortification of the body; but have no real tendency to bring about any honourable [and well-regulated] gratification of the bodily appetites. This paraphrase will be of use in Art. xxxii. sect. 18.

III. if the first be innocent, he must have merit enough; has not then the other *more* than barely enough? and what could he do better with some of it than *transfer* it? A man may have 408 more interest sometimes than he wants for introducing himself to an advantage—he may have interest enough to be able to introduce a friend.

‘And does not common *language* shew that this is common reason? *Praise* is not bestowed, nor *rewards* conferred, on those who merely perform their *duty*. And it is so common to say, such a man *gave more*, or *did more* than he was under *obligation* to do, that we must look upon common language as establishing or implying the distinction between *precepts* and *counsels*.

‘Nay, farther, does not *Scripture* confirm the same thing? does it not make use of *praise* and *reward* as incentives? does it not exhort or advise some men to do more than men *need* do? as in the case of him who was to *sell*⁵ *all* he had and give to the poor; and of *St. Paul*, who *preached gratis*, foregoing the stipend to which he had a right⁶, (for *St. Paul*’s example is to us as exhortation,) and who himself gives *counsel*⁷ where he will not give *precept*; to which last instance may be joined the favourable mention of those who “made themselves *eunuchs* for the kingdom of heaven’s sake⁸.”

If we can answer this objection satisfactorily, we have nothing more to fear from our present Article: it is partly of a *moral* nature. We must allow that one man may be only just free from blame, yet an object of calm esteem and benevolence, whilst another, who is compared with him, may be much admired: let us give these two characters names; the former is *A*, the latter is *B*.

409 First, when *A* and *B* stand thus compared, *A* may be really *less worthy* than *B*; yet that may not be the reason why he is less admired; nor does it follow, because he is not blamed by man, that he is *innocent* in the sight of God, in such sort that he must escape punishment; nor, because *B* is *admired*, can we infer that he has any merit to *spare*; nor that, if he had, he could *transfer* it, or any man for him. But this must be expressed more at large. The reason why *A* is not *blamed* is, because he does what is prescribed in a *definite* man-

⁵ Matt. xix. 21. Luke xviii. 22.

⁶ 1 Cor. ix. 12—18, of which Mr. *Locke* says, (Contents to sect. 5,) in the person

of *St. Paul*, “I do not content myself with doing barely what is my *duty*.”

⁷ 1 Cor. vii. 25.

⁸ Matt. xix. 12.

ner, or performs *determinate* duties. Men find it, generally III. speaking, inconvenient, or wrong, sometimes impracticable, to blame any who perform those duties, the circumstances of which can be particularly marked and insisted on; hence it is *habitual* to confine blame to violation of such duties. And, in like manner, it is habitual to *praise* only the performance of *indeterminate* duties; it being always evident that they may be evaded by any one who wishes to evade them, and wants principles: add, that if a man performs indeterminate duties, such as beneficence, forgiveness, gratitude, &c. with any *danger* to himself, or in any *unexpected* manner, a pleasing *wonder* heightens moral approbation; so that, though a man neglected some determinate duties, (for people are often *generous*, who are not strictly *just*), yet if he overpowered blame, by the force of these more pleasing sentiments, he might be admired, and applauded. But though A, the harmless or blameless man, is generally treated as *innocent* by man, yet he will not be so by his own conscience, or by “*God* the judge of all¹,” if he neglects indeterminate duties, which he has opportunity of practising—if he never gives, or forgives. Though therefore he may not be 410 blamed by man, he may be *punished* by God. Consequently, nothing can be grounded on B’s being better than A is; whereas the objector supposed that A was *innocent*, or had merit *enough*, and B more than A. Nor, because B is *admired* by man, has he therefore any merit to spare. He may be *punishable* for neglect of determinate duties, or even of indeterminate: his obedience is *imperfect*, though it may be *striking*; and so he would tell you *himself*. What military commander, of real merit, would say of himself, that he had done more than his duty? Yet such an one might say of an inferior officer, whose merit was much below his own, that *he* had done his duty; but this would mean only that he had done all which could be *demanded* of him. It is here worth observing, that *language varies* when a man speaks of himself and of *others*. But, if the obedience of B, the admired character, is confessedly *imperfect*—if he may be *blamed* by God, who knows all his circumstances, can he have any merit to *spare*? Nay, suppose that *both* A and B get some reward, yet may they not be susceptible of reward in different *degrees*? and may not God reward them in *proportion* to their real merits? When B has got a certain reward, he is not *full*, incapable of receiving more.

¹ Heb. xii. 23.

III. As to a man's having interest to introduce a *friend*, that is founded on no general principle. In different *cases* in common life, it depends so very much upon particular circumstances, that no argument can be deduced from it.

Secondly, though A may be only just not blamed, and B may be admired, yet it is possible A may be *as good* a man as B, or much *better*. Suppose A regular, industrious, frugal, kind to his neighbours in a plain way, not diminishing his
411 power of providing for his family: suppose B generous, but beyond his fortune—brave, willing to sacrifice any advantages, to encounter any dangers for his fellow-creatures in distress:—A might only just escape blame, and B be generally admired; and yet I should hold A's the better character. But, suppose A this sort of plain benevolent man, and B a *Simeon Stylites*²: how great then would be the difference in point of admiration in favour of B, (taking a proper age to judge) in point of real worth, in favour of A! No man, who aims at extraordinary merit, can pursue one thing without neglecting another: his worth must depend on the value of what he neglects. A canonized saint has generally left substantial duties to ordinary men: these would be less admired than himself, but might often have much more real worth.

The best plan then is, to set each man on watching what opportunities of doing good his station affords, without neglecting any thing which is really more valuable than what he aims at; and on *exerting* himself to the utmost in *improving* such opportunities. As he went forward he would see perpetually *new openings*, which would occasion *new exertions*. How much better is this than turning a man's attention on the misguiding distinction between precepts and counsels! fit only to make men idle or vain! If men are indolently disposed, the
412 distinction between precepts and counsels will make them rest in determinate duties; if more active and ambitious, it will make them arrogant, as if they were doing what even God could not require.

But our objector refers to common *language*, with regard

² See Middleton's Free Inquiry, p. 165. A passage translated from Theodoret.—Suppose a dialogue was composed, after the manner of *Lucian*, between Simeon Stylites knocking at the gate of heaven, and St. Peter, as porter, keeping the keys of heaven. Simeon might bring

our A, and, taking his own admission for granted, desire an *inferior* place for poor A, on account of his (Simeon's) merits: Peter might examine both; order A to be admitted to a good place, and order Simeon to be kicked down into the nether parts, &c. &c.

to *praise, reward*, and doing *more* than a man is *obliged* to III. do—as favouring the distinction between precepts and counsels. This part of the objection is, in effect, already answered. Praise and reward are not, amongst men, proportioned to real worth, but depend upon what we *expect*¹; which depends upon what we are *accustomed* to. We praise nothing that is *common*, however *useful* it may be, and how much soever we praised it when it was *uncommon*; and reward is praise carried into action. We *blame* a breach of any common rules of conduct, because that is a shock and disappointment to us.

When we say, a man gave *more* than he was *obliged* to give, we generally mean that he gave more than the petitioner could have demanded, or than the magistrate could have insisted on. Perhaps a man, of whom we should say this, did not give so much as he was under obligation to give, in the judgment of *God*, who knew all his circumstances. If a man wants to have distinct ideas, when he hears it said, such a man gave more than he needed to give, he will always ask, more *in whose judgment?*

A man may be conceived to give so much that God will reward him (Prov. xix. 17); he may give more, God may reward him more; he may give more still, God may reward him *less*; because he neglected something, in the last instance, to which he was more strongly obliged. We are to aim at a maximum of good, upon the whole.

Precepts and *counsels* seem only to differ as *duties determinate* and *indeterminate*. 413 The general reason why a direction is made a counsel rather than a precept, or an indeterminate duty rather than a determinate one, is, because circumstances are so variable, that a calculation of them must be left to the agent; but this is nothing to the essence of duty, nor to the judgment of *God*.

It must be owned that a man is sometimes blamed for neglect of indeterminate duties; but that is when they are very common, and the evasion of them gross. But, even in these cases, they are blamed more by the rash and censorious, than by the candid and considerate; and what is faulty in such blame, is not to be made the ground of objection here.

We should never forget, that *language* is secretly guided by convenience², and use. Praise and blame, on that account, as well as on account of what was mentioned before, seldom

¹ Art. xii. sect. 23.

² Introd. to Second Part of the Articles, sect. 4.

III. mark the real worth of actions. Babes in Christ, and 'tis the same in morals, must have milk, and not strong meat³. A discreet pastor thinks what he may blame with *success*; if he succeeds at first, he will venture farther; and sometimes he finds difficulty; for encouragement makes some men remiss, others it quickens; blame revolts some men, though it corrects others; and the same kind of thing tends to fix the standard of blame and praise in the world at large.

I cannot quit the subject of language without repeating, that, when I am speaking of *others*, *duty* means, what I can *claim*; when of *myself*, it is, what I can *do*.

414 5. Our objector alleges, that *Scripture* encourages the distinction between precepts and counsels; that is, encourages the notion that a man may, in many cases, do more than he is *obliged* to do. To this part of the objection, relating to *Scripture*, no general answer seems necessary, except, that the language of *Scripture* is *common* language⁴. What is said therefore of *praise* and *reward* in *Scripture*, must be interpreted as it is in common life. The particular *instances* alleged from *Scripture* certainly deserve some answer. *Why* our Saviour told the young man, who wished to be his follower, to *sell all* he had, and give to the poor, I think no man may be able perfectly to see: the case was evidently *extraordinary*, and such as no man should copy, except he was able to make the proper allowance⁵ for difference of circumstances: was any one to do the same *now*, he might be "worse than an *infidel*⁶." There is an *appearance* that the young man was *too sanguine*—wanted to *undertake* what he would not have had the resolution to *persist* in to the *end*. This is a temper of youth; and our Saviour might mean to convince him that he was *unfit* for what he aimed at; and might require that sacrifice of him, without which he would have been a troublesome disciple, if not an apostate⁷. But, if I was to make an hundred conjectures, I should end with saying, that it is not probable that we should see the *whole* wisdom of our Lord's proposal. St. Paul preached gratis; but there is no⁸ appearance that he thought God was his *debtor* on that account. 415 Having an opportunity of doing credit to the Gospel, he did it; but his reason for speaking of his motives was, that his

³ 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

⁴ Introd. to Second Part, sect. 12.

⁵ Book I. chap. xi. ⁶ 1 Tim. v. 8.

⁷ This passage of *Scripture* is considered again, Art. xxxviii. sect. 6.

⁸ 1 Cor. ix. 12—18.

disinterestedness was turned against him by a rival party; and III. he was even said not to be a true Apostle¹ because he had not the stipend of one. Had Paul accepted a stipend no *man* would have blamed him; but yet if he had neglected any opportunity of furthering the Gospel, he might have had blame from God, or a less reward.

What belongs to voluntary abstinence from *marriage*, for the sake of promoting the interests of religion, may be deferred to the thirty-second Article. The passages are generally urged on our present subject, and therefore are mentioned here; but what is said on other passages may sufficiently, for the present, obviate difficulties relating to them.

Barbeyrac, on Grotius *de Jure*, &c. I. ii. 9, has a long note on the distinction between Precepts and Counsels.

6. The expression, "*charity shall cover the multitude of sins*," seems to me to mean, that, as all rules of virtue are only modifications of benevolence, or charity—where we want *rules*, if we act from the fundamental principle, benevolence, as well as we can, we shall be excused for any mistakes which we may run into. It is probable that we run into many faults every day; but they are undistinguished faults, unnoticed—the *crowd*, the herd, "the *multitude* of sins"—or what the Psalmist calls, our "*secret sins*"²; as opposed to such as are "*presumptuous*."

7. I will now venture to proceed to our *application*; though it does not seem necessary, in treating the present 416 Article, to detain you by forms of assent.

As to mutual *concessions*, I will read you what *Dupin* says on the Article³. There does not seem to be much hope from it⁴. *Baxter*, in his *Catholic Theology*, which is all reconciling, declines the attempt to reconcile Papists and Protestants in those doctrines which have in view the accumulation of *wealth*. Something might possibly arise from the different senses in which we use the word *duty*, when we speak of *ourselves*, and *others*. The popish doctrine is of the duties of *others*, the saints; our Article runs in the name of the agent, and speaks of duties as done to *God*. We are by no means against voluntary exertions; we think every such ex-

¹ Locke on 1 Cor., section 5, Contents.

² Psalm xix. 12, 13.

³ Mosheim, vol. vi. 8vo, p. 77, being Append. 3.

⁴ Would not Dupin be tolerably satisfied by what is here said, that good Christians must exert themselves beyond what is required, in some sense?

III. ertion will have its adequate reward;—the more the better, so long as the greatest possible good is aimed at upon the whole—so long as we neglect no stronger obligation for a weaker.

Improvements seem to depend much on settling, in each case, the comparative worth of ordinary life and extraordinary exertions; and something might result from reducing indeterminate duties to determinate⁵.

417

ARTICLE XV.

OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.

CHRIST in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except; from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

1. We begin, as usual, with *history*.

There are *two subjects* in the Article: the *purity of Christ*, or his perfect freedom from sin;—and the *sinfulness of man*.

2. It is scarcely to the purpose to mention that the *Jews* calumniated our Lord as a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, as a sabbath-breaker and a seditious person; because the character of Christ, with which we are concerned, is that which results from a view of his whole conduct.

Some very ancient Christians have been accused of speaking slightly at least, if not slanderously, of their Lord and Saviour; but, as we have not any of their writings, and those who
418 accuse them wrote some time after them, generally speaking, and not in the most candid and dispassionate manner, I will not dwell upon opinions so faintly described and imperfectly

⁵ *Inns* have reduced the indeterminate duty of *hospitality* to a determinate bargain; and services, which might once have canonized a saint, may now be compensated by the stipend of a missionary.

proved. The best account I know of them is in *Lardner's* III. posthumous work. We have before said¹ that the *Socinians* look upon Christ as *peccable*.

The passage quoted by *Welchman* from *Irenæus* is to our purpose: its original meaning must have been to oppose the *Docetæ*. *Tertullian's* passage is rather curious, and particularizes the right *kind* of sins; allowances being made for difference of *manners* in different ages and countries. It leads us to the *second subject*, the *sinfulness* of man.

3. We pass on to the *Pelagians*. In consequence of their slight notions of original sin and divine grace, when the orthodox exclaimed, how *sinful* men are! they extolled the freedom of man's will, and maintained, "that a man may be without sin"—"keep God's commandments easily², if he will." What they urged in defence of their opinion was so specious, that it perplexed the mind of *Marcellinus*, a nobleman of Carthage, who wrote to Augustin on the subject. Not that this was the only subject on which he consulted him: we have three books written by Augustin, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione, et de Baptismo parvulorum*, addressed to Marcellinus³. The second is to our present purpose; and of that I will read you the *contents*, and perhaps a passage or two. Augustin speaks on the same subject in other works; and Jerom in his writings against the Pelagians. Leporius, whose 419 recantation we have⁴, had leaned towards the Pelagians. They represented the orthodox as saying, in effect, when they called all men certainly sinful, that the commands of God are *impossible*; which the Papists charge upon *Luther*⁵, as they do the doctrine, "that *invincible ignorance* is not excusable;" a doctrine, I fancy, connected with this Article; as making a *cause*

¹ From Priestley's Letters, p. 101.

² Wall's Inf. Bapt. p. 166, 4to, from Jerom. See the original (in Jerom, or) in *Append.* to tenth vol. Op. Aug. p. 55; where are many things on this subject, as well as on other parts of Pelagianism.

³ Aug. Opera, vol. x. beginning. Argument of 2d Book.

⁴ See Sirmond's collection, or *Opuscula varia*. Gennadius's memorandum prefixed is more useful than the Recantation itself, which is declamatory, and about several more important things. This Recantation is mentioned in Jortin's 2d Dissertation, p. 88.

In the Appendix to the tenth Tom. of Op. Augustini, p. 86, there is a short quotation from this Recantation; from whence it seems that Leporius's error had been rather on the *first subject* of this Article, making Christ man in the most *extended* sense; saying, he bore the *suffering* as a *mere* man, without *divine help* of any kind. This was indeed implying also that a common man does his difficult duties without divine help. In Sirmond's edit. this passage is p. 20.

⁵ Dupin's Compend. Hist. Cent. xvi. chap. vi. p. 16; and Berti's Compendium, vol. II. pp. 153, 154.

III. of doing wrong *actions*, however unavoidable, a species of *sin*.

4. The Council of *Trent*, in eighteenth canon of session vi., declares against *impossibility* of keeping God's commands; though in the tenth canon it says that men are not formally *righteous*. The twenty-fifth canon is against saying that Christians sin *venially*, at least, even in their good works; but then it is supposed that eternal punishment is held to be merited by such venial sin, of itself. The account of the *Virgin Mary* may be noticed. The Romanists reckon her void of sin⁶. Bishop Burnet thinks the scriptural expressions rather imply some imperfection in her. Some have gone so far, we are told⁷, as to say, that St. *Francis* performed every command of God; but as Dupin⁸ makes no objection to this Article, we will say no more of the Church of Rome⁹.

5. The two ideas of sinless perfection, which are most to our purpose, may as well be mentioned without regard to *time*; I mean those of the *Mystics* and *Antinomians*. So much has been said of both these sets of Christians before¹⁰, that I may confine myself to the ways in which they have conceived themselves *free from sin*. The *Mystics* became free from sin by the intimate *union* of their souls with God and Jesus Christ; the *Antinomians*, by having all their sins *laid upon Christ*. The mystical enthusiast does not purposely do any thing which we should call wrong; the Antinomian does things *wrong* in themselves, but they are *right* because he, a true Christian, does them; insomuch, that if he was to *steal*, the crime commonly called theft would in him lose its criminal nature. But let us say a word or two about each of these *separately*.

Men may be *mystics* in different *degrees*. I have been told, from respectable authority, that the Arminian Methodists, known better as disciples of *John Wesley*, have a class, or rank, or small society, which is called *the select band*; the members of which are supposed to be in a state of *perfection*. They do not indeed like to join the word "*sinless*" with perfection:

⁶ Trent, session 5, end of decree about original sin. Rhem. Test. on Col. i. 24.

⁷ Rogers on the Article.

⁸ Mosheim, octavo, vol. vi. p. 77.

⁹ Luther considered the Papists and Anabaptists as the *Pelagians* of his age,

and might be too warm against them. And our Article might be intended to soften matters. See *Life of Ridley*, pp. 344, 345, referred to in Art. xiii. sect. 5.

¹⁰ Book III. chap. xv. sect. 11, is partly on mysticism: for the Antinomians, see Art. vii. sect. 3.

they like best to say, they are “*perfect in love*”¹. Baxter III. mentions some enthusiasts who conceive “a certain height of holiness,”—“a state of *sinless perfection*,” attainable “in this life”². He speaks of Origen and Macarius amongst the ancients, and of “some later papists,” as having favoured the conception. The *Familists*, before mentioned³, seem to have gone deep into it⁴.

6. *Antinomians* have held, that Christ, having fulfilled the law for them, has taken away *sin*. Their name of *Libertines*⁵ was from their using carnal liberty, I think, as well as from their doctrine having that tendency; and probably something of this sort has occasioned some of the ancients to be accused of holding all actions to be *indifferent*⁶. Baxter says, it is the “known opinion of the Antinomians⁷,” that “God seeth no sin in his people; the guilt falls on Christ.” These he calls afterwards⁸ “*Libertine Doctrines*,” as synonymous to Antinomian. In Dickinson’s Letters⁹, an Antinomian reasoner says, “If he (a Christian) be united to Christ, and interested in his righteousness, he is perfectly righteous; and if he be perfectly righteous, he cannot be sinful.” Picart mentions¹⁰ some Moravian *Anabaptists* who “omitted this part of the Lord’s Prayer, *Forgive us our trespasses*, &c. because being regenerated, they esteemed themselves to be without sin.”⁴²²

The “Brethren and Sisters of the *free Spirit*,” as described by Mosheim¹¹, seem to have the nature of both Mystics and Antinomians.

When we spoke of *hardening*¹², &c. we quoted some expressions about God being the Author of *all thoughts*.

7. From history, we proceed, as usual, to *explanation*.

The *title* of 1552 is somewhat different from ours: “No *man* is without Sin but Christ alone.” It turns our thoughts to the sinfulness of *man*, which seems the *proper subject* of the Article; and at the same time it shews us the *ground* of the

¹ 1 John iv. 18.

² Pamphlet on Perseverance, 3d opinion; pp. 4, 5.

³ Art. vii. sect. 3 and 7.

⁴ Baxter, *ib.* conclusion. Fuller’s Church History, 9th Book, p. 113. *Mysticism* was an object of attention to the *Reformers*: see Art. vii. sect. 3, referring to Art. xix. of 1552, and *Reform. Legum de Hæresibus*, cap. 3.

⁵ Art. x. sect. 20, and Art. xii. sect. 1, and Art. xiii. sect. 5.

⁶ Lardner under Basilides, sect. 13. Trent, session vi. canon 19.

⁷ On Perseverance, p. 12.

⁸ P. 40.

⁹ P. 350.

¹⁰ Quoted by Rutherford, Charges, p. 55. See also Art. vii. sect. 3 and 7.

¹¹ Cent. xiii. 2, 5, 9, 10, &c.

¹² Art. x. sect. 20.

III. question, whether Christ was not, in any way, sinful; namely, his having the nature of *man*¹³.

8. It seems proper to observe how much of our Article is taken out of *Scripture*. Christ “was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted,” may be looked upon as taken from Heb. ii. 17, and iv. 15, united. “The *Lamb* without spot,” is from 1 Pet. i. 19. “Who, by the sacrifice of himself, once made,” is from Heb. ix. 26, and other passages. “Should take away the sins of the world,” is from John i. 29. “And sin was not in him,” is from 1 John iii. 5. “Baptized and born again in Christ,” may be conceived as taken from John iii. 3, and 5, joined. “Offend in many things,” is from James iii. 2; and the rest from 1 John i. 8.

423 9. It might be doubted whether our Article does, in strictness, affirm that Christ was not *peccable*: it certainly affirms that he *did not sin*; which seems to amount to much the same. If sin had been in his propensities, he would seemingly have committed it sometimes, as we do, so many are the openings to sin: but this we cannot thoroughly understand.

10. “*All we the rest*,”—implies the *human* nature of Christ: it is calling him one of the human species, though distinguishing him as alone free from sin.

11. “*Baptized and born again*,”—means, having gone through external forms of admission into Christianity, and having the suitable disposition; so that baptism¹⁴ shall have its proper *effect*.

12. The only thing remaining, of explanation, is settling the *kind of sins* here spoken of, which all Christians have in common. Dr. Overal¹⁵ says, “*Articulus xv. de quotidianis et communibus peccatis tractat, quæ omnibus regeneratis communia sunt; in quibus offendimus omnes, salvâ tamen gratiâ, nec ab eâ recedentes.*” The beginning of the sixteenth Article, about every *deadly* sin—*willingly* committed, does give countenance to this opinion; so does the text from St. John, as

¹³ *Leporius*'s error seems to have turned on something connected with this. See pp. 19, 20, of his *Recantation*, ed. Sirmond.

¹⁴ Sometimes the outward ceremony, sometimes some *privilege*, is used to express admission into Christianity; which of these shall be preferred depends on circumstances: here it seems

best to use *both* expressions.

¹⁵ Short account of the Five Points according to the Church of England, in a vol. with *Fur prædestinatus*. Dr. Overal was a moderate man; Regius Professor at Cambridge, Dean of St. Paul's, Bishop of Lichfield; then of Norwich, in 1618, seemingly for one year only.—Not in *Biographia Britannica*.

well as that from James, which Bishop Overal has quoted; we III. deceive ourselves “if we say that we have *no sin*”—none whatever. In the original, James’s expression is, *πολλὰ γὰρ* 424 *πταίμεν ἅπαντες*. *πταίω* is to stumble, make *trips*, mistakes. Yet people sin in degrees different without end; therefore we must not *exclude* more *heinous* sins from the meaning of the Article, though it will *extend* to those run into by the *best* of Christians, and may be *chiefly* meant of them. I before said¹, that, when Luther is charged with holding “that invisible ignorance is not excusable,” the charge seems to have relation to the present Article; and some expressions in *Jerom’s* Dialogue with a Pelagian², seem to shew, that when the orthodox Fathers spoke of all Christians as sinful, they meant that the best Christians fall short of perfect, or consummate virtue, in some thing or other.

13. We come now to our *proof*. There seem to be only *two propositions* remaining to be proved.

1. Christ was void of sin.

2. No Christian is wholly void of sin.

Other propositions are certainly contained in the Article; but they have either been proved before, or are themselves brought from Scripture as proofs.

14. Christ was void of sin.

This has been, incidentally, proved before³. It is also proved in this *Article*, as has already appeared, under the explanation. I may add a text or two:—Is. liii. 3—5. Luke i. 35. John xiv. 30. Acts iii. 14. 2 Cor. v. 21. Heb. vii. 26. In the Article, we have a proof of the purity of Christ, from the *type* of him, the spotless Lamb: from his being a *sacrifice* 425 for the sins of others, which seems to imply that he himself did not want a *redeemer*. The *difficulty* of his being perfectly pure arises from his being *real man*⁴. But he was not conceived and born in sin⁵; he was conceived by the Holy Ghost; and, by that wonderful expedient, he became free from what we call *original sin*: how far that contributed towards his being free from *actual sin*, we know not. Yet if, as⁶ before

¹ Sect. 3.

² This dialogue is transferred into the Appendix of the 10th vol. of Augustin’s Works, p. 55. “Ego sentio, (says the orthodox character, Atticus) nullam creaturam, secundum *veram consummatam-*

que justitiam, (δικαιοσύνην) posse esse perfectam.”

³ Append. to Art. xi. sect. 20.

⁴ Of *Leporius*, see sect. 3 and 7.

⁵ Psalm li. 5.

⁶ Sect. 9.

III. observed, he was peccable, he was very *likely* to have fallen into sin.

15. No *man* is void of sin.

Texts to this purpose have appeared under the ninth Article: but the proposition is sufficiently proved in the Article itself. It may not be amiss to add, 1 Tim. i. 15, with regard to St. *Paul*; and Luke v. 8, Gal. ii. 11, with regard to St. *Peter*. If we look round for other authorities, we must take care not to infringe upon other Articles—not even on the sixteenth. What has been already said, in describing Christian *good works*, about their *imperfections*⁷, applies here directly.

16. Other texts will appear in *objections*; to which therefore we may now proceed.

Against the perfect purity of the character of Christ, might it not be objected, that, when a person calls him “Good Master,” he disclaims the title of *good*, and says, “Why callest thou me good⁸? there is none good but one, that is, God.” This seems intended by Christ to rebuke the man for flattery. How good soever *we* see Christ to have been, when we review his *whole* life, the person rebuked could not so clearly see him
426 to be good. But the reply might convey, and be intended to convey, a different idea to those who knew the whole history of Christ. It might mean, ‘If I am good, strictly speaking, and at the same time a real man, it is owing to the union of the *divine* with the human nature in my person.’ Our Saviour probably meant, moreover, in rebuking the person who called him good, to rebuke the general practice amongst the Jews of giving flattering titles to the *Rabbis*⁹.

17. With regard to the universal sinfulness of man, it has been objected, that certain persons are spoken of in Scripture as *blameless*¹⁰. It seems sufficient to reply, that, whatever *inculpatus* means in any Latin, or ἀμειπτος in any Greek classic, “blameless” should be understood to mean in English; that is, I take it, a person not to be *complained* of—one whom you would not think of blaming, but rather of *commending*. It is common to say, ‘this is a man of an *irreproachable* character’—‘a most *unexceptionable* man.’ We have before¹¹ explained *good works*, on principles of fact and probability, on

⁷ Art. xii. sect. 6. See also Homily on the Misery of Man, 2d Part, p. 12, 8vo.

⁸ Matt. xix. 17.

⁹ Macknight, on the place, may be worth reading.

¹⁰ Luke i. 6.

¹¹ Art. xii. sect. 6.

which all language is built. What Jerom says¹ may amount III. to much the same: some persons are called blameless, “non quòd omni vitio careant, sed ex majori parte virtutum;” which gives the *character*.

It might not be improper to look back to the *first objection* under the twelfth Article, sect. 23.

18. Let us now take, as an objection, the Pelagian *dilemma*²: “Aut possibilia Deus mandata dedit, aut impos- 427
sibilia. Si possibilia, in nostrâ est potestate ea facere si volumus: si impossibilia, non in hoc *rei* sumus, si non facimus quod implere non possumus.” My answer would be—*each* command of God is possible to be performed; but (especially considering our depraved propensities, and our standing in need of divine assistance,) the commands of God are so *numerous*, and each of them admits of so many degrees of *nicety* in the principles, and of *exertion* in the manner of performance, that it is *extremely improbable*, that, when we come to look *back* upon our conduct, we shall not perceive something wrong, in some respect or other. So improbable is this, that, in common language, it is called *impossible*—there is no *expectation* in the mind that it will happen; and in this sense our Lord himself says, “It is *impossible* but that offences will come³.” We have it in our power, however, to do what is sufficient for our *salvation*⁴; that is, in every thing to *aim* at doing well. The impossibility here spoken of does not appear at all whilst we are *resolving* upon duty—not *beforehand*; the impossibility appears only on *review*—on calculation, or retrospect. Such impossibility does not take away the universality of our *principle* of obedience; it does not put us on any footing different from those who believe they can do their whole duty; it does not prevent our being considered, and punished, as guilty, for every command which we neglect or violate. God sees all the variety of degrees in which men endeavour to perform perfect obedience; and he can reward or punish according to circum- 428
stances, be they ever so complicated.

We should now take notice of an objection on the part of the *Mystic*, and of one on the part of the *Antinomian*.

¹ I happen to take this from Augustin's works, vol. x. p. 51. *Appendix* (the Epistle to Ctesiphon). Augustin's answer to this objection may be seen in the *Corpus* or *Syntagma Confessionum*, p. 116, (first paging) col. 2.

² Jerom's Dialogue, between Atticus and Cretobolus—Append. as above, p. 56.

³ Luke xvii. 1. See Art. xii. sect. 9, and passages there mentioned.

⁴ This answers sess. vi. canon 25, of the Acts of the Council of Trent.

III. 19. The *Mystic* may urge 1 John iii. 9: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin;"—which he might strengthen by 1 John iv. 17, 18, about perfect love of God casting out fear. My answer would be, this is a description of the *Christian character*, but not of any *Christian*: it is *theory*, not *fact*: it is what Christians must continually exert themselves to attain, but what no Christian *has* attained. And the same distinction is applicable to other passages of Scripture. When we find ourselves exhorted to be *perfect*, &c. (though the word may sometimes be used for *becoming Christians*—compare Phil. iii. 12, and iii. 15), we must consider the exhortation as comparative, and as pointing to *ideal perfection*; when we read descriptions of the *faultiness* of man, we must understand them as descriptions of *fact*. It also occurs in common life. Sir Joshua Reynolds has written much about ideal perfection, but he never confounds it with actual attainments. There is no one fault which a *painter* must voluntarily give into; yet there is no painter who will not *find*, on looking *back*, that he has run into *faults*; and how absurd would any man be thought who said, that he was a regular *professed* painter, and *therefore could* not paint wrongly. The Scripture does not make a good conscience to depend on sinless perfection, but on being "in *all things willing* to live honestly⁵." And, in ordinary life, a man is called a good Christian, notwithstanding his being obliged to cover⁶, with charity, "the *multitude* of sins."

429 20. What has just now been addressed to the mystic, may apply to the *Antinomian*. Perhaps he might add such texts as Rom. viii. 1, 2; Rom. viii. 33; 1 Cor. i. 30; or Eph. v. 27. Of the *first* some account was given under the ninth Article⁷; which declares that text to be not inconsistent with concupiscence, though concupiscence has the nature of sin. The rest seem to belong to the Church of Christ as a *collective body*⁸; and the last, to that body in a state of *ideal perfection*.

Rom. viii. 33, &c. seems to correspond to the mention of some form of government, or political *constitution*, or some colony, or scheme for promoting the welfare of some large body of men⁹. "Both Jews and Gentiles are admitted into Christianity; what a glorious situation! people so situated can come to no real *harm*. Who shall *accuse* them? that God who

⁵ Heb. xiii. 18.

⁶ 1 Pet. iv. 8.

⁸ Art. ix. sect. 30 and 32.

⁷ Art. ix. sect. 32.

⁹ See Locke on Rom. viii. 33, &c.

justifies them? Christ who laid down his life for them? How III. idle must be the *fears* of people so protected! What are temporary *persecutions* to *them*? all powers of any real importance are on their side! This, at least, is the situation which providence deigns to allot them. They may perversely neglect its advantages, or abuse them; be that upon their own heads.' This is all expressed, or implied, in the passage. What a pity that folly should make anything out of such noble reasoning inconsistent with rational religion and virtue!

21. In the last place, this question may be proposed: If all men are sinful, shall none be *happy hereafter*¹? "the wages of sin is death"²." Nothing has been proved here which is 430 inconsistent with the declaration of the twelfth Article, that Christian works, though imperfect in themselves, shall be *accepted in Christ*. God, on account of his Son, may reward men with happiness inestimable, if they have been habitually "willing in all things to live honestly;" though he may see in them some failings and infirmities. If any difficulty remained after this, it might be lessened by what was said under the thirteenth Article³, about Christian virtues having the nature of sin⁴.

22. Having given a direct proof of our Article, and farther illustrated the meaning of it by answering a few objections, I come to the *application*.

As to forms of *assent*, we might, in *natural* religion, declare that there is a *character* of *ideal perfection*, to which no one has ever in fact attained; and to which it is very unlikely that any one ever *will* attain—so unlikely, that men, who speak from their feelings, would speak of such attainments as *impossible*. A *Christian* might express the sense of our Article thus:—

'Christ was a real *man*, yet free from *sin*. The seeming inconsistency is removed by attending to his supernatural conception; and his purity is proved not only by words of Scripture, but by the *types* which prefigured him, and by his being a *victim* for the sins of other men.

¹ Acts of the Council of Trent, canon 25, of sess. 6.

² Rom. vi. 23.

³ Art. xiii. sect. 17.

⁴ One is apt to think *Horace's* candour about poetry natural, and to hope for the same about *actions*.

Verùm ubi plura nitent in carmine,
non ego paucis

Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria
fudit,

Aut humana parùm cavit natura.

Ar. Poet. 351.

III. ‘Other men, though become Christians, may be considered
431 as, in some degree or other, sinful; nay it is to be expected
that they always will be so. Not but the ideal *character* of
the Christian is pure; and no man must *allow* himself in any
sin whatever: yet such are our propensities, such the number
of openings to sin, that amongst the best the *fact* answers,
and is likely to answer, to the general declaration of Scripture,
that all believers frequently *stumble* in their Christian course;
and that it would be hypocrisy, or self-deceit, for any one to
say that he has no sin whatsoever.’

23. *Mutual concessions* need not occasion much difficulty
between Orthodox and *Pelagians*, as they seem to differ very
little. Pelagians own that no man *is* free from sin⁵; Orthodox
only say they *cannot* be, as speaking the result of experience.
Orthodox say that Christians may have only *venial* sins; Pela-
gians say, venial sins are no sins at all⁶. This will apply to
more *modern* Pelagians, Romanists, Anabaptists.

As to *Mystics* and *Antinomians*, I fear we must not
attempt any *rational* compromise with them: they come under
the observations, made under the seventh Article⁷, about illite-
rate sects. What Baxter says may be applied to them: “they
are obscure teachers,”—“that shun the clear disclosure of their
minds⁸.” Dr. Balguy’s expressions seem also applicable to
them⁹: “Unfortunately the parties concerned are most of them
432 out of the reach of rational conviction. They who appeal
to their senses, instead of their understandings, are only to be
pitied, not confuted.” Yet the notions of such must be *exa-*
mined, for the sake of those whom they disturb and perplex.

24. I will not dwell upon *improvements*. Perhaps more
attention to the difference between the *ideal Christian* and the
real one might have its use¹⁰.

⁵ *Cretobolus* says, “non dico hominem
esse sine peccato, quod tibi forsitan im-
possibile videatur, sed *posse* esse si velit;
aliud est enim *esse*, aliud *posse*; *esse*
quærit *exemplum*—(so that he never pre-
tended to know an *instance*)—*posse* ost-
tendit imperii veritatem.”—Page 56, Ap-
pend. Op. Aug. tom. x.

⁶ Nicholls on the Article.

⁷ Art. vii. sect. 3.

⁸ On Perseverance, p. 4.

⁹ P. 106, Disc. 6.

¹⁰ Something might be here urged about
the *consistency* of Christ’s conception in
“the virgin’s womb,” with his character;
and about the improbability of fishermen
forming such a plan, or drawing such a
character.

ARTICLE XVI.

OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

NOT every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is a sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. 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. And therefore they are to be condemned which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

1. Although this Article treats only of the conduct of Christians, when they fall into sins of some *moment*, yet this subject has been seen in such different lights, that one single series of historical facts will not be sufficient. I will however endeavour to make *two* answer our purpose; at least as principal:—the first, relating to those who do not allow the *efficacy of repentance*; the second, to those who reckon that true believers are made to *persevere* immoveably in their state of grace, or justification, by the assistance of God, in consequence of the divine promise. Some have used the word *implacabiles* for the former, and to that has been opposed the word *impeccabiles*; whether for those who hold the *notion*, as⁴³⁴ well as for those who are supposed never to sin, may perhaps seem doubtful¹.

2. I begin, as the Article does, with those who deny the efficacy of *repentance*; that is, when the sins committed have been heinous. In most, or all ages, men of severe tempers have inclined to this. Clemens Romanus² indeed speaks as a moderate man amongst us would do now. Welchman has part of the passage to which I would refer, and he has some others from very ancient Christians. But *Montanus* was severe enough. He lived in the second century, about 170, and therefore perhaps I might have passed him over³, had not the great Tertullian become, in old age, his disciple. In Tertullian's

¹ Forbes xii. 9, 10, Instruct.

² Ep. ad Cor. sect. 7 and 8. Wake's Translation.

³ According to what was said, Art. xv. sect. 2.

III. book *de Pudicitia*⁴ there are some very severe expressions: *mæchia* he calls “*immundabile vitium* ;” he compares men who sin to some discoloured *stones* (as I understand him) in an house infected with the *pestilence*, which must be taken out and thrown entirely away ; he calls the *repentance* of a Christian a *second* repentance, the first having been before baptism, and says, that a *second* repentance cannot be valid. And the Montanists in general “did not allow the Church the power to forgive great sins after baptism⁵.”

Novatus, or Novatianus, (I follow Lardner in giving these two names to one person) is placed in the year 251. He was a presbyter of Rome. He formed the sect of *Novatians*,
 435 “*volens (says Jerom) apostatas suscipere pœnitentes.*” He did not allow those, who had sacrificed during the persecution, to be received again into the communion of the Church ; but he did not deny that *God* might forgive them, though he thought the Church had no right to do so. His severity, however, was not confined to this particular offence. The Novatians did not allow the Church to pardon *mortal* sins, or such as were particularly *heinous*, committed after baptism. Some ancient⁶ authors use the expression *mortale peccatum*, some *majora* or *graviora* crimina. The Novatians were, on account of their strictness, called *καθαροὶ* and “*mundi*,” which Lardner translates⁷, *Puritans*. Lord King⁸ mentions, from Augustin, *three kinds* of repentance, the first, before baptism ; the second, what was called *daily* repentance, which accompanied the daily confession of sins in prayer ; and the third, repentance for more heinous sins, such as were sometimes called *mortal*: the instances are murder, sacrilege, &c. The Novatians allowed the first two sorts of repentance, but not the last.

Severity has probably varied, and appeared in different ways. Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, (capital of Sardinia) thought, that, when priests apostatized, and repented, they might be re-admitted into the Church, but only as *laymen*.

⁴ See cap. xx.—Grotius (on Matt. xii. 13) has some good passages from Tertulian, &c.

⁵ Lardner’s *Heretics, Montanists*, sect. 8. Works, vol. ix. p. 489. See also vol. ii. p. 376.

⁶ See Lardner’s Works, vol. iii. p. 216, &c. See also a short expression or two, Appendix to Op. August. Ed.

Benedict. Tom. x. pp. 74, 75.

⁷ Ibid. p. 217. We have before quoted Augustin’s expression, “*numquid perfectè de pœnitentiâ tractatum est, antequam obsisterent Novatiani ?*” Art. i. sect. 4. *Pacian*, A. D. 370, wrote against the Novatians, three Epistles, extant, in *Bibl. Patrum*, and separate.

⁸ On the Creed, p. 382.

To this severity is ascribed the very late baptism of the III. Emperor *Constantine* and others¹. 436

In what manner the Fathers of the fifth century declared against the Novatian rigour, may be seen in Lord King's History of the Apostles' Creed, under "Forgiveness of Sins."

3. But for understanding our Article, I do not think that we need look out for variations. We may content ourselves with those objects which the compilers had chiefly in view; and these, I think, were the *Anabaptists*. Both the confession of Augsburg² and our homilies do refer to Novatians expressly; but their aim was, probably, to strike the Anabaptists a stronger and safer blow, by introducing the ancient heretics³. Sleidan, in his History of the Reformation, relates, that Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, in 1535, reckons up, to the Anabaptists, near or at Munster, their doctrines; amongst others, "their denying absolution to a sinner that relapseth." And both our *Reformatio Legum*⁴, and our Homily⁵ on Repentance, imply that some persons were troublesome in renewing Novatian Doctrines, *at the time* when they were composed. These might be called Novatians, as some were opprobriously called Pelagians⁶.

The Council of *Trent* seems not to have decreed much, about repentance after baptism, of which we need take particular notice at present. It insists on the necessity of the sacrament of penance; but that subject will occur under the twenty-fifth Article. Some of the Reformers had held, that only want of *faith* could throw a man out of a *state of grace*; that is, *unmake* him a Christian in the sight of God. One may see what they meant: that, as faith is that by which a man embraces⁷ Christianity, only the loss of that principle can render that embracing null and void. The Romanists opposed to this the doctrine, that every *mortal sin* throws a man out of a state of grace; meaning, probably, a state of *favour* with God—that state which the Holy Spirit particularly maintains 437

¹ Lardner's Works, vol. iv. p. 159. The Donatists thought their sect so perfect, that quitting them was quitting Christianity—so they re-baptized: but of them more hereafter.

² *Syntagma*, p. 55. Art. xi. Heylin *Quinq.* p. 519. Homily on Repentance, p. 418, 8vo.

³ *Sort of Novatians*, Strype's Whit-

gift, Book I. In 1562 the Convocation in England was settled thus: "in the which also is to be determined the truth of those things which *in this age* are called into controversy." See Strype's Annals for that year, chap. xxvii. p. 282.

⁴ *De Hæresibus*, cap. ix.

⁵ P. 418, octavo.

⁶ Art. ix. sect. 12. ⁷ Art. xi. sect. 17.

III. and cherishes: so that a man under the guilt of a mortal sin is not to be considered, according to the Romanists, as a person in full possession of the spiritual privileges of Christianity—he has something to *recover*. These two things are not directly opposed to each other; but they might sound as if they were. It is an obvious effect of want of *faith* to run into the commission of *heinous sins*.

Of the Church of *England* I have been led to say something, by speaking of the *Anabaptists* whom they opposed. And under the twelfth Article⁸, I mentioned, that the *Necessary Doctrine* divides good works of Christians into works of righteousness, and works of *penitents*; and, under the eleventh Article, that it speaks of justification as *variable*—as capable of being increased, diminished, lost for a time, *restored*⁹. In the *Necessary Doctrine*, several expressions occur to our purpose; but I will read only that part concerning *Good Workes*, which is about acts of *penance* when men have been in *deadly*
438 *sin*. It begins, “*Other workes there be,*” &c¹⁰.

Burn, in his *Ecclesiastical Law*, under *Dissenters*, says, “The tenets of the old *Anabaptists* were amongst other things,”...“that sinners after baptism cannot be restored by repentance,” &c....“all which were excepted out of the general pardons of 32 Hen. VIII. c. 49, and the 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 24.”

Puritans have had a notion of making *discipline* strict; and particularly, of *excluding* scandalous livers from the Communion. The *Brownists*, a species of *Puritans*, thought themselves the only true church of Christ; a notion which, when carried to an extreme, is apt to make men unforgiving.

Fulke, who wrote upon the *Rhemish Testament*, was, I think, a *Puritan*: he says some severe things in answer to the *Rhemists* on Matt. xii. 31: “That God will not forgive the sinne against the Holy Ghost, the text is more plaine, then that with any glosse of man’s inventions it can be obscured. That there is a sinne, which he that hath committed cannot be renewed by repentance, the Apostle speaketh as plainly, Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6,” &c.

4. This might suffice for an history of the first set of men referred to in our Article, were it not for the mention of *sin against the Holy Ghost*. Some facts must be mentioned concerning men’s notions of that sin. The foundation of all is in *three passages* of Scripture, which must be read:—Matt. xii.

⁸ Art. xii. sect. 6.⁹ Art. xi. sect. 14.¹⁰ Necessary Doctrine is not paged.

31, 32 : Mark iii. 28 ; Luke xii. 10. Here is some sort of III. declaration of irremissibleness, and yet the sin not to be forgiven is *not defined* ; and in other parts of Scripture men are said to *resist* and *quench* the Spirit, and to do *despite* to the Spirit of grace. It is not very much to be wondered at that men of grave and austere tempers should, in the warmth of 439 reprimanding and warning, come to speak of all heinous sins as sins against the Holy Ghost ; especially in those who “ are not under the Law, but under *grace*.” Origen, of old, is ¹ said to have had this idea. But it was more common to make *any one sin*, or *heresy*, particularly attacked in controversy, to be this undefined and irremissible sin. Thus, Athanasius makes a denial of the divinity of Christ to be sin against the Holy Ghost. And the Rhemists, on Matt. xii. 24, say, “ The like blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is to attribute the *miracles* done by *saincts*, either dead or alive, to the divel.” And on Matt. xii. 31, “ which sin he committeth that dieth with contempt of the *sacrament of pennance*.”

John Hales, at the close of his tract upon this sin, gives *six notions* of it maintained by the schoolmen, one of which is *final impenitency*² ; another, impugning the known truth. 440 Grotius is said to have held that it is the habitual disposition of an hardened sinner. The opinion most commonly held, I think, is, that it is ascribing the miracles of Christ, or the extraordinary works done after his death, to evil spirits. Archbishops Sharp and Secker have written on the subject, and Macknight has something sensible in his explanation. Archbishop Sharp contends, with great appearance of reason, for the

¹ John Hales's tract on the subject, p. 36, where the same is said of the *Novatians* : “ They denied remission of sins to any that fell, thinking all falls of Christians to be sins against the Holy Ghost.” From *Ref. Legum*, cap. ix., it seems as if the Anabaptists of the times had held the same.

² See Fulke on the Rhemish Testament, Matt. xii. 31, where the Rhemists adopt the *six notions*, and say as just now mentioned ; and where *Augustin* seems to say, that, if a man set himself obstinately against John xx. 22, 23, refusing or despising that *remission*, which was entrusted to the Apostles when they were told to receive the *Holy Ghost*, and *died* in such obstinate refusal, he might

be said to sin against the Holy Ghost. But by what Augustin says about *dying* in the error, it is implied that he thought a man might *repent* during his lifetime, and that with effect. *John Hales* is mentioned in *Mosheim's History* ; though I do not see his name in the Index to the quarto edition, which is the only one I have by me at present....I beg leave to apologise to my readers for sometimes referring to the quarto and sometimes to the octavo edition : it has been very irksome to me to change in such a manner ; but it has been a matter of necessity : at some places and times I could only get the use of the quarto, at others only of the octavo. The apology is also wanted with regard to some other books.

III. whole sentence being only a *comparative* declaration of the punishment due to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, in *comparison* of other sins. But Lord King says³, the Fathers used, in repeating the creed, to conceive "*forgiveness of sins*" to extend to all sins *except* that. As I said before⁴, there may be a wisdom in many of our Saviour's sayings which we cannot yet fathom. That those, to whom he made his declaration, were guilty of the sin mentioned, may not be certain; much less can we fix it on any one else. But our present business is *history*. Let us now proceed to our *second* recital of facts.

5. *Perseverance* is a doctrine so seldom spoken of, that some may not know what it means. It is indeed properly *subsequent* to the doctrine of *election*, and in most confessions comes *after predestination*⁵; but here it comes before, probably, that every thing about *sin after baptism* might come into one Article. We before mentioned⁶ it as the last of the
441 *Five Points*. God is supposed to *elect* certain men, or predestine them to eternal happiness; during their passage through this life they are exposed to many temptations and spiritual *dangers*; if they are not preserved from these, and made to *persevere* unto the end, their *election* is all in vain. And there are several passages of Scripture which seem to *promise* such protection, and which seem to engage that God shall effect the *perseverance of the saints*.

This is the doctrine, on which we are to make a few *historical* remarks. The *Stoics*⁷ used to hold, that a man once truly virtuous was always virtuous. The *Jews* had high notions that God⁸ would never forsake his *elect*—meaning themselves. But the early Christians do not seem to have done more than *hope* for protection and salvation. Vossius was a man of great learning; and he says⁹, that, before Augustin, the Latin Fathers (the Greek ones always) used to ascribe perseverance to the *grace* of God—(it is but a series of good works)—but not to any *decree* of God.

Augustin joined with his predecessors in ascribing perseverance to the grace of God; but he *added* the idea of that

³ Page 384, on Creed.

⁴ Art. xiv. sect. 5.

⁵ It is the last of the *five points*. See Heylin's *Historia Quinquarticularis*; Whitby on the Five Points; and others.

⁶ Art. x. sect. 15.

⁷ Diogenes Laertius, in his account of Zeno, Segm. 127, 128. Edit. Wetstein. The language is just like, "*Gratia amitti non potest.*"

⁸ Art. xi. sect. 1.

⁹ Hist. Pel. Lib. vi. cap. xi. xii. Thesis.

perseverance having, in every case, been *predetermined*¹. That III. all those who are *elected* to go through a state of justification to eternal happiness, will persevere in such state, seems only an identical proposition; but some stubborn facts are apt to come in the way of this. Good men do fall into sin; even those applauded in Scripture, and inspired. How is this to be 442 managed? why, says Augustin, others, besides the elect, may fall away; but they were never the *elect*, though upon² a footing with the *justified*.

This seems but trifling work; for to mere *human* eyes, according to this, some true Christians, or saints, persevere—some fail. I really believe Augustin meant only to frame his notions so as to neglect no text of Scripture: he hit on no better method of bringing them into one plan, and so he adopted this method³. Perhaps some better may hereafter be found; but to *neglect no texts* is the *honest* plan. It is fashionable to think he went *too far*: many learned men⁴ have thought he did not go far enough. However wrongly he might judge, his mistakes, if such they be, were probably owing to his being serious, pious, modest⁵, fearful of neglecting 443 any thing revealed. Thus was he inclined to support, in general, the *Divine Agency*; and he probably felt, that what seemed *peculiar* to Christianity, was not to be softened in order to make way for vulgar notions and habitual prejudices of ordinary men. Then his adversaries might sharpen his tem-

¹ This from Vossius, *ibid.* but Baxter doubts the authority: on Perseverance, p. 8. For Augustin's opinion see also sect. 30.

² See *de Correptione et Gratiâ*, cap. xiii. Tom. x. p. 510, sect. 40. Edit. Bened.

³ This seems the more probable the more one sees the manner in which he argues on different texts. He strongly disclaimed the notion that any *individual* could know whether he had the gift of perseverance, or was one of the elect. He says, God does not *let* men know this, for fear they should be too *careless*. *De Corr. et Gratiâ*, cap. xiii. (p. 510. Ed. Ben. Tom. x.) *De Dono Persev.* cap. vi. quoted in sect. 30.

In this way, could Augustin's doctrine of perseverance and predestination do much *harm*? Is it not (as to predestina-

tion) like that of our Church? (this again Art. xvii. sect. 5.)—After considerable attention I seem settled in my opinion, that Augustin meant only to keep *both* divine and human agency, which were to be reconciled as well as they could. He opposed the *Pelagians* in order to keep the divine agency, and the *Manicheans*, in order to keep the human agency. I do not think he *could* *reconcile* divine and human agency; and perhaps, in defending the one, he might sometimes, for a while, pay but little attention to the other. And in defending *either*, he might understand some texts too *literally*. (See Art. x. sect. 11.) That Letter to *Valentinus*, prefixed to *De Gratiâ et libero Arbitrio*, proves all this to *me* sufficiently.

⁴ Baxter on Perseverance, p. 5.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 6, quotation.

III. per in dispute ; as he might often be fully persuaded that they were wrong, when he was unable wholly to extricate from difficulties what he judged to be right.

Such *failures* in the perseverance of Christians, as I have mentioned, have been the great sources of *dispute*. Some have been bold enough to say, that, when Christians fall into adultery⁶, or drunkenness, or commit murder, they may *persevere* all the while ; not *totally*, but *finally*. Such offenders have been compared to *leaves* sprouting forth (for they are supposed to *reform*) from a trunk seemingly dead, or fire breaking out from ashes seemingly extinct. An *auxiliary* idea has sometimes been taken in, to solve such difficulties. Something of a *confirming* has been assigned as a cause of persevering—something *subsequent* to justification, perhaps as supplementary to election ; but I would not detain you with attempts at precision in this matter. *Richard Baxter*, who seems to have been a conscientious man, and well skilled in religious opinions, has 444 stated *twelve*⁷ notions of perseverance, each held by some particular man, or set of men. I will only, at present, observe that, as all was ascribed to *grace*, there is a kind of grace called *confirming* grace—the *gift* of perseverance.

Of *special* grace I have spoken under the tenth Article⁸.

6. But to proceed with our history.

The *Pelagians*, I believe, ascribed perseverance in the faith to the agent himself, or thought it, some way, in his power to persevere. But the *Semi-pelagians* are said⁹ to have made this distinction:—they allowed that perseverance was so far owing to God, that men could not persevere *without* divine assistance ; but they denied any one's having such assistance that he could not *but* persevere.

7. It seems as if the idea of perseverance, as effected by God, may have been growing stronger from the time of Augustin, down through the *scholastic* ages to the *reforma-*

⁶ See Whitby's Five Points, end of first chap. about Perseverance ; and Baxter, p. 12. Gurtler (cap. xv. sect. 572, p. 347) says, "Docet reformata Ecclesia, illos nominatim homines, quos Deus ex misericordiâ potenter transtulit in statum Gratia, licet quandoque a peccato superentur et prosternantur, a Deo tamen relevari et custodiri, ut *manere* in peccato, in quod inciderant, et *interire* in *perpe-*

tuum, nequeant."

⁷ In his pamphlet, entitled, "*Of the Saints' Perseverance*," his honesty appears, pp. 16, 17.—(the latter is noble)—and in his refusing the bishopric of Hereford, in order to adhere to his old flock at Kidderminster.

⁸ Art. x. sect. 19.

⁹ Forbes, *Instruct. Histor. Theol.* VIII. xix. 1.

tion¹, and for some time afterwards. Those of the reformers, III. who were high predestinarians, were high in their notions of perseverance. We shall see more of them in the next Article. Some thought perseverance a consequence of election, so that the truly faithful *never do fall away*: it is *possible*, they would say, but it never will *happen*; others thought it *impossible*². The latter, I think, were *Zuinglians*, the former, *Calvinists*.

8. The *Romanists* reckon that *all* Christians may fall into sin, and even continue in sin; and, as before³, that a 445 mortal sin puts them out of a state of grace; which state may be often lost⁴, and recovered. One might consult the end of Rom. viii. in Fulke's Rhemish Testament, though it rather runs into the doctrine of *assurance*. However, what Fulke says in answer is to our purpose: "We have no *promise* that we shall be preserved from *all* sin, but only from that which is irremissible; but that we shall always persevere in the *favour* of God." Before we quit the Romanists, we may say, that almost all churches find some differences arise between their *members*, as to degrees of divine and human agency. This difference in the Romish Church we have mentioned under the tenth Article.

Arminians are commonly opposed to Calvinists. They at first left our present subject in *doubt*⁵; but afterwards declared, "that the saints might fall from a state of grace." This is the opinion of the *generality* of Christians; particularly of the *Lutherans*, and, as most people think, of the *English Clergy*.

I will be the less particular about the Reformed Churches, on account of the subject of the next Article; but some notice may be taken of the Church of *England*. The *Necessary Doctrine* says, "It is no doubt, but although we be ones justified we may fall therfro, by our own free wyl," &c. This is in the part concerning justificacion; and afterwards we are told, that we are to judge of our election by our *persevering*; and in the part concerning Good Workes, it is said, that if, when Christians, we do not "apply our will to worke well, 446 we shall *fall from the grace of God*," &c. Bishop Overal observes, that our Article does not determine anything about total or *final* perseverance; but that in our homily "*Of the*

¹ See the passage from Gurtler, "Reformata Ecclesia," &c. lately quoted; near the end of sect. 5.

² Baxter's 7th and 8th opinions. Calvin's own idea, Inst. 11. iii. 11.

³ Sect. 3.

⁴ Council of Trent, sess. 6, canons 22, 23; and cap. xv.

⁵ Mosheim, Cent. xvii. 2. 2, 3, 4. vol. v. p. 345, 8vo. Baxter's 2d opinion.

III. *declining from God,*" it is laid down, that wicked Christians, after grace received, may perish *finally*. I do not see such an expression; but there are several of like import. And near the end of the first part of the Homily on Good Works, it is said, that the thief on the cross was indeed justified by faith; but if he had lived, and had not had both faith and works, "he should have *lost his salvation* again."

Salvation is here as like justification, as any where that I have seen. (Art. xii. sect 8.)

The *Reformatio Legum* declares, that they think perversely of justification, who think that the once justified cannot fall into sin.

Mr. Baret's case is briefly and clearly related by *Neal*⁶. A paragraph of his *Recantation*⁷ will shew both what he thought, and what he was ordered to think. His affair occasioned⁸ the *Lambeth Articles*: they will occur in the next Article, but I will read the fifth now. In 1595, the scholars of Cambridge were taught these⁹. In 1603, at the Hampton-Court conference of conforming Clergy and Puritans, the agent for the Puritans "requested that, to those words in the sixteenth Article, "*we may depart from grace,*" may be added, "*but not totally nor finally;*" which, as Dr. Waterland¹⁰ rightly observes, "would have defeated the whole intent and meaning of the Article." In 1618, the Synod of *Dort* has this Article, entitled, "*Of the certainty of Perseverance:*" "That such as have once received that grace by faith can never fall from it finally, or totally, notwithstanding the most enormous sins they can commit." When Oliver Cromwell was on his death-bed he asked Dr. Goodwin, "*Whether a man could fall from grace?*" to which the doctor answering in the negative, the Protector replied, "*Then I am safe, for I am sure I was once in a state of grace*"¹¹."

Jonathan¹² Edwards held lately, and other able men hold

⁶ Hist. Puritans, vol. i. 4to, p. 387. A. D. 1595.

⁷ In a volume of pamphlets, G—12—15. Camb. Library.

⁸ The short History of the Lambeth Articles (in F—15—8, Camb. bound with *Fur Prædestinatus*) seems to make the first difference at Cambridge a difference between the lectures of the two professors there—Whitaker, Regius Professor, taught *Calvinism*, and Baro, Mar-

garet's Professor, taught the opposite. *Baret* did preach *ad Clerum*, &c. but he might be a follower of Baro: I am not, at this time, master of the dates.

⁹ Lambeth Articles, in Overall, or Neal.

¹⁰ Supplement to Arian Subscription, p. 53.

¹¹ Neal, A. D. 1658. vol. II. quarto, p. 512.

¹² See on Justification, p. 86, &c.

now, this doctrine of perseverance; though it does not seem to III. be dwelt upon in popular discourses.

9. It seems doubtful whether we need *separate* those who “say they can *no more sin* as long as they live here,” from the advocates for *perseverance*. *Jovinian* is mentioned as the leader of a sect, “qui dicunt¹ hominem post baptismum nullo modo posse peccare;” but this was not on any *predestinarian* principle. How does Jerom argue with *Jovinian* on this point²? The *Mystics* mentioned by Baxter were perseverers; and so 448 were the *Antinomians*. We must read a word or two more about both these than we did under the last Article. We saw³ that they were (soi-disant) *sinless*; but not that they were always to *continue* so. Our *Reformatio Legum* notices the *Antinomians*, in the chapter before referred to, in these words: “aut si fortè quicquam eorum faciunt quæ Dei Legibus prohibentur, ea Deum *pro peccatis*⁴ non accipere.” The confession of Augsburg condemns the old *Anabaptists*⁵ as holding, that Christians, after justification, cannot lose the Holy Spirit; and refers to others, “who think that men⁶ may have so great a measure of perfection in this present life, that they cannot fall again into sin.” But the *Anabaptists* split into many opinions.

From all this we collect, that the Mystic, the Antinomian, and the Predestinarian, hold the doctrine of perseverance on *different principles*:—the first, because he is *united* to God; the second, because his sins are all *laid on Christ*, and God sees no sin in his people; the third, because a *decree* passed in his favour before the beginning of time.

¹ See Opera Aug. Ed. Bened. tom. x. Append. p. 75. A confession of faith thought to have come from some who did not join in condemning Pelagius, &c. about the year 418.

² Jerom only proves the *frailty* and *sinfulness* of man in general, seemingly. I see no argument of *Jovinian's* but 1 John iii. 9, which Jerom only answers by 1 John v. end. He does not *solve* the inconsistency between a Christian's never sinning, and his being exhorted to keep himself from any fault, as Gentile worship, or idols. This error of *Jovinian's* is treated at the beginning of Jerom's second book against him. Bower's account of *Jovinian* (vol. i. under *Siricius*) relates only *facts*; and has most reference to his opinion, that wives are as good

Christians as virgins are. By this *Jovinian* seems to have given offence. His idea about *sinlessness* seems to have been, that, when a man was become a Christian, the *Devil* could not hurt him—could not tempt him, so as to seduce him; but see more sect. 19.

³ Baxter on Perseverance, 3d and 9th opinions: (Art. xv. sect. 5): the third is about enthusiasts. He mentions *Weigelians*, about whom see Mosheim, Cent. xvi. 3. 2. 1. 12.

⁴ *De Hær.* cap. ix.

⁵ Art. xi. See Heylin's *Quinq. Hist.* p. 519. Also *Syntagma*, p. 15.

⁶ I think it ought to be, “some men;” the Latin is *aliquibus*. The English words are, I think, Heylin's.

III. 10. It seems as if we ought not to close our history, 449 without taking some notice of a Christian's *assurance* concerning his *own* salvation. Such persuasion does not seem to have been entertained before the time of Augustin⁷, except Jovinian had something of it; but Vossius⁸ shews, that, in the time of Augustin, several Fathers entertained it; though, from some passages, it seems as if Augustin himself had not⁹. Assurance of one's own being in a state of favour with God, and in a state which will continue, may arise either in the *mystic*, or the *antinomian*, or the *predestinarian* way, as was just now said of the general doctrine of perseverance. As an illustration of the first, one might repeat the case of the *Weigelians*; of the second, Baxter's twelfth opinion; of the third, the notion of the *Zuinglians*¹⁰, or the Lambeth Articles, or Baret's Recantation, or the Article of the Synod of Dort; and we might add, the answer of Fulke¹¹ to the Rhemists, on the conclusion of Rom. viii. which would lead us to the opinion of the Romanists, shewn in the Annotation on that passage; and that might be farther confirmed by the canons of the Council of Trent¹².

The Church of England does not seem to say much directly *against* assurance. We see what is *implied* in this 450 Article (sect. 25). Perhaps an expression in the Homily on Repentance may give the true sense of the Church: "Although we"... "fall into great sins," "yet," "by repentance" and "faith," "there is an *assured* and *infallible* hope of pardon and remission," &c.

The conclusion of the Article of *Faith*, in the *Necessary Doctrine*, is also well worth reading. It says, "but whether there be any *special particular* knowledge which man by faith (I neglect the spelling) hath *certainly* of *himself*," &c., "cannot be found" (no such thing can be found) "either in Scripture or Doctors," (Fathers).

I think Mr. William Law, a *Mystic*, used to teach the doctrine of assurance; and so, if I mistake not, did John Wesley, on the same ground¹³: if Mr. Whitfield¹⁴ taught it,

⁷ Baxter's 2d opinion, with authorities, p. 3.

⁸ *Hist. Pelag.* Lib. VI. Thesis 13, p. 750, where three degrees of faith are mentioned; the third strengthens him so that he can fall no farther; "*et hoc de se certissimè sciat.*" This expression is from Gregory the Great.

⁹ See Baxter, p. 7, bottom, from *De Civ. Dei*, Lib. II. cap. xii.

¹⁰ Baxter's 8th opinion; and see Heylin's *Hist. Quinqu.* p. 510.

¹¹ Mentioned before, sect. 8.

¹² Session 6, can. 13 and 14.

¹³ P. S. See Dr. Rutherford's 3d Charge.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* opening.

which I should imagine he did, it might be upon *Calvinistic* III. principles. I fear some teachers have spoken ambiguously on this point; at least to them that are without: perhaps it might be only speaking of assurance as not absolutely necessary in *all*. I conclude with the honest confession of Richard Baxter; but the paragraph is too long to be transcribed. It ends thus: "I never knew the man that attained any more than such a strong *persuasion*, (as he had described) mixed with some *doubtings* and *fears*; yet so far overcoming them as to live a peaceable joyful life¹."

I will close the history of this Article by observing, that it is one of those to which, in the time of Archbishop Wake, *Dupin* made no objection. The account is given in Mosheim's History, vol. vi. octavo, p. 77.

11. My historical remarks have run out into some length; but I hope I have introduced nothing which will be useless. 451
I now proceed to *explanation*.

We begin with the *title*: "*Of Sin after Baptism.*" The title in 1552 was, "*Of Sin against² the Holy Ghost;*" and then the Article said, in effect, the Anabaptists are wrong in calling *all* great sins, sins against the *Holy Ghost*; and therefore another Article was subjoined, which was entitled, "*Blasphemy (not Of Blasphemy) against the Holy Ghost.*" In this the sin was *defined*, and declared *unpardonable*. I am glad it was blotted out; as I should rather doubt our authority either to make the notion of the sin quite *definite*, or to declare it *unpardonable*, in an *absolute* sense. The title stands altered by the hand of Archbishop Parker³; and the reason of the alteration might be, that the subject of sin against the Holy Ghost was by no means the subject of the whole Article.

12. "*Not every.*"—This expression implies that there *may* be some sin which is properly sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable, though "*not every*" great and wilful sin is so.

13. "*Deadly sin,*" or *mortal* sin. This is opposed to the sins treated of in the preceding Article⁴, such as the best Christians are apt to fall into. There are several other words used, which are supposed to be equivalent to *deadly*; as *great*,

¹ On Perseverance, p. 21.

² The title of the 9th chap. *de Hæresibus in Reform. Legum*, is, "*De casu* (meaning the same as *lapsu*) *justificato-*

rum, et peccato in Spiritum Sanctum."

³ Strype, 1562, Annals.

⁴ Art. xv. sect. 12.

III. heinous, scandalous, notorious⁵, &c. We have already had some *Latin* words to the same effect⁶. The word seems to have been taken from *Scripture* and the *Fathers*. See 1 John v. 16; with which might be compared 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, and Gal. v. 21; though the word *deadly* does not there occur. *Mortale peccatum* we had before⁷. If any one asks whether I can always tell a *venial* sin from a *deadly* one, I answer, that divisions of things, and of actions, into *classes*, are useful, though it may be, in some cases, doubtful to what class a particular thing should belong. This is true of the *genera and species* of natural history. If you divide a set of animals into horses and asses, you will have a *mule* coming across to puzzle you, now and then; and the same *sort* of difficulty will occur in various instances, *moral* as well as natural. But the next expression should be taken in, before we proceed.

14. "*Willingly committed.*"—In order to make a sin of the kind meant in the Article, it must not only be hurtful in its nature, but be committed *wilfully*. A man may perform an act which every one, hearing merely of the *act*, would pronounce mortal or heinous; and yet the man may not be upon the same footing with one who commits the same act, knowing and feeling its heinousness. According to the *Necessary Doctrine*, if he does not perform it *wilfully*, "he loseth not the state of his justification, but remaineth still the child of God⁸." What act more heinous than *parricide*? yet the *American* destroys his aged parent; purposely indeed, but not *wilfully*, in the sense of our Article, or *conscious* of his crime.

15. Now let us return to our *distinction*, between *venial* and *mortal* sins. We know by experience, in every way of life, in academical life, for instance, that there are some smaller irregularities, which do not throw a man out of the character of a regular man, though he may sometimes suffer some degree of punishment for them; but that there are others, more gross, which occasion a temporary suspension of his academical privileges, so that it is difficult to say whether he is, for a time, a true academic or not. Yet mere *acts* will not make the difference between irregularity which is tolerable, and that which is intolerable, except regard be had to *circumstances* also.

⁵ Lord King, Creed, p. 362. Lardner, Novatus. Works, vol. III. p. 216.

⁶ Sect. 2.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ I only modernized the spelling of this passage; it is in the part about *good works*, rather after the middle.

If no sins or offences are made *venial*, you drive men to **III.** *despair*; if particular offences are made venial, such come to be committed freely, and without remorse; and almost any may, in some cases, be very pernicious.

You cannot, as the *Stoics* are said to have done, make all offences *equally heinous*; that would drive a man to murder, when he might have aimed only at theft. Neither can any human reasoning convince us that *God* will make all offences equal. Nay, the Scriptures speak of some men having “the greater sin¹,” and of some who are beaten with *few*² stripes, and others with *many*.

Attempts have been made to draw the line between venial and mortal sins; but neither the Angelic Doctor Aquinas, nor the celebrated Cardinal Bellarmine, would satisfy honest Richard Baxter³. Robert *Baron* gives five criteria; but they come too near fixing upon particular offences⁴. *Our Church* acknowledges the distinction; by praying, in her Liturgy, both against “every *deadly* sin,” and for forgiveness of “*negligences* and ignorances.”

Permit me to give my own idea, of the manner in which 454 this distinction ought to be made. No sins whatever ought to be considered as venial *beforehand*; but, when a man comes to *look back* upon his conduct, and finds that he has run into some things wrong, without having been very *negligent*, and without any deliberate bad purpose, then he may hope that what he has committed will be deemed *venial*, if his repentance be proportioned to the offence into which he has run. But if he finds that he has been *extremely negligent*, or that he has *deliberately* given up his good *principles*, in order to indulge some unlawful passion, then he should treat his offences as *deadly*; and by an hearty repentance, with satisfaction to all whom he has injured, endeavour to restore himself to the divine favour. And, if we are obliged to judge others, we should put ourselves in each man’s place, and proceed in the same manner; substituting for repentance, punishment. Such cases may have so much similarity, as to occasion some *general ideas* of a difference between venial and mortal sins; but our judgment can never be right without great regard to particular circumstances. A polite French *Abbé* would reckon sins venial which would shock a *Puritan*.

¹ John xix. 11.

² Luke xii. 47.

³ See on Perseverance, p. 34.

⁴ Melancthon has written on this distinction.

III. The distinction between sins of *ignorance*, *infirmity*, and *wilfulness*, is natural, as corresponding to that between the *understanding*, the *passions*, and the *will*; but ignorance itself may be owing to wilfulness, or passion⁵.

Sins of ignorance were thought by the Pelagians no sins⁶; but whatever is *corrected*, by punishment⁷, *deserves* punishment. Moralists have found it worth while to form rules for the punishment of *negligence*. And the *Mosaic* law has made the same provision⁸. Even the Gospel, though merciful to what is done through real ignorance⁹, speaks of beating with few stripes the offender who knew not his master's will¹⁰.

16. "*After Baptism*"—better than after being *born again*, &c., because the mark of admission into Christianity must, in the present case, be such as all the Church could judge of.

17. "*Is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.*"—We have here two predicates to the same subject, and consequently, in strictness, *two propositions*.

Not every heinous sin is sin against the Holy Ghost.

Not every heinous sin is unpardonable.

Or our words might mean, Not every heinous sin is *both* sin against the Holy Ghost, *and* unpardonable; but the *Reformatio Legum* seems to condemn *separately* those who hold that every heinous sin is sin against the Holy Ghost, and those who hold that every heinous sin is unpardonable. On the whole, the true sense appears to me to be this: Not every heinous sin is sin against the Holy Ghost, *in such sense* as to come under the texts Matt. xii. 31, 32; Mark iii. 28; and Luke xii. 10; which, it has often been supposed, declare *some* sin to be unpardonable.

18. "*Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism.*"—"The grant of repentance" is, in Latin, "*locus pœnitentiæ*;" and in the English Article of 1552, "*the place for penitents*;" the Latin the same in both. *Locus pœnitentiæ* is used in Heb. xii. 17, and in Clemens Romanus; (see Parkhurst's Lexicon, under *μετάνοια*); and is by no means an unusual expression; but in our *Articles*, we may observe, that "the grant of repentance"

⁵ Bishop Saunderson, in his sixth Sermon, *ad Populum*, on Gen. xx. 6, p. 263, and Archbishop Sharp, on Heb. x. 26, vol. III. have something to this purpose.

⁶ P. 57. App. to tenth vol. of Aug. from Jerom's 2d Dialogue.

⁷ Art. ix. sect. 30.

⁸ Lev. iv. 2. Numb. xv. 24, &c. Deut. xix. 4.

⁹ 1 Tim. i. 13. Acts xvii. 30.

¹⁰ Luke xii. 47.

must mean the same with “the place for penitents;” otherwise they could not both be English for the same Latin. The meaning then seems to be, that heinous offenders may be permitted to have *some* place in the Church: not the place of such as are at peace with discipline, and under no censure; but that of those who have been in some way degraded, and are labouring to recover their former station. And this agrees with the confession of *Augsburg*¹, the members of which church (confessedly the most like ours of any)—“*damnant Novatianos, qui nolebant absolvere eos, qui lapsi post baptismum, redibant ad pœnitentiam.*” There must always be supposed, in every legitimate church, a connection between *absolution* and *remission* of sins from heaven (See John xx. 23). Absolution is then rightly given, when there is good reason for expecting such remission².

19. “*After we have received the Holy Ghost.*”—This is another³ expression for *justification*, or becoming Christians, as described from the *internal* part, or the act of *God*. It will occasion our using a little repetition; as one wrong notion may cause several errors. The corresponding chapter of the *Reformatio Legum* is entitled, “*De casu justificatorum.*” Why any particular expression was preferred, we may not always be able to see; but the title of our Article, as was lately mentioned, was originally “*Of Sin against the Holy Ghost;*” and the error of the *Anabaptists* was—holding, that after men had been once justified, they could no more lose the Holy Ghost. The expression⁴, as we have seen, is, “*Damnant (Ecclesiæ apud nos) et Anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos, iterum posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum.*” And *Jovinian’s* notion was, that baptism (or the mysteries) impressed upon a man’s mind *good desires*; so that, after baptism, he could *will* only good; he was also restrained from *error*⁵.

20. “*After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin.*”—This may be

¹ Eleventh Article, p. 15. *Synagma*.

² In the same 11th Art. of the Confession of *Augsburg*, Remission and Absolution are connected in this manner:

“*De Pœnitentiâ docent (Ecclesiæ apud nos) quòd lapsis post Baptismum contingere possit remissio peccatorum, &c.—et quòd Ecclesia talibus, redeuntibus ad Pœnitentiam, impertire absolutionem debeat.*”—I suppose that *wavering* between

these two things, *remission* and *absolution*, has *unsettled* the expressions of our Article.

³ See Art. xiii. sect. 7 and 8, and places there referred to.

⁴ Sect. 9. Confess. Aug. Art. xi. *Synagma*, p. 15.

⁵ August. *contra Julianum*, pp. 695, 891, tom. x. Edit. Benedict. *Jovinian*, before, sect. 9.

III. meant to be opposed to, after we are *elected*⁶, or *predestinated* to happiness, we may fall into sin; which would be a contradiction. Our church then says, that the *justified*, or regenerated, may fall from grace, and recover their state; but does not say a word about the fall of any person supposed to be *predestinated*. *Grace* seems to mean the *same* with Holy Spirit; only the expression "*depart from grace*," might be easier than, depart, fall, &c. 'from the Holy *Spirit*.'

458 21. "*And by the grace of God*."—The word "*grace*," may seem to be often repeated; but it would not have been reckoned right to say, that a man could rise from the state of a mortal sinner to that of "a child of God⁷," without ascribing such rise to the divine assistance. This is fully expressed at the close of the first part of our *Homily on Repentance*.

22. "*We may rise again*."—*Resurgere* occurs in Vossius, and, most likely, in the ancients: it is opposed to *lapsus*, relapsus, casus, &c.—"let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he *fall*⁸." Παράπτω signifies (Parkhurst) to fall away; in Ezekiel, with reference to apostasy: παράπτωμα means a fall, a trespass. Adam's transgression is called the *Fall of Man*, because denoted by παράπτωμα. The Calvinists would like better to have, '*must rise again*;' as that would express, according to their language, that the justified *persevere finally*. Supposing the *justified* to be the same as the *elect*, (and the difference between them has been often neglected), this change would make this expression agree with our seventeenth Article, which declares, that the elect, meaning those predestined to life, will "*at length*" "attain to everlasting felicity." Something turned upon this, when the House of Commons summoned to their bar, in 1625, Mr. Montague, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, then canon of Windsor⁹.

But though our Article does not declare *for* the *final* perseverance of the saints, it does not declare *against* it: "we *may rise again*, and amend our lives." This is, probably, what

⁶ See Waterland's Suppl. to Arian Subscr. p. 53. But *elected* may mean, either elected to eternal happiness, or only elected into the Christian *Society*, in the *way* to eternal happiness: in the latter sense, *election*, *admission*, and *justification*, are synonymous. The Necessary Doctrine (on Justification) says, "Whan we bee ones *elected and ad-*

mitted unto Goddis service, and have received our *justificacion* in *baptisme* or be restored thereunto by true penance," &c.

⁷ Sect. 14, from Necessary Doctrine.

⁸ 1 Cor. x. 12.

⁹ See Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. 11. p. 736, referred to by Waterland. Suppl. Arian Subs. p. 54; or see Neal, Index, *Montague*.

Bishop Overall meant (sect. 8) by saying, “Nihil hic de *totali* III. aut *finali* defectione à gratiâ explanatum est.” 459

23. “*And amend our lives*”—in Latin, *resipiscere*; from *re* and *sapesco*, as it were, to recover one’s sense¹, one’s right *mind*. The Articles of 1552 and 1562 have here the same expression; they agree both in English and Latin.

24. “*And therefore they are to be condemned, which say.*”—Condemned here means much the same as *anathematized*, which last is equivalent to “*accursed*” in the eighteenth Article: the Latin expression here is “*damnandi sunt.*”

25. “*They can no more sin as long as they live here.*”—“*They*”—who? the persons who hold the doctrine say not, in general, the *justified*, or the *elect* can no more sin; but they *themselves* in particular. Does not this look like a condemnation of the doctrine of *assurance*? I consider it as such. The change of *persons* in the Article is not to be overlooked. The first part, about absolving the penitent, is all *impersonal*; in the next, *we* give our opinion of ourselves—we the orthodox, as Christians regularly initiated; in the last part, *they* whom we condemn speak of *themselves*.

26. “*Or deny the place of forgiveness*”—in Latin, “*veniæ locum denegant.*” In the Article of 1552 it is, again, “*deny the place for penitents;*” the Latin of which is, “*pœnitentiæ locum denegant.*” By the word *again*, I refer to the eighteenth section.

27. “*To such as truly repent.*”—The Latin, in both sets 460 of Articles, is, “*vere resipiscentibus;*” but the *English* in the older set is, “*to such as truly repent and amend their lives;*” which may be compared with the middle of *our* Article, “*and amend their lives.*”

If we compare the beginning of the Article with the end, we find a sort of inconsistency: in the beginning, *not every* sin is unpardonable; in the latter end, *no* sin is unpardonable. The latter notion seems the one intended, and agrees with our *homily*², and with *Lord King’s*³ account of the ancients. The

¹ *Resipisco* is used, in Suetonius, for recovering from a fainting-fit: *resipiscentia* was coined, from *μετάνοια*, in the time of Lactantius, (Ainsworth). There is no idea of *conduct* in either *resipisco* or *μετανοέω*, except as far as reformation may be supposed to follow, of *course*, from recovering one’s right *mind*, or re-

forming one’s *principles*. *μεταμέλομαι*, to be *uneasy*, is only a *step* toward such change of mind; as has been observed at St. Mary’s by Mr. Dixon, of Bene’t College.

² Homily of Repentance, latter end of First Part.

³ On the Creed, p. 384.

III. former expression is evidently occasioned by the intervention of sin against the *Holy Ghost*. There is, however, no absolute *contradiction* between ‘no sin is unpardonable,’ and ‘not every sin is unpardonable.’

Here then we close our explanation, and proceed to our *proof*.

28. From what has been said, there seem to result *four propositions*; *two principal*, each of which has one subordinate.

1. No Christian is incapable of falling into heinous sins, or of losing the favour which he has with God as a Christian.

2. No Christian is taught in Scripture that he is to be *assured* of his own salvation.

3. No Christian, when he has fallen into any heinous sin, is incapable of recovery, if he sincerely repent.

4. Not every heinous sin comes under the texts of Scripture which seem to condemn some sin against the *Holy Ghost* 461 as *unpardonable*.

29. No Christian is incapable of falling into heinous sins, or of losing the favour which he has with God as a Christian.

Of this, all texts may be considered as proofs which in any way imply the possibility of such falling. As *threatenings* in case of such falling, *promises* on condition of persevering, *exhortations* to persevere.

And the same may be said of all *instances* of such falling. The words of our Article seem to allow us to include the instances of *David* and *Solomon*, though they do not come properly under our proposition⁴; but *Peter* does, and *Hymenæus*⁵, *Alexander*, and *Demas*⁶. All the disciples⁷ of Christ too forsook him, and fled. *St. Paul* had an idea of the possibility of his being a *castaway* or *reprobate*⁸.

And, as perseverance is set forth as the work of the *Spirit*, all those texts must tend to overthrow it which speak of the actions of the Holy Spirit as influenced by *man*—which speak of man as able to *resist*, *quench*, or *grieve* the Spirit; or to do *despite* to the Spirit of Grace. These texts must also operate against the opinion, that the Holy Spirit once gained can never be *lost*.

⁴ It has been thought that we might with propriety say of David and Solomon, though under the old law, that they had received the Holy Spirit, and afterwards had fallen into sin. Baxter calls

David “a member of Christ,” (on Perseverance, p. 13,) and the schoolmen seem to have had the same idea.

⁵ 1 Tim. i. 20. ⁶ 2 Tim. iv. 10, 14.

⁷ Matt. xxvi. 56. ⁸ 1 Cor. ix. 27.

But I will mention some texts in particular:—Matt. v. 13; III. x. 22; Luke xxi. 36; Rom. ii. 20, &c.; 1 Cor. viii. 9, 11; xvi. 13; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Col. i. 23; and ii. 5, 6, 7; (or 2 Thess. ii. 3). The Epistle to the *Hebrews* has too many texts to be enumerated. Its *general design* seems to be to induce Christians to *persevere*. We may mention, Heb. iii. 6, 14; vi. 6; x. 26, 38¹. Also 1 Pet. v. 8, 9. 2 Pet. ii. 20, &c.; iii. 17. Jude 20. 462

Whole churches may be unchurched; compare Rev. i. 20, with ii. 5. These texts conclude against *impeccability*, on whatever principle it may be founded.

30. This may suffice for direct proof, with regard to the matter of perseverance. Let us take some *indirect* proof, relative to the same subject, keeping as clear as possible of the subject of the next Article, predestination. Indeed, there seems little more wanting, on the doctrine of perseverance, than to shew how understanding men might be induced to profess it; and this is best shewn by considering their *objections* to our arguments.

They seem to have thought this doctrine suited to the *Immutability* of God. *Baxter* blames those who of old held the *Arminian* opinion, “Yea, (he says) when they saw that this was liable to be assaulted with the absurd consequence of inferring a *change* in God, some did not stick upon it².” Heb. vi. 17, 18, would be added in confirmation. But those who keep in mind our manner³ of acquiring ideas of the qualities of God, will allow that we have no right to ascribe immutability to God any farther than it implies *perfection*, or is opposed to some imperfection. And it is not for *man* to consider it as any imperfection in God to place man in a state of *probation*; nor to consider it as fickleness to reward only during good behaviour. This is well expressed in the *Necessary Doctrine*, at the close of the preface, or Article of *Faith*. And the immutable *counsels* of God, as described in the passage of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, lead only to *hope* as their ultimate end. It is called an *anchor* of the soul⁴. We are told to be *sober* and *hope* unto the *end*⁵. Hope always implies a possibility of *disappointment*. 463

¹ Whitby puts some of these texts together; on Perseverance, (as one of the *Five Points*) chap. ii. p. 414.

² On Perseverance, 2d opinion, p. 3.

³ Introd. to 2d Part, sect. 8; and Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 19.

⁴ Heb. vi. 19.

⁵ 1 Pet. i. 13.

III. I will now give some of those *texts* which seem the best supports of the doctrine of *perseverance*, or *impeccability*. Matt. xxiv. 24, may imply that it is impossible to lead the *elect* into error: the *prayers of Christ*, Luke xxii. 32, and John xvii. 11, 15, imply that God protects and preserves the faith of good Christians. John x. 28, declares that Christians shall have eternal life—shall *never perish*—shall never be *plucked out* of the hand of Christ. Rom. viii. 38, 39, is to the same effect. Rom. xi. 29, shews that God does not give and take again. The tendency of other texts is evident: as 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 22; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; Phil. 1. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 19; 1 Pet. i. 5; and 1 John iii. 9.

These texts may serve to give an idea of the manner in which men have been induced to profess the doctrine of perseverance. As we have mentioned them, it seems proper to endeavour to get some satisfaction amidst such contending authorities. And the more, as a due consideration of these texts will be the best introduction to the seventeenth Article, which has always been accounted particularly difficult. I will first take some notice of *each* of these texts, and then make a few *general* observations.

464 Matt. xxiv. 24, seems to me rather to imply a *possibility* of deceiving the elect, than an *impossibility*: I speak of *natural* impossibility, not of *moral*. It implies that *false* Christs would find much *more difficulty* in deceiving, by their specious pretences, those who were already grounded in the principles of genuine Christianity, than those who were not of any religion, which professed itself to be a completion of prophecies concerning the *true* Christ. Besides, the saying in question is itself grounded on an *exhortation* to *beware* of credulity. As to the *prayers* of Christ, they must imply some degree of *uncertainty*; and are inconsistent with perseverance being absolutely *promised* by God, or a *gift* quite *determined* upon. The prayer of Christ in favour of *Peter*, that his *faith* should not fail, was *before* it *did* fail; and though he rose again, and recovered his right mind, yet that was not the object of the *prayer*.

The prayer of Christ in John xvii, was for the whole body of Christians. There is no doubt, however, but that the whole *body of Christians*, as such, may depend upon having the protection of God; though that protection may not take any *individual* out of a state of *probation*. Nor, with regard to John

x. 28, is there any doubt that the *flock* of Christ is intended, III. *as a flock*, to have eternal life; though some individuals may be found, “like sheep,” to “have gone astray¹.” Our *Shepherd* is *strong* enough to prevent the *wolf*, or any plunderers, from *plucking* them out of his hand; but, if he depends upon them to “know his voice,” and “*follow him*,” some may wander and be lost. Of the conclusion of Rom. viii, we have said something² lately. Rom. xi. 29, relates entirely to the Jews³, 465 who rejected the Gospel. Such was the fidelity of God, that he would still perform the promise which he had made to their “forefathers, Abraham and his seed for ever.” But this has no immediate relation to *Christians*; and, if it is applied to Christians, it is part of an argument which declares that any persons whatever may be cut off from the Christian covenant, if they do not make a proper use of it. A gift not being *resumed*, does not mean that the *conditions* of it are annulled. 1 Cor. i. 8, appears to express the *general* design of the *Gospel*. The Corinthians had enjoyed all privileges of a Christian church in time past, and might depend on the fidelity of God for the time to come: but this does not prove that no *conditions* were to be performed on their part; only that those conditions need not be enumerated just in that place—not in the exordium of the Epistle. The passage, on the whole, has the air of an eloquent and refined *exhortation*. The next passage, and three others, mention the Holy Spirit, given to the converts, as a *seal* or a *pledge*. I apprehend that by the Holy Spirit is meant, in these passages, the *extraordinary*⁴ gifts of the Holy Spirit. A *seal* sometimes is a sign of a *contract*— 466 sometimes a *mark* set upon anything in order that it may be known to belong to a certain proprietor. A *pledge* is either a *security*, or an *earnest*, which means a payment *in part*. Now, though the expressions of Scripture may have a mysterious and figurative sound, yet there is nothing in them on which the

¹ Isai. liii. 6.

² Sect. 8 and 10; also Art. xv. sect. 20.

³ See Locke and Taylor on the place.

⁴ How did this act upon the *heart*? There might be strong moral sentiments excited by the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit—gratitude, benevolence, &c. *Devout* affection also would naturally arise. The difficulty is rather to see how any man could have supernatural gifts with-

out being virtuous and pious, both before and after they were entrusted to him, than how he could be so. It is indeed *possible* for a person to abuse supernatural gifts, as we find from Matt. vii. 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 9; (see sect. 18); but it is a thing so exceedingly strange, that we may be fairly allowed to consider extraordinary gifts of the Spirit as generally implying a disposition previously good, and as nourishing every good principle.

III. doctrine of *perseverance* can reasonably be founded. A *seal* to a *contract* does not oblige one party singly, but both *reciprocally*; so that if one party neglects conditions, the other is released. A seal, as a *mark*, does not imply that the thing marked cannot be *alienated*, or *destroyed*, if it does not answer its purpose. A *pledge* is only a contract of the *accessory*⁵ kind. An *earnest* engages to nothing more than to pay the *remainder* of what was engaged for; which is only to be paid if all *conditions* are fulfilled.

Gal. iv. 5, shews that we are on the footing of *adopted* sons in the sight of God; but though adopted sons do, generally speaking, inherit fortunes, yet any one may be disinherited for ill conduct. As to Phil. i. 6, it is merely a *compliment* devoutly expressed. It is evidently an effusion of Christian pastoral *affection*: nothing can be concluded from it in the way of *speculation*. The good behaviour of the Philippians was to be referred to *God*, and they were not to doubt of the continuance of his *protection*.

2 Thess. iii. 3, is of the same kind with some of the foregoing. It is clearly addressed to the *whole church* of Thessalonica, whatever difference of character might be found in the individuals.

467 And we might say of 1 Pet. i. 5, that any one, who understands the foregoing, will not find much difficulty in that; but by looking back to the third verse, we see that nothing beyond *hope* was in the mind of the sacred writer.

Of the last text, 1 John iii. 9, we have spoken before⁶.

Having now taken some notice of *each* text, we may proceed to a few *general* observations.

1. The texts in favour of perseverance are of a *lofty* and mysterious nature; those against it are much more level to *human* affairs. We ought, therefore, to have a greater diffidence in interpreting the former than the latter: we ought to conclude, that the idea which we have of the former cannot be an *adequate* idea; though that which we have of the latter probably is adequate. Matt. xxiv. 24, for instance, is part of a *prophecy*, which has been thought⁷ to have both a primary and a secondary sense. 1 Cor. i. 8, and 1 Pet. i. 5, give some *lofty* and *faint* intimations of the *counsels* of God, such as to us must be, in a very great degree, unintelligible.

⁵ Grot. II. xii. 6. de Jure, &c. Balguy }
2. 3. 1. 34. MS.

⁶ Art. xv. sect. 19.

⁷ Book I. chap. xvii. sect. 10.

2. The texts produced by our adversaries are *eloquence*, III. ours are *practical* directions. Now what is intended to *move* and persuade is never to be taken so literally as that which is to be the guide of our *conduct*. Making eloquence into systems of speculation, has been the *grand cause* of error and controversy amongst Christians¹: it is, particularly, the way in which men of good understanding, great learning, and of a grave and pious turn, have been misled. It is observable, that several of the texts which are urged against us are parts of *exordiums*; and Ephes. iv. 30, though not an opening, is preceded by fine, affectionate, moral advice, and is rising towards the *pathetic*. 468

3. The texts of our adversaries have more relation to *theory*, or what *ought to be*; ours more to *fact*, or what *is*. This remark has been made before².

4. The texts against us belong more to *collective bodies*, ours more to *individuals*; the effect of this has been³ already shewn. When our church was delivered from the dominion of the *Pope*, it certainly was not to be expected that *each* Protestant should have all the characteristics which belong to the *collective body* of Protestants; and each Papist all the characteristics of popery. Some private subjects enjoy more liberty under a monarch than others in a free state. John x. 28, Rom. viii. 38, &c., and several other texts, come under this remark.

5. When perseverance is spoken of as the *gift* of God, what we have said under the tenth Article should be applied; for perseverance is only a series of good acts, or of acts favoured as good. As therefore we were never to refer any good act to the grace of God, till it was *past*⁴; so neither ought we to ascribe our *perseverance* to God, till we *have* persevered. Whatever opinion may have been entertained of *Augustin*, this was as much his doctrine as it can be⁵ any one's.

6. Lastly, interpreting Scripture more literally than other *popular* language, must always produce error. After all that has been said of Phil. i. 6, there seems no sufficient reason why 469

¹ Introd. to second Part, sections 9, 11, 12; and Art. x. sect. 42.

² Art. xv. sect. 19.

³ Art. xv. sect. 20, with references.

⁴ Art. x. sections 35, 42, 50.

⁵ Sect. 5. See Aug. Op. t. x. p. 546, which is *de dono perseverantiae*, cap. vi.

Whence it appears that Augustin said, perseverance could not be *lost*, merely because it is absurd to say, that can be lost by any man, which you cannot know to have existed till the end of life arrives. See Sirmond, vol. III. Opuscula, p. 91. Plafiere and Baxter (Persev.) have something to the purpose.

III. it should be interpreted more literally than the proverbial expression; ‘a good beginning makes a good ending:’ and “*if it were possible,*” in Matt. xxiv. 24, should be compared with Acts xx. 16, “he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost.”

I now proceed to the *second proposition*, which is annexed to this, and, in a manner, comprehended under it.

31. No Christian is taught in Scripture that he is to be *assured* of his own salvation.

This follows from what has been already proved. Under the fifteenth Article it appeared, that no Christian can say, at any moment, that he *is sinless*; and under the sixteenth, that no Christian is incapable of *falling* into heinous sins. The consequence is obvious, if we only allow, that without “holiness” “no man⁶ shall see the Lord;” which we have endeavoured to prove more at large under the twelfth Article.

To produce additional texts is no way difficult. Luke xii. 4, 5. Rom. xi. 20. 1 Cor. x. 12. Phil. ii. 12. Heb. iv. 1; xii. 28. 1 Pet. i. 7. These may suffice: nothing need be added in the way of *direct proof*. Let us look out for some *indirect proof* relative to the doctrine of assurance, taking the strongest proofs of our adversaries which we can find.

We must conceive one of them to urge Heb. vi. 11, and x. 22. I used to be told that these texts were urged in making 470 converts. Some also have argued thus: Christ died for *my* sins⁷, therefore I ought to assure myself he did not die in vain. Some have proved assurance from their own inward *experiences*; and we may observe, as our direct proof has turned much upon *fear*, that some have said, *fear* was not inconsistent, at least, with *perseverance*; on the contrary⁸, *fear* caused perseverance. And it has been said, that some learned and sober-minded men, free from enthusiasm, have declared, in the most credible manner, when dying, that they felt more than even a *lively hope* of salvation⁹.

In reply, we reason thus: the assurance mentioned in Heb. vi. 11, is only “the full assurance¹⁰ of *hope*,” and it stands

⁶ Heb. xii. 14.

⁷ See Rutherford's 3d Charge, notes.

⁸ Baxter on Perseverance, p. 39, bottom.

⁹ The Catholic Doctrines, &c. p. 37.

¹⁰ In the original—πληροφορίαν τῆς

ἐλπίδος. The divines, to whom the Lambeth Articles were proposed by Professor Whitaker in 1595, substituted *plerophoriâ* in the sixth, instead of *certitudine*; and they wished (or some of them) to have substituted *spei* for *fidei*. F—15—8. Cambr.

between two exhortations to *diligence*. Heb. x. 22, mentions III. the “full assurance of faith,” but the beginning of the next chapter informs us that “faith is the substance of things hoped for.” Christ died for *me*: true; so he did for the *whole world*. Is the whole world assured of salvation? That is not said. As to *inward feelings*, the scope of Mr. Locke¹ is, to prove that the enthusiast *himself* has not reason to conclude that he is inspired; but supposing he had, he certainly gives no proof to any one else². Self-deceit is always to be suspected; Jeremiah³ says, “the heart is deceitful above all things.” Bp. Butler treats the subject of self-deceit in his masterly way; and what he says of it in *general*, seems applicable to this particular case. Either a man is conscious of having deceived himself, or not: if he is, he has deceived himself in *some degree*; if not, he has deceived himself in a *great degree*⁴. 471

Men persevere by means of *fear*. It does seem *possible* that *God* may *foreknow* that a man may persevere unto the end; and *fear* may be the *instrument* by which he perseveres; but while a man fears, *he can know* nothing of the event—except as far as he forms an *estimate* of his condition from *examining* the state of his mind, and comparing it with the *laws* of God. To such judgment as this we have no objection; but we would not call it *certainty*.

Lastly, I will not deny the *fact* that some men have afforded reason to believe they enjoyed, on the point of death, something beyond a *lively hope* of future bliss. Supposing they really did, that is very different from its being taught in *Scripture*, as a doctrine, that *every* good Christian must have an assurance of his being in a state of salvation during a good part of his *life*. Good and sober men, with very few exceptions, have disclaimed⁵ such doctrine; though as *likely* to

¹ On Enthusiasm, Hum. Und. Book IV. chap. xix.

² See Baxter on Perseverance, p. 20.

³ Jer. xvii. 9.

⁴ As all Christians must acknowledge the influence of the Holy Spirit, the precise meaning of expressions relating to it may sometimes be difficult to ascertain; but I have understood it to be declared, with regard to *some* thoughts or feelings, though not with regard to *all*, that a man, (not *every* man) may distinguish whether

they arise in his mind *naturally*, or come from the *Holy Ghost*—may say, with regard to some sentiments arising in his mind, ‘*this* is from the Holy Ghost.’ I mean, that I have so understood what I have heard myself, spoken in public—spoken with earnestness, and distinctness, though in the Latin language.

⁵ With regard to Baxter, see end of sect. 10, and his pamphlet on Perseverance, pp. 20, 21, and 17; and the end of this section. For Augustin see sections 5 and 10.

III. experience the blessed influence of heaven upon their minds as any men.

472 I imagine that the doctrine of assurance has succeeded, as much as anything, from an idea that those who disclaim it refuse to the good and pious a lively spiritual satisfaction, or joy in the Holy Ghost; yet this is far from being the truth. It seems possible that they, who have for a length of time lived in confirmed habits of virtue and piety, may look forwards to a future life not only with comfort but with rapture and exultation; though perhaps never without some degree of diffidence, or modesty. If they have been in all things willing to live honestly, they may *trust*⁶ they have a good conscience; if their heart condemn⁷ them not, they may have "*confidence towards God*:" they may *taste* the good word of God, and "the powers⁸ of the world to come," in such a manner, as to enjoy great *happiness*, without ever being out of a state of *probation*. I conclude, as before, (sect. 10) with a sentence from *Baxter*, where he is shewing the necessity of religious *fear*, and at the same time shewing how it should be regulated. "We teach all Christians⁹ to contend with the utmost diligence, to get up to the highest trust, love, joy, thanksgiving, and praise, as the proper evangelical excellency nearest heaven; and to get, as fast as they can, above that fear which hath torment, which is cast out as love groweth perfect; and to pray and seek for the Spirit of adoption, of power and love, and of a sound mind, instead of the spirit of fear and bondage; and not to place too much of their religion in that very fear which in its season is a *duty*; much less in hurtful, sinful fear: but

473 always, and in all things, to rejoice in the Lord, with love and gratitude, and confidently to cast all their cares on him."

32. Our *third proposition* is,

No Christian, when he has fallen into any heinous sin, is incapable of recovery, if he sincerely repent.

This will seem, to most men, self-evident; but yet there are texts of Scripture which have led some men into a contrary opinion. Examining the true meaning of these will be our principal business. The *direct* proof need not be long: it will be given more for the sake of regularity, than because it is absolutely necessary. Consult then Matt. vi. 14; xviii. 24—32; Luke xv. (both as to the joy over a repenting sinner, and

⁶ Heb. xiii. 18.

⁷ 1 John iii. 21.

⁹ Catholic Theology, Part III. p.

⁸ Heb. vi. 5.

257.

the Prodigal Son); John xx. 23; 2 Cor. vii. 10; Gal. vi. 1; III. Eph. iv. 32; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 John i. 9. Also the instances of forgiving David and Peter. The expressions of the Evangelical Prophet¹, on this head, are strong.

The chief *objections* seem to be *eight* in number; I will mention them all, before I endeavour to answer any of them. If the difficulty of some of them detains us, it will promote candour towards such of our Christian brethren as may seem to have encouraged needless doubts about a plain doctrine of Christianity.

33. 1. Does it not appear, from 1 John iii. 9, that whoever commits sin degrades himself to the rank of the unregenerate?

2. Does not he who commits one sin, according to James ii. 10, make himself guilty of *all* sins?

3. Though repentance before baptism be available to the remission of sins committed before baptism, yet will a second and a third, and an endless *series* of repentances, be available 474 in like manner? *Tertullian* could not think so; and the Romanists think it so unlikely, that they make the falsehood of such a notion the foundation of their sacrament of *penance*.

4. Does not 1 John v. 16 teach us, that it would be vain and presumptuous so much as to *pray* to God for remission of a deadly sin?

5. Are not we taught in the sixth chapter to the Hebrews that it is *impossible* to renew to repentance such as fall away?

6. Does it not appear from the tenth chapter to the Hebrews, that those who *sin wilfully* have “no more sacrifice for sin; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment?”

7. If there be so much difficulty in the recovery of a sinner, when he is not supposed to have persisted in sin for any length of time, what must be the case when he has acquired *habits* of sinning? “Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?” then may he “also do good” who is “accustomed to do evil.”

8. Nay, does not God sometimes give men over to a *reprobate* mind²? and do not they then go beyond a mere facility of sinning? are they not then *enslaved* by appetite? do they not contract unnatural cravings, and feel themselves in bondage to depraved propensities?

¹ Isaiah i. 18.

² Rom. i. 28.

III. These objections contain some of the most difficult parts of Scripture; but supposing they could not be satisfactorily answered, they would not overthrow the general doctrine of the Remission of Sins. They might leave an awful *diffidence* on the mind, as no part of Scripture should be *neglected*; but yet their effect needs only be, to occasion a *suspense* till the
 475 texts on which they are built were fairly reconciled with others more perspicuous and familiar³. This observation is the more applicable to these texts, as they appear to be introduced in an *extraordinary* manner, on *occasions* by no means common. But let us venture upon an artless examination of each of them.

1. Of 1 John iii. 9, an idea has been already given⁴; and it has also been shewn that regeneration allows of progressive and gradual improvement⁵—of an approximation to the *ideal* character of him who “doth not commit sin.” An heinous sin may throw a man *back* in this progression, but may not throw him entirely *out* of the path, so that he shall never be able to regain it.

2. James ii. 10 does not seem to mean that a man who commits *one* sin is overwhelmed and lost, in the same manner as he would be if he did *nothing right*; but only that he may be said to violate the *body of laws* taken *collectively*; or to be “a transgressor of *the Law*”⁶; and therefore is not innocent, or *blameless*, however he may *value himself* upon his *regularity* in other points. A man who broke one of the laws of the *twelve tables*, might be said to break *the law* of the twelve tables.

If you heard any one say, such a person is a friendly good sort of man, but we cannot prevail upon him to observe *the College statutes*; you would never suspect him of violating *all* the statutes, but only some one or two which stood most in his way. St. James seems to have had in view some regular, worthy persons, who, without meaning much harm, behaved
 476 rather insolently to the *poor* in religious assemblies, and shewed too great an attention to the *rich*; he tells them that, while they allow themselves in such conduct, they must not value themselves as if they were perfectly *blameless*. No one, in short, must ever be allowed to say, I *will* do my duty with

³ This plan of keeping *both* doctrines till they can be reconciled, see before Art. x. sections 6, 11, 46.

⁴ Art. xv. sect. 19.

⁵ Art. ix. sections 24 and 32.

⁶ James ii. 11.

one *exception*, or two exceptions: he must act upon a *principle* III. of being “in *all* things willing” to do his duty: the *exceptions* will shew themselves soon enough, without being made *beforehand*.

James ii. 10, then, belongs to those who are *about* to do their duty, and are settling their *principles* of action; whereas *repentance* implies *retrospect*, to which the saying of James seems inapplicable—except as far as it may direct a penitent to ask himself, whether he set out with *purposely* neglecting any duty.

3. Whilst the preachers of the gospel were making *converts*, remission of sins *prior* to baptism must be the *common* theme; but yet the Christian *plan* must be, to give remission of sins, at *all* times, more easily than it could be procured on any other plan.

The prophets must foretell the Christian Dispensation with a view to the *perpetual* continuance of it: see Is. liii. 5; Jer. xxxi. 34; and Matt. xxvi. 28, and Acts v. 31, must have the same extensive meaning; so must all that is announced by John the *Baptist*. Indeed to “give repentance¹,” must be nugatory, if it is only for sins before baptism; and so must be the institution of the Lord’s Supper, considered as a “continual remembrance of the death of Christ.” Consult, moreover, Acts xx. 28; Heb. iv. 15; 1 John i. 1, 2; and our proofs of the doctrine of *atonement*²—also our *direct* proof of the proposition now before us. If a Christian does *frequently* relapse, he may find it more and more difficult to recover; and he may be punishable in a greater degree; and the discipline of the Church may proceed accordingly. Yet in no case is an hearty repentance, suitable to the occasion, to be deemed wholly ineffectual. 477

Even excommunication is only like rustication; it allows of the offender being reconciled to the Church. All we here prove is, that fallen Christians may rise again. How far a *sacrament of penance* may be needful for that purpose, when we have the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, must be considered hereafter.

4. The text 1 John v. 16, is *not easy*; some have thought it related to curing *diseases*³ by the prayer of faith,

¹ Δοῦναι μετάνοιαν: see Parkhurst’s Lexicon, under μετάνοια.

² Append. to Art. xi. sect. 22.

³ See continuation of Benson: by imitators of Mr. Locke’s exposition.

III. like James v. 14, 15. If so, it is clear of our present subject. But, supposing it to relate to *sins*, the whole passage may have this meaning: '*Intercessions* may be properly "made for all men⁴;" for *lighter* offences they may be made with *effect*; but when that is declared, it must not be understood to be *expressly* declared, at the same time, that intercessions *shall* prevail in favour of all *heinous* sins. If your brother commit an heinous sin, it is not *forbidden* you to intercede for him: the case stands in *need* of intercession clearly⁵; but that was not the thing *meant*⁶. No one can *engage* that intercession shall procure forgiveness for *all* sins: a relapse into *idolatry* 478 must be attended with great *danger*; and in *other heinous* offences it must not be thought a matter *of course* that prayer is to preclude a future *judgment*.'

Deadly sin therefore may be prayed for, though not perhaps effectually, if it be not *repented* of.

5. In Heb. vi. the meaning of the *whole* passage must be attended to. The Apostle presses the better sort of converts to make a gradual *improvement*; if they did not do that, they were in great danger of going back, farther and farther, till they *relapsed* into *Judaism*: this was to be prevented if possible. He urges strenuously, 'If, instead of improving, you go back, what must be the consequence? what can possibly be *expected*⁷? Cannot such a foretaste as *you* have had, of heavenly good, keep you in your improved state? The whole *process* must then begin again! yet nothing can be tried, in your case, which has not already failed: how much less likely is it to succeed a second time! Christ died, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and became Head of the Church: all this you have felt the force of, and have applied to yourselves. If you *undo* this, what is it, in effect, but calling Christ an *impostor*, and consenting to his ignominious death? How disgraceful! to Him and to you! A *field* has been⁸ watered by a genial rain! if its fertility appears in *corn*, well; the blessing of Providence is upon it, and it makes the heart of him rejoice that tilled it; but, if only "*thorns* and *briers*" spring up, what

⁴ 1 Tim. ii. 1.

⁵ My brother, Samuel Hey, is of opinion that the words "I do not say that he shall pray for it," may mean, 'I *need* not say;' 'it is *evident à fortiori*:' he adds, that he has compared other passages like, 'I say not.'

⁶ Οὐ περὶ ἘΚΕΙΝΗΣ λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ.

⁷ For *impossible*, in the sense of 'not to be *expected*,' see Art. xii. sect. 9; and Art. xv. sect. 3, with references.

⁸ Apollos, 1 Cor. iii. 6.

a mortification ! has he who tilled it, or ordered it to be tilled, III. any *hopes*?—any *remedy*? will he not be apt to exclaim, 'T were best to *burn* it up at once?'

Such seems to be the meaning of the argument ; but it 479 cannot be fairly applied to different *circumstances*¹. Before the converts relapsed it was a fair argument to press ; *afterwards*, the Apostle would have exhorted them to *repentance*. Repentance would become more *difficult* by a relapse ; but not *ineffectual*.

6. Heb. x. 26 will seem clearly to be about *wilful apostasy*, to any one who reads the 23d and 28th verses, (with Deut. xvii. 2—6,) and also the 32d and 38th. Indeed, all the 11th and 12th chapters would confirm the notion. The *symptoms* of apostasy are first mentioned in the 23d, 24th, and 25th verses ; and then the sin itself, with its *consequences*. The Apostle's address to the converted *Hebrews*, in this alarming situation, seems to have been to this effect : 'Supposing the Christian religion true, and Christ really the Son of God, it cannot but be an heinous thing to desert Christianity. How can any one do it without treating the character of Christ in a contumelious and contemptuous manner ? And how could God send his Son into the world, and permit him to suffer, and to die, if it were a slight and indifferent matter to forsake his religion ? Perhaps you may build your hopes on the *sacrifices* to which you have been accustomed—to their returning periodically ; but they are at an end ! "Now *once* in the end of the world"² hath Christ sacrificed himself ; but what sacrifice can be available for *apostasy*? not the Jewish, as being superseded ; not the Christian, for that is despised.' Thus might an Apostle argue, in order to prevent converts from making their *baptism* void ; but such argument cannot invalidate *re-* 480 *pentance* whilst baptism continues in force.

7. *Habits* do certainly add *difficulty* to repentance, but do not destroy its *efficacy*. Indeed, if they entirely *incapacitated* men for repentance, there would be a case in which a man *could not recover* his lost spiritual condition ; but, in strictness, our proposition *supposes* repentance *possible*, and only affirms its being *available*. And in fact, every man *may* repent if he will ; every bad moral *habit* is to be unravelled³, or dissolved, as it were, in time, and a good one formed in its place ; though,

¹ Art. xi. sect. 11, with references.

² Heb. ix. 26.

³ Art. x. sect. 50.

III. in some cases, it is not to be *expected*, on a footing of probability, that this will happen—at least, in any short time.

8. The language about a *reprobate mind*, is only a referring of bad habits to the superintendence of the Governor of the world: it can therefore add nothing to the last-mentioned difficulty: and it has been treated before⁴.

I might have mentioned the *case of Esau*, who “found no place of *repentance*, though he sought it carefully with tears;” but the *μετάνοια* mentioned in that case does not seem to have been a change of mind in *Esau himself*, but in his *Father Isaac*⁵, whom he intreated for a blessing, in vain. Parkhurst’s Lexicon may be consulted on this point, under *μετάνοια*.

34. We have yet another *proposition*. Not every heinous sin comes under those texts of Scripture which seem to condemn some sin against the *Holy Ghost* as *unpardonable*.

I need not dwell long on this, after what has been said about heinous sins being *pardonable*; especially as the notion
481 that all heinous sins are of the same class with the sin mentioned Matt. xii. 31, has not been held by any considerable number of respectable Christians. The three⁶ passages about this sin do, in reality, only make one; and the singularity of the denunciation makes it very improbable, that it should be applicable to *all* heinous sins. Supposing all heinous sins were of this sort, what a great alteration must be made in Scripture, before that was fully *expressed*! The *Epistles* contain *nothing* about blasphemy or sin against the Holy Ghost. Nothing about it is said when those sins are enumerated which disqualify⁷ a man for the kingdom of heaven.

As, in denunciations against sins, it is generally understood that the punishment is to take place *except* men *repent*, there may be no sufficient reason why the same exception should not be allowed with regard to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost⁸. If that be the case, the formidable text Matt. xii. 31, and its parallels, are no more against the efficacy of *repentance*, than any others. To make *final impenitence* the sin against the Holy Ghost, seems unsatisfactory, (sect. 4) because that is *no* sin; it is only not *deserting* sins, without distinction.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 50.

⁵ Gen. xxvii. 38. Heb. xii. 17.

⁶ Matt. xii. 31, 32; Mark iii. 28; and Luke xii. 10, as mentioned in sect. 4.

⁷ 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; add 1 John v. 16.

⁸ See Hammond on Matt. xii. 31.

The *practical* part of this subject is, to be very *cautious* III. of acting as the Pharisees did, whom our Saviour reprov'd; or in any manner resembling or *approaching* to their conduct. Though a *Christian* cannot impute the miracles of Christ or his Apostles to demons, yet some to whom Christianity is *daily offered*, and some nominal Christians, may shew a greater 482 or less *attention* and respect to the proofs of its divine authority.

At length we come to our *application*.

35. The *application* may consist of the same parts as before.

A *form* somewhat analogous to our Article might be used in *natural* religion.

‘As it is the purpose of religious *association* to procure a *continuance* and improvement in virtue, and as institutions ordinarily answer their ends, men may fall into a way of speaking, as if those, who were associated on religious principles, would *of course persevere* in good living, and in the favour of God. And some, perhaps partly as *fatalists*, have held that true virtue, once acquired, cannot be *lost*. Yet, such are the temptations incident to human life, that this is rather a subject of *hope* than of *certainty*. However, if a man, in such a state of improvement, *does* fall into any great sins, his only wisdom is to *repent* and amend his life. How far his repentance may be *accepted*, he may not certainly *know*; but there is a good *probability* that he may be *forgiven*¹, and a very strong one that his repentance may prove greatly *beneficial* to him.’

36. A *Christian* may say,

‘Christianity is an excellent plan for perpetuating virtue and happiness; yet those who are engaged in it must not be *secure*. Each Christian may fall from the favour of God; but his fall will not prevent his regaining the divine favour, if he truly *repent*, on the genuine principles of his religion.’

37. *Mutual concessions* may take place, either with the advocates of the doctrine of *perseverance*, or with *Novatians*². 483 Or indeed they *might* take place with such as maintain the doctrine of assurance, or with such as make all heinous sins on a footing with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

To the advocates of the doctrine of *perseverance* we might say, that the doctrine cannot be a reasonable ground of *schism*

¹ Div. Leg. Book IX. p. 652, quarto.

² For this *name*, see our Homily on | Repentance, p. 418, 8vo; and sect. 3 of this Article.

III. or *dissension*, because it has never been inserted into *creeds*³, or any confessions of faith, which were to be used by *all* members of the Church.

We might moreover inquire, whether they and we have, in reality, such material difference of opinion between us as may seem on first appearance?

They think God causes our perseverance; we say that our perseverance should be *ascribed* to God; though, as neither of us see his operations distinctly, it should be ascribed *indistinctly*; and we say, with their esteemed Augustin, that it should be ascribed *after the event*.

Both parties own the same facts. A Christian falls into wickedness; he *repents*, or he does *not* repent: if he *does* repent, we say, he has departed from grace, but by the grace of God he *rises* again, and amends his life. They say he is one truly *justified* (or *elected*); he was *overcome* by sin for a time, but never lost the *favour* of God; he perseveres *finally*⁴.
 484 If the man does *not* repent, we say, he was a real Christian, but has fallen away; they would say, that he *never was* truly justified (or *elected*); but then of this they judge by the *event* as well as we. "The house," says *Baxter*, (alluding⁵ to Matt. vii. 26,) "that falleth when the winds arise and the storms assault it, *was* never built upon the rock, but upon the sands." His idea is, indeed, that something has been *different* in the good and bad, from *the beginning*; fundamentally: we cannot say that it has *not*; but the opinion that it has cannot be applied to *practice*. We are *ignorant* of the beginning, therefore both parties must *exert* themselves as uncertain—as if all depended on themselves; and, if they form any *judgment* of the state of any particular men, they can only do it by reasoning *à posteriori*—from their *conduct* as an *effect*, to the divine will as a *cause*.

As to the advocates for *assurance*, if the "*assured and infallible*⁶ *hope*" of our homily, will not coalesce with their⁷ qualified and wavering *certainty*, I know not what to say. Would they accept of the expedient of the bishops and divines, who gave a judgment on the Lambeth Articles, and proposed

³ See Baxter on Perseverance, pp. 18, 23.

⁴ If the Calvinists had not understood our *departing from grace and rising again*, as equivalent to their *final perseverance*, I do not see how they could

have subscribed to this Article.

⁵ On Perseverance, p. 33.

⁶ Homily on Repentance, p. 419, 8vo, mentioned in sect. 10.

⁷ I think one may call it so. See the notes to Dr. Rutherford's 3d Charge.

substituting for *certitudo*, the original Greek word *plerophoria* III. in ¹ Latin letters?

If time permits, I will here read *Baxter's* Prop. v. in his Essay on Perseverance, pp. 16, 17.

To the *Novatians*, of ancient or modern times, I have very little to say. Severity is *respectable*, though it be not *amiable*; concessions must depend upon the effects of it. As, on the one hand, dissembling with great sinners may seem to be treachery to pure religion, and presumption in making our- 485
selves judges of the execution of the laws of God; so, on the other hand, it seems a duty to aim at the greatest possible good. Severity may disappoint itself; and to proceed in reforming by a mild discipline, improving gradually, seems acting in the most rational manner—in a manner most conformable to the spirit, the precepts, and the models of Christianity.

Those who favour the notion, that all great sins are sins against the *Holy Ghost*, in such a way as to come under Matt. xii. 31, (and parallel places) are so few in number, and so little respectable, that it seems needless to try to hit upon any compromise with them; if indeed any such persons there be at this time.

38. In the way of *improvement*, one might be allowed to wish, that, in the words of the Article, all mention of sin against the Holy Ghost were omitted; which would remove the inconsistency between *not every sin*, and *no sin*. Perhaps the doctrine of *assurance* should be more clearly expressed, or not at all. And it would be best to have both *remission* of sins mentioned, and *absolution*. I will only add that it would be a very great improvement indeed if men would learn to construe *eloquence* rhetorically, and *popular language* popularly. But this belongs equally to the seventeenth Article.

¹ Mentioned sect. 10.

III.

486

ARTICLE XVII.

OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

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 to 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: they through 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.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and 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
487 Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises 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.

1. This being one of those Articles against which men are apt to be *prejudiced*, I will give a *general idea* of it, by way of *Preface* or Introduction. To my own mind it does not present so many difficulties as that which we have last considered. In

speaking of it to *others*, the chief perplexity, of which I am III. sensible, is that arising from an endeavour to give the right value to words which are not intended to have a precise and literal meaning.

Many texts occur in Scripture, which convey an idea of God's predetermining events. To think that he really intends to admit us into his counsels, is ridiculous; yet no text is to be *neglected*. What is to be done? Draw out these texts, connect them, form them into a series; then ask, in what light are they to be considered? not as affording us any *rule* of conduct; what they tell us is concerning the part of *God*; all our *morality* must be settled *before* we meddle with any of them. As far as they can be serviceable to virtue, previously settled, we may use them, but no farther; and we only can be the judges. Nay, what they tell us of the government of *God* is 488 so faint and indistinct, that we cannot make of it even *speculative* propositions, to be understood in a strict and absolute sense; nor need we suppose the sacred writers themselves to have understood these texts more distinctly. They have all the imperfections which have been¹ described as incident to popular language, when used about things Divine. Have these texts then no use? yes; but it is to the *heart*, and not to the *head*. Each text was originally *introduced* in such a manner as to produce some good and pious *sentiment*—so as to warm and raise the heart to holy gratitude, admiration, devotion; and they should always be used for that purpose, and that purpose *only*.

Suppose a man previously *good*, they will animate and comfort him; but no *bad* man must use them—they would make him *worse*; he would use them too *literally*; that is, he would *pervert* them. The applying of them must be guided entirely by the *good* they seem likely to do. This could not be the case if we *understood* the texts. If the propositions they seem to contain were level to the apprehensions of man, then one man might use them as well as another—the bad as well as the good. Speculative truths, properly so called, are truths as much to the bad as to the good; but *instruments*, or weapons, will, in the hand of a good man, be *useful*, in the hand of a bad man, *hurtful*.

As to our *conduct*, that (our *morality* having been previously settled) must all proceed upon the *promises* of God.

¹ Introd. to Second Part of the Articles, sect. 11.

III. All promises suppose those at *liberty*, to whom they are made; and therefore God's promises would contradict his decrees, were what are called his decrees strictly and properly such, and were they perfectly understood by us. Intimations of his decrees, or indistinct referring of events to them, may give us some idea of what God *permits*; but, in our *conduct*, we are not to do what he *permits*, but what he *wishes* to have done—in our conduct, we are not to study what is faintly intimated, but what is plainly expressed.

If any one was to hear this said, without any reference to any Article, I should think he would hesitate little about it. And I hope to make it appear that our Article ought not to convey any other idea. But to begin with *history*.

2. There is so intimate a connection between our present doctrine and the doctrines of some preceding Articles, especially the *tenth*, that a good deal has been already said which might have been said here. If therefore we seem to mention any persons or events without sufficient clearness, or fulness of description, it may be because a fuller account of them has been given before.

In all ages of the world men have had ideas of referring events to *fate*; and philosophers have been led, from sayings of *common life* concerning fate, into metaphysical speculations. Human knowledge being very indistinct on this matter, thinking men have fallen into various opinions, or rather conceptions; but when these have been opposed, dissensions, in different ages, as springing from the same causes, have nearly resembled each other; they have varied more in circumstances than in essence. Indeed, all dissensions respecting fate, destiny, &c. have sprung from different modes of adjusting the wisdom of God with the freedom of man. Milton puts together fix-fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute, as causing perplexity even in beings superior to man². The *Stoics* were fatalists—the *Epicureans*³ were of an opposite turn. *Cicero*, in his book *de Fato*, gives some account of the different ways in which different philosophers reasoned⁴. And those ancient authors, who have related or imitated the incidents of common

² Paradise Lost, Book II. v. 560. Lardner produces, vol. ix. p. 85, a passage of Agathias, which mentions a common notion, that *years* are owing to the stars, or fate.

³ Calvin calls his adversaries Epicureans, Iust. III. xxiii. 8.

⁴ In the book *de Divinatione*, there are many things concerning *Fate*, &c.

life, have left us passages referring events to fate¹ and the III. decrees of the gods².

Mr. Hume observes, that the subject “has been found hitherto to exceed all the skill of philosophy³.”

3. The opinions of the *Jews* are peculiarly worthy of our attention, as expressions of the New Testament are accommodated to them; but they have been already mentioned⁴. The fifth Chapter of Maimonides *de Pœnitentiâ* is more applicable in this place than under the tenth Article. The phraseology of the Jews, as being remarkable for referring events to God, has been mentioned repeatedly⁵. An idea always to be kept in mind is, that the *Pharisees* were a sort of Stoics, and the *Saducees* a sort of Epicureans.

4. The Christians *before the fifth century* seem rather to introduce texts of Scripture, than to form doctrines out of them. They have been thought to hold much the same opinions about 491 · predestination with the Arminians of later days; neither neglecting divine nor human agency. They conceived that God elected or predestined men to future happiness, *foreseeing* their fidelity in making a *good use* of the privilege⁶. But it is *controversy*, which makes doctrines *definite*⁷; that is, which shews what it is that each man holds.

5. In the fifth century, the *Pelagian* controversy set people on thinking and examining; though predestination was only an incidental, not the original or principal subject of that controversy⁸, which was, the power of man to work out his own salvation. *Augustin's opinion* of predestination has been differently represented: my own idea of it is this. He took the texts of Scripture on which the doctrine of predestination is built in too literal a sense; but insisted on that sense chiefly because his adversaries, the Pelagians, tried to evade it, without giving any sufficient scriptural reason. He saw that there must be *something* professed about predestination and election; but whatever it should be, he never meant it to interfere with the *duties* of individuals—with their *love* of God and

¹ Homer II. Ω . 209, 210. Plautus, *Aulularia*, act. iv. scene 10, *Deus impulsor mihi fuit*, &c.

² See a story of Dog and Fox in Dr. Musgrave's *Dissertation on the Grecian Mythology*, pp. 37, 38. Consult Parkhurst's *Hebrew Lexicon*, under כח .

³ End of *Essay on Liberty and Necessity*.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 3. Art. xi. sect. 1.

⁵ Art. x. sect. 3 and 50, with references.

⁶ Baxter on *Perseverance*, 2d opinion. Vossii *Hist. Pel.* Lib. vi. thesis 8.

⁷ Art. i. sect. 4.

⁸ Vossius, p. 761. Lib. vi. thesis 16.

III. man, with their *fear* of God and themselves, nor with moral *diligence*. (See Art. xvi. sect. 6). He said plainly, that no one could *distinguish* between⁹ one of the elect and any other person; nor could any man know whether he himself was one of the elect or not. He held that God left man in this ignorance in
 492 order to make him *fear*, and to prevent his falling into that *securitas*, of which our Article speaks¹⁰. Whether his notions were reconcilable with each other, or not, he left men, for *practice*, just as the earlier Fathers had done—as much depending upon their *free-will*. So that it is most probable he did not, at different times, hold what could be properly called different *opinions* concerning *free-will*; but, by controversies with Manicheans and Pelagians, was led into two different ways of *expressing* himself; which is also Bp. Overal's¹¹ opinion. As he wished *both* free-will and grace to be allowed, and predestination as a preparation for grace, he must, of course, defend any one of them against those who wanted to set it aside.

His change of conception, as to the theory of predestination, is mentioned in his book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*, cap. 3. But it only amounts to this, that he once thought the preference given to *Jacob* over *Esau* was a *reward* to *Jacob's fidelity* (which God foreknew); but afterwards he thought the Scriptures represented that preference as purely a *favour*, and no *reward*. For his change about *grace*, see Art. x. sect. 6. He seems to have written to the monks of *Adrumetum*¹² in *defence* of free-will, in some sense; that is, proving that *neither* grace was to supersede free-will, nor free-will grace. He owns the subject to be very difficult. His ideas of predestination and virtue seem to have been of the same sort—*neither*
 493 *was to set aside the other*¹³, *though we could not reconcile them*:—a method which I have commended before repeatedly¹⁴.

Fulgentius and Prosper supported Augustin. The Greek Fathers were never great predestinarians. Their sending *Petrus*

⁹ *De Corr. et Gratiâ*, cap. xiii. See Baxter, *Persev.* p. 7.

¹⁰ In the English, "wretchedness." *De Correptione et Gratiâ*, cap. xiii. He says we should *love all men*; we do not know who are the elect.

¹¹ Page 8. F—15—11. *Camb. Hist.* Art. Lamb. "neque tam sententiam se (Augustinum) tunc mutasse, quam lo-

quendi genus."

¹² In the Byzacene, not far from Augustin's Diocese. *De Gratiâ et libero Arbitrio*. The Letter prefixed to Valentinus, shews this plainly.

¹³ Page 1. Rhemists on Rom. viii. 30, seem to hold this opinion.

¹⁴ Art. x. sect. 11. 46; and Art. xvi. sect. 33.

Diaconus¹ was as much upon our present subject, as on that III. of the tenth Article.

The principal question agitated in the Christian church was, did God elect men, and *make* them virtuous, &c. ? or did he elect them *because* of their virtue ? that is, because he *foresaw* they *would* be virtuous ? The former sort of election was called *absolute*, the latter, *conditional*². And this seems always likely to be the principal question while there is any. *Absolute* predestination, election, decree, would be conceived to be made for promoting the *glory of God*, or from his good *pleasure* ; and it would be called the *cause of virtue*, as virtue would be called the cause of *conditional* election. It was also a question, whether the *number* of elect was limited: many seem to have been inclined to maintain some predestination to happiness, and none to misery, (not unlike the compilers of our Article). Moreover, disputes arose about the *consequences* of the doctrine of predestination, as to *God*, and as to *man*; whether it proved God to be partial, unjust, cruel, &c. or *man* incapable of exhortation, reproof (*correction*), &c. ; and what rules of *prudence* and reserve should be commonly followed in *teaching* the doctrine. 494

The *Pelagians* seem to me not to have entered into the subject of predestination. They declare indeed against any man's being forced to sin by *necessity* ; but that declaration was made with respect to *original sin*, and the possibility of keeping God's commandments;—subjects already treated under our ninth and fifteenth Articles. In Aug. *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*, you find it said what the *Pelagians* hold³ ; but I think Augustin means by *Pelagians* those whom we call *Semi-pelagians* ; for that book, and the following, *de Dono Perseverantiæ* (which has been called the *second* book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*) are both written to the *French* prelates, Prosper and Hilary, in answer to reasonings which had been sent to Augustin (in Africa, I suppose,) by them—reasonings which were prevalent at *Marseilles*⁴, the mart of *Semi-pelagians*, and had spread into different parts of France. I do not

¹ Art. x. sect. 7.

² Whitby speaks of “a *conditional* election upon our perseverance in a life of holiness.” Five Points, p. 36. And this is all the election he allows. And this was once my idea of *conditional* ; and then I called the kind of conditional

mentioned above, *intermediate*—between absolute and Whitby's conditional ; and *media scientia* occurred to my mind.

³ Aug. *de Prædest. Sanct.* cap. xix. Opera Edit. Benedict. tom. x. p. 539.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 8.

III. see anything about predestination in Pelagius's Creed sent to Innocent; nor in that ascribed to *Julianus*⁵. The dispute about predestination was *incidental*, as just now mentioned; and Augustin did not write his book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*, seemingly; till about twelve or thirteen years after the death of Innocent. Indeed, Augustin seems to me to have said but *little* upon *predestination*; considering how much noise his sayings have made. He considered it chiefly as the Christian dispensation viewed in the foreknowledge and predetermination of God: he calls it *præparatio Gratiæ*.

495 6. The *Semi-pelagians* seem to have thought just as Augustin did in the former part of his life, when he published his *Opuscula*; that is, that those who were *elected* by God were favoured on account of their good disposition, or *faith* and confidence in him. They thought, moreover, that the *number* of the elect was *not limited*; and they had a notion, that such as died *infants*⁶ would be rewarded or punished in a future life, according to the conduct which they *would have* observed had they lived on to maturity⁷.

The *Mohammedans*⁸ are reckoned great fatalists; but

7. We come next to the *ninth century*. We spoke of poor *Gotescalc*⁹ under the tenth Article. The transactions most to our present purpose passed after he had been entirely subdued, and had recanted¹⁰ his opinion. Then several churches in France, with *Remi* (or Remigius) Bishop of *Lyons* at their head, undertook to defend his cause and his doctrine. They held *councils*, and wrote *epistles*. The Epistle of the Church of Lyons (*Ecclesia Lugdunensis*) is one of the principal defences of *predestination*. It, amongst other things, 496 tries to settle the difference between *prescience* and predestination; that is, between knowing what *would* happen, and determining what *should* happen. The distinction was not then new: it is in Augustin¹¹. Predestinarians are glad to have recourse to it, as it helps them to defend themselves against

⁵ See 2d Appendix to 10th vol. of Augustin's Works, Ed. Bened. pp. 64 and 74.

⁶ Art. ix. sect. 9.

⁷ For these notions, see Hilary's Letter to Augustin, which is sometimes prefixed to his book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*. Vol. x. p. 519, ed. Bened.; and *de Prædest. Sanctorum*, cap. xii.

⁸ Art. x. sect. 9.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ See in Usher's book about him, his two confessions. In Sirmond's *Opuscula*, vol. III. at the beginning, there are two *sentences* against him; one of them in the form of a Synodic Epistle. In Mosheim, Cent. ix. 2. 3. 24, we see what a great deal has been written about this poor monk, and the contests he occasioned.

¹¹ *De Præd. Sanct.* cap. x.

the charge of making God the *author of sin*. They can, by III. means of such a distinction, allow his *foreknowing* sin, and deny his *causing* it. There seems an inconsistency in several writers, in making the decrees of God *absolute*, and yet, at the same time, an exercise of the divine *justice* in *punishing* ¹.

8. If we looked into the writings of the *schoolmen*, we should find that, before the scholastic ages, and during them, the notions of predestination had been growing stronger. The intricacies, which that doctrine brings into discussion, suited the schoolmen. Bishop Burnet on this Article may furnish some instances. I could content myself with referring, as in the tenth Article, to one of Thomas Aquinas's Indexes ². The same differences which prevailed between the Thomists and Scotists, the Dominicans and Franciscans ³, about grace, prevailed also about predestination.

9. Let us then pass to the age of the *Reformation*; taking first the early reformers, without regard to country, and mentioning the Council of Trent, as composed of persons from different countries; and then, as in the tenth Article ⁴, let us take accounts of our doctrine as professed in different *countries*, without keeping to one time. 497

At the beginning of the *Reformation*, the first opposition was to popish *good works* ⁵. This occasioned great stress to be laid upon every part of *divine agency*. *Wickliffe* was a predestinarian ⁶; and so were other able reformers—*Zuingle*, *Calvin*, and at first, *Martin Luther*; though he afterwards softened ⁷; but *Calvin* continued in his first rigour, and his follower *Beza* increased upon it. We might read *Calvin's definition* ⁸ of predestination. *Dr. Balguy* calls his system "*nonsense*;" and his religion, "a religion which seems to have rested on this execrable foundation, that God is a tyrant. Why else did its teachers *delight* to represent him as govern-

¹ See *Fulke's Rhemish Testament*, on parts of *Rom. ix.* See also expressions of *Calvin* in *Diss. on this Article*. *Baret* owns, or is made to own, that sin is not the cause of reprobation, but that "the reprobation of the *wicked* is from everlasting."

² At *Lecture I* read two heads out of the *Index* to the works of *Thomas Aquinas*, beginning, "*Prædestinatio jுவatur precibus sanctorum,*" &c. and "*Præscientia meritorum non est causa,*" &c.

³ *Art. x. sect. 10.*

⁴ *Art. x. sect. 13.*

⁵ *Art. xi. sect. 6.*

⁶ *Hume's Hist. England.* *Gilpin's Life of Wickliffe*, p. 80.

⁷ *Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 11. p. 107*, quoted in *Oxford pamphlet*, p. 27. I beg leave to call by that short name, or even the shorter one of *Oxf. the Dissertation on the Seventeenth Article* printed at *Oxford* in 1773, which I have heard was written by *Dr. Winchester*.

⁸ *Calvin's Institutes*, III. XXI. 5.

III. ing by *will* only, not by wisdom?" The Zuinglians held, "for predestination and reprobation, that *man* doth nothing, but all is in the will of God⁹." But Melancthon wholly omitted the subject of predestination in the Confession of *Augsburg*¹⁰. And the Saxon¹¹ confession declines it.

Before the Council of Trent, we are told, that the *Roman-*
498 *ists* were inclined to what has since been called *Calvinism*¹²; which, considering their veneration for Augustin and the schoolmen, is very probable in itself; though different parties would fall into it in different *degrees*¹³. At the Council of Trent, the Dominicans were for referring all to God, and laying down, that what relates to man, his conduct and his welfare, has been fixed and decided before all worlds. The Franciscans wished¹⁴ to have it declared that all is in the power of man. A third sort took a middle way, and would have some things declared to be fixed, others to be left to human choice and endeavours. Luther and Melancthon passed uncensured in this matter. The result we find in the canons and decrees of the Council. From the fifteenth and the seventeenth canons, and the twelfth chapter of the Decree, we gather, as I should express it, that the Romanists did not deny the reality of predestination, but condemned every thing by which a man could apply it *to practice*, or to his own particular *case*.

The Rhemists on Rom. viii. and ix. follow Augustin, and are for unconditional predestination; but are not so decided with regard to the motive of God, or with regard to reprobation, as their answerer Master Fulke.

10. We must now take a short view of predestination in different *countries*; leaving our own for the last. Of *Spain*¹⁵ and the Jesuit *Molina*, I seem to have nothing new to advance. He is said to have invented the *Media Scientia*, by which God
499 sees whatsoever would follow upon "such or such conditions¹⁶."

11. And, under the head of *Holland and Flanders*, I have already said all that is needful¹⁷; only I may read the decrees of the Synod of *Dort* as far as they relate to predestination. The *English* divines were ordered by King

⁹ Heylin *Quinq. Hist.* p. 510.

¹⁰ See his idea of the matter in the Aug. Conf. cap. v. *de Fide*, quoted in Oxf. p. 31. Heylin, p. 519. *Syntagma*, p. 21.

¹¹ *Syntagma*, p. 84, (2d paging).

¹² Dean Tucker's Letters to Dr. Kippis, p. 81, &c. quoted Oxf. p. 79.

¹³ Art. xvi. sect. 8.

¹⁴ See Heylin from Father Paul, p. 510.

¹⁵ Art. x. sect. 14.

¹⁶ Burnet on the Article, 8vo, p. 195.

¹⁷ Art. x. sect. 15.

James the First to vote for universal redemption; but they III. were outvoted.

I have heard, I think, that Calvinism is now the ruling religion in Holland, but that Arminianism is tolerated. Limborch was an Arminian; but he read divinity lectures in public at Amsterdam, and his *Body of Divinity* was published there: he died in 1712, aged 79.

12. Of *Germany* I have said something under the tenth Article¹. The Calvinists and Arminians are there mixed with Romanists; the different religions prevailing in different degrees in different places. The *Lutherans* do not, I believe, differ much from the Romanists, or from us, with regard to predestination.

13. The disturbances in France² did not regard the doctrine of grace only: the propositions condemned were *five*. The last is against the universality of redemption³; and therefore favours, at least, the doctrine of predestination.

14. We will take the early *Socinians* as belonging to *Poland*, as we did before⁴. In the *Racovian Catechism*, in the chapter *de Libero Arbitrio*, we have the Socinian definition of predestination:—“Prædestinatio Dei in scripturis aliud 500 nihil notat, quàm Dei, ante conditum mundum, de hominibus decretum ejusmodi; Quòd iis, qui in ipsum crederent, eique obedirent, daturus esset vitam æternam: eos verò qui in eum credere, et ei parere, recusarent, æternâ damnatione puniturus esset.” Afterwards it is said, that *election* sometimes means the same as *vocation*, sometimes it implies, farther, leading a Christian *life*. The Socinians have been, I think, sometimes said to deny the Divine *prescience*: perhaps it might be thought that they deny it in this passage; but I should rather say they do not profess it. If God decrees to reward those who should believe in him, he *may* foreknow who will believe in him, though that be not mentioned⁵.

15. *Geneva* used to be the principal mart of *Calvinism*: there Calvin flourished, and Beza taught. The *Helvetic*⁶ confession says, all those are *reprobate* who are *not Christians*; though it *hopes well* of all, and takes pains to prevent *abuse*.

¹ Art. x. sect. 16. ² Art. x. sect. 17.

³ Mosheim, Cent. xvii. 2. 1. 1. 43.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 28. There is a *Confessio Polonica* in the *Syntagma*; and

the Socinians are called *Fratres Poloni*.

⁵ P. S. See Burnet on this Article, near the beginning, p. 190, 8vo.

⁶ *Corpus* and *Syntagma*.

III. But I have been informed that *Calvinism* is now a mere *form* at Geneva, and that Ostervald's Catechism is chiefly taught. I believe Ostervald was a Lutheran. I have already, in the third book⁷, mentioned this change as an instance of a *tacit reformation*.

The *Jesuits*⁸ are reckoned Semi-pelagians.

There is a comic dialogue called *Fur prædestinatus*, which exposes the principal predestinarian opinions down to the Synod of *Dort*.

16. I come lastly to *England*. The Necessary Doctrine
501 has⁹ something very like our Article; what one might call the *seeds* of it: "And here all phantasticall imaginacion, curious reasonyng, and vayn truste of predestinacion, is to be laied apart. And accordyng to the playne manner of speakyng and teachyng of Scripture, in innumerable places, we oughte evermore to be in dread of our own frailtie and natural pronitie to fall to synne, and not to assure ourselfe that we be elected any otherwyse, than by felyng of scriptural mocions in our herte, and by the tokens of good and vertuous lyvyng, in folowyng the grace of God, and perseveryng in the same to the ende."

In the *Reformatio Legum*, predestination is the last subject of the part *de Hæresibus*. It mentions as a fact, that many did, at the time, use the plea of predestination as an excuse for their immoral lives; but it does not seem to hint at any penalties for such abuse. It is more of a declaration or *memorial*, to prevent scandal and perversion, than a *law*. No more need be said upon it at present, as it will be useful in our *explanation*.

In our *Homilies* I do not see the doctrine of predestination¹⁰ treated. If I have not overlooked any passages concerning it, we might conclude that our Church did not think it a doctrine to be commonly taught to the *people*.

The principal *writers* at the time of the Reformation in England, Cranmer, Latimer, Hooper, Ridley, are extremely rational in treating our doctrine: specimens may be seen in Heylin's *Historia Quinquarticularis* and the Oxford Dissertation. My own opinion was formed and publicly delivered

⁷ Book III. chap. iv. sect. 4.

⁸ Art. x. sect. 13.

⁹ In the Article of Justification, about four pages from the end.

¹⁰ From Heylin, *Quinq.* p. 558 (2. 9.

7,) one would think that our *Homilies* *did* mention the doctrine; but the Italics denoting quotation are continued too long. That work of Heylin's is incorrectly printed.

before I knew theirs; and I was happy to find the best and III. ablest men giving me the most support, and making my ideas 502 seem most like those of the Church of England.

It seems clear to me that our Church did not, at the time of the separation from the Church of Rome, properly intend to lay down *any doctrine* of predestination; but only to declare *against abuses* actually prevailing. If it had not been for this, they would probably have followed the example of Melancthon, when he formed the confession of Augsburg. The opinions of *Erasmus* confirm this, as he was far from a rigorous predestinarian; and yet they were considered as proper to help forward the Reformation in England. His paraphrase on the New Testament was placed by authority¹ in our churches; and the clergy were put upon studying his *works*. He died in 1536, aged 68.

IV.

17. Queen *Mary's* court does not seem to have intermed- 1 dled much with predestination; they had other matters to engage their attention; their chief view was to bring the nation back to popery. As we have given the decision of the Council of *Trent*, we need take no more notice of the popish part of our countrymen.

The reformed fell into disputes amongst themselves even in prison, where they were confined as heretics, expecting, many of them, to be brought to the stake: "they wrote against each other, and dispersed their writings abroad in the world²." The doctrine of predestination was even now gain- ing strength amongst the generality of plain divines, though 2 it was checked by some of the most improved minds. Some *forms* were drawn up for the prisoners to sign, in order to reduce them to amity; but they are not extant. It seems probable, that though they did not run into the extreme of Calvinism, they approached too near it to be encouraged by the principal reformers³. *Bradford* and *Carless* are named on this occasion—both martyrs; as were many others engaged in the dispute.

18. *Elizabeth* came to the throne in 1558. In the beginning of her reign the more liberal and polite sort of divines wished to lower the doctrine of predestination, or to avoid it. The less liberal and refined pushed it forward very stoutly; nay tyrannically; so as to oblige some to seek for shelter and

¹ Introduction to Book IV. sect. 4.

³ Oxford Pamph. p. 67, &c.

² Neal, vol. i. 4to, p. 69. Oxf. p. 67. Heylin.

IV. protection. Both these things appear, I think, from *Strype's Annals*⁴. Besides, the *Puritans*, who were Calvinists, got considerable power in the *House of Commons*, and made the queen so jealous, that their proposing to ratify by act of parliament the *Reformatio Legum*, was reason sufficient⁵ with her to set it aside.

Much of the growth of Calvinism has been ascribed to the flight of the Protestant divines from England during the reign of Queen Mary. Some went to *Geneva*, others to Switzerland, &c.⁶ But *Jewel* went to *Italy*, and others to other places⁷, where they rather grew weaker than stronger in the doctrine about the divine decrees. Much would depend upon the notions they found associated with kindness and hospitality; but Calvinism seems to me to have been growing in England even before, or during the reign of Queen Mary.

I gave the history of the *Lambeth Articles* under the sixteenth Article⁸; I have now only to read such of them as belong to our present subject. The cordial assent to them all, of that professed divine Matthew *Hutton*, Archbishop of *York*, may amuse the curious⁹. The remarks of the bishops and divines seem to be ingenious, and to have drawn the sting of some of them very expertly. I suppose Archbishop *Whitgift* was at the head of these remarkers¹⁰. He is said to have acted "*facilitate et metu*"¹¹. Though he encouraged some eminent preachers against reprobation, he might not think Professor *Whitaker* a man to be bluntly opposed: but his conduct¹² seems to prove what has been already observed:—

⁴ *Annals* 1559, pp. 116, 118, vol. i. and p. 294, (in some editions, I think, p. 331). My old references to the first vol. of *Strype's Annals* seem all wrong: what edit. did I use? The reference in this section to the second vol. is right, for Sid. Coll. Library.

⁵ Oxford, p. 47, from Collier, II. 530.

⁶ Somewhere I have mentioned the bad reception which these refugees met with from the *Lutherans*, on account of their being what was called *Sacramentarians*, that is, denying the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The cruelty of the *Lutherans* made them take refuge with the Calvinists, who used them kindly: they were indeed of the same opinion in regard to the Sacrament. See *Mosheim*, vol. iv. 8vo, p. 87, or Cent. xvi. 3. 2. 2. 16.

⁷ *Strype's Annals* 1562, vol. i. p. 294. (Sid.) or near that page; perhaps 293.

⁸ Art. xvi. sect. 8.

⁹ *Strype's Whitgift*, p. 478.

¹⁰ P.S. I cannot find, from *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, who these remarkers were. *Strype* contradicts the writer on the *Lambeth Articles*; and represents *Whitgift*, more than that writer does, as favouring *Whitaker* and Calvinism. Yet I thought he did not quite prove what he undertook. *Whitgift* seemed to me, even from *Strype's* account, to be guided much by prudence, and to dislike *Whitaker's* zeal.

¹¹ Hist. Art. Lamb. F—15—18, Cambr.

¹² *Waterland's Suppl. to Arian Subscr.* p. 44, &c.

1. That men of improved minds were endeavouring to IV. soften the rigours of predestination.

2. That the less refined were very strenuous in heighten- 4 ing the doctrine, and were very hard to restrain.

One sentence of *Neal*¹ may make students aware of the language of Puritans in whatever books they meet with it: "Though the *Pelagian* doctrine was espoused by very few of the English Reformers"—"it revived the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign under the name of *Arminianism*², and within the compass of a few years supplanted the received doctrine of the Reformation."

Before we pass to another reign, it may not be amiss to mention the idea of predestination entertained by the *Familists*³. "There are two, with their members, that are predestined or preordained; the one unto preservation, and the other unto condemnation, from the beginning: the one is *Christ*, the man of God, predestined unto preservation, and with him, all his incorporated members; the other is the man of Sin, *Antichrist*, predestinated unto condemnation, and in him all his incorporated members⁴: as for any other predestination than this (come it out of Turkey, or elsewhere) I know not of it."

19. In the reign of *James I.* there seems to have been an odd mixture of Calvinism and Arminianism. He was bred in the Kirk, and was, at one time, Calvinistic; and he favoured Prince *Maurice* at the synod of Dort, who favoured the Calvinists; yet in the conference at Hampton Court, in the beginning of his reign, he discouraged them, and never chose to prefer them in the Church. He preferred Arminians⁵; yet kept up decency, and restrained the Puritans in an artful manner. He gave his preferments to men of abilities and good lives. He forbade the Puritans to *rail* against the Papists; but then every one was forbidden to rail at the Puritans; this sounded fair, but was really a great restraint. The *five points* were too mysterious and nice for the ordinary clergy to preach upon—reasonable enough; therefore only *bishops* and *deans* must preach upon them; but James made Arminians bishops and deans; and so the Puritans were silenced on those points which they wanted most to propagate. And sometimes laws

¹ Hist. of Puritans, vol. I. p. 70, 4to.

² Eliz. died in 1603, Arminius in 1609 (æt. 49): it was early for the name of *Arminianism*.

³ Art. vii. sect. 3.

⁴ Strype's Annals, vol. II. p. 378.

This passage is given by Strype from an *Apology* of the Familists, but it is not marked with inverted commas.

IV. appearing perfectly equal were so executed as to make the Puritans complain. It seems as if James, though a pedant, considered things more as a statesman than as a divine: favoured those men whose manners were the most courtly; and checked, as imperceptibly as he could, those who were more rigid and uncomplying.

20. In the reign of *Charles I.* Calvinism grew headstrong; but still it was not in favour at *court*: there Arminianism flourished; indeed with too great openness to be consistent with prudence. One charge against Archbishop *Laud*, when he was impeached, was Arminianism: the opposition to that was stronger than to anything else.

Mr. *Hume*⁵ remarks, that perhaps the only thing in which all the sectaries agreed, was the notion, that the doctrines of fate and destiny were essential to all religion. Dr. *Balguy*⁶ speaks of their overturning the monarchy as being only a *step* to overturning the Church. If we have time, I will read some of Mr. *Rouse's* speech in the House of Commons; and a *protest* of the house against Arminianism, in 1628⁷.

In 1643 the Parliament, by ordinance, appointed an *Assembly of Divines* who should reform the Church of England, bring it nearer Calvinism, and make a coalition with the Church of *Scotland*. We have their *Catechisms*, and the *Articles* which they reformed; but after debating ten weeks on the first fifteen, they stopped short, and desisted from⁸ the task.

21. The turn which religious opinions took in the reign of *Charles II.* has been mentioned under the eleventh Article; and the notions of *Antinomians* with regard to election, sufficiently under the sixteenth. It has been hinted, that *Methodists*⁹ are divided into Calvinistic and Arminian; and that the generality of the English *Clergy* are reputed Arminians¹⁰. The first Earl of *Chatham* said, in parliament, that we have a Calvinistic creed, and an Arminian clergy¹¹; I should be more willing to acknowledge the latter than the former. Dr. *Jortin* says¹², "Our Dissenters, in the last century, were generally

⁵ A. D. 1644. vol. v. 4to, p. 371, near the bottom: chap. viii. These are not the very words of Hume, but taken from two sentences.

⁶ Page 61.

⁷ See Neal's Pur. vol. i. 4to, pp. 530, 532, 534, from Rushworth.

⁸ Neal 1643, vol. II. 48, 4to. The articles are in the Appendix.

⁹ Art. xvi. sect. 10.

¹⁰ Art. xvi. sect. 8.

¹¹ See Belsham's Memoirs of the reign of George III. vol. i. p. 362, ed. 1796.

¹² Second Dissertation, p. 112.

absolute predestinarians;”—they are now, I take it, mostly IV. *Socinians*¹. The *Quakers* are said to profess Arminianism: and some Presbyterians, I have been told, continue Calvinists.

22. The most formidable Calvinist of *modern times* I take 7 to be *Jonathan Edwards*. He died in 1758. The modern *Baptists* are represented by Wall, in his *History of Infant-baptism*, (Part II. chap. viii. sect, 6, subsect. 16,) as more earnest about predestination than any other people in England—as being anxious to know whether any one is a *Freewillier* or a *Freegracer*. They have also amongst them a division of persons into *General men*, and *Particular men*, from their holding a general or a partial *Redemption*.

23. In *Scotland* John Knox established Calvinism; and in 1643 the Assembly of Divines had in view the *reformation* of the Church of England, but only the *preservation* of the Church of Scotland; which shews how Calvinistic it was, and Puritanical in discipline. The *Confessio Scotica* seems to conceive the *true Church of Christ*² to be the *elect*, and others *reprobates*. What are now the notions of the established presbyterian Kirk, or of the tolerated episcopal Church, I have not been well informed.

24. The *Irish*³ Articles were drawn in 1615 by Archbishop *Usher*, when provost of Dublin College: the *Lambeth Articles* were incorporated into them. But in 1634 Archbishop Laud got our xxxix. accepted—Neal says, in the *room* of the others; but Waterland says the *Lambeth Articles* were never formally laid aside. Usher was then primate. His *Body of Divinity* is very Calvinistic; but Waterland says, “he renounced his Calvinian principles, as is well attested by three good hands⁴.”

Archbishop *King* has left a very good discourse on predesti- 8 nation.

25. Having in the tenth Article reserved the notion of God’s causing *evil*, I do the same here. He has been supposed to cause it either by *influence*, or by *decree*; the former belonged to the tenth Article, the latter to this.

¹ I do not perceive that Dr. Priestley allows any decree at all. Famil. Illustr.

² *Syntagma*, pp. 141, 148, Art. *Electio*; et de *Ecclesiâ*.

³ Neal, i. 475. Waterland Suppl. Ar. Subscr. p. 51.

⁴ In a MS. note in the Library of Mag-

dalen College, Cambridge, are mentioned Bryan Walton, Peter Gunning, and Herbert Thorndike; with reference to Smith’s *Life of Usher*, and Collier’s *Eccles. Hist.* vol. II. p. 868. And Neal owns the fact, in a degree, *Hist. Pur. Index*. All the Calvinists still speak respectfully (I am told) of Archbishop Usher.

IV. Vice is ascribed to fate in Homer. Agamemnon excuses himself for robbing Achilles of his prize by saying⁵, 'Εγὼ δ' οὐκ αἰτιός εἰμι, Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ Μοῖρα. *Agathias* mentions it as a common notion, that wars and battles were imputed to the stars and fate. See Lardner's account of Simplicius in his *Heathen Testimonies*⁶.

26. With regard to the *Jews*, I know not that I need add anything to what was said under section 3. As Jewish expressions, arising from Jewish ideas, are the very things which cause our difficulties, they will appear of course in the solution.

27. Some early Christians have been said to run into notions of sin being caused by decrees of powers above; but the accounts seem scarcely to be depended upon⁷. They are mentioned by Heylin at the opening of his *History of the Five*
9 *Articles*, chap. i. sect. 4-6. But *Colarbasus* seems, in *Aug. de. Hær.* only to have believed in *æons*. Of the *Priscillianists* Augustin says, "Astruunt etiam *fatalibus* stellis homines colligatos," &c.

28. In *Augustin's* time the monks of *Adrumetum* are said to have held that God predestinated the wicked, not only to punishment, but to *guilt*. And all those who came into this notion were called *Predestinarians*. But disputes have arisen concerning this part of history⁸. What I have seen of Augustin's writings to Valentinus and others of that monastery at *Adrumetum*, has not given me an idea⁹ that they held so strange a doctrine.

29. Some have allowed a *foreknowledge of sin* in God, as a motive for reprobation, who would not allow a *foreknowledge*¹⁰ of *merits*, as a motive to election. Peter *Lombard*¹¹ says, "prædestinavit eos quos elegit, reliquos vero reprobavit; id

⁵ *Iliad*, Book XIX. l. 86. This expression is quoted by Heylin, p. 507; but a few other expressions might be read. Agamemnon says, what could he do? a divine power made him offend.

⁶ This was mentioned before as an instance of ascribing *events* in general to fate, sect. 2; but it ought also to appear as an instance of ascribing *evils* to fate. Natural evil may be distinguished from moral, but though war is natural evil it is usually caused by moral.

⁷ Art. xv. sect. 2, and Art. xvi. sect. 2.

⁸ Mosheim, vol. II. p. 90, 8vo, or Cent. v. 2. 5. 25.

⁹ These monks were for grace excluding free-will; which is rather a *symptom* of their being for predestination excluding virtue. *Jansen* felt as I did: see opening of Sirmond's *Historia Predestinariana*. *Vossius's Hist. Pelag. Lib. VII.* is about Reprobation; and I think he is of my mind: see Index to *Hist. Pelag.* "*Prædestinationem*," &c.

¹⁰ Sect. 7, end.

¹¹ *Lib. I. Dist. 40.*

est, ad mortem eternam præscivit peccaturos." Some have IV. made *reprobation* to consist merely in *not electing*. The Rhemists on Rom. ix. 14, speak of an illustration of Augustin's, who compares the elect and reprobate to two *debtors*, one of which is forgiven all, and the other made to pay all, by the same creditor.

Some strong expressions of *Calvin* may be found in the first seventeen pages of the Oxford Dissertation; but in those expressions we see that desire before mentioned of making reprobation, though proceeding from the good pleasure of God, 10 an act of *just* punishment.

At *Trent* the Dominicans founded reprobation on the mere pleasure of God; alleging the instance of *Esau* reprobated before he was born.

There has been a distinction between *Supralapsarians* and *Sublapsarians*, from *lapsus* the *Fall* of man. The former held, or have been charged with holding, that God decreed the Fall of man, and all its fatal consequences; the latter, that God's decree *presupposed* the Fall, or only *permitted* it, and determined the state of different men in *consequence* of it. One *Twisse* has been reckoned a *Supralapsarian*¹; he was prolocutor to the Assembly of Divines in 1643.

This gives an idea of all *mankind* taken collectively; with regard to a particular *instance*, Master *Fulke* speaks plainly in his answer to the Rhemists on Rom. ix. 17:

"The purpose for which God *set up* Pharao is manifest in the text, *that in him he might shew his power, &c. God made all things for himself, even the wicked unto the evil day.* Therefore was Pharao a vessel of wrath ordained to destruction, vers. 22. His reprobation therefore was for the glorie of God, his condemnation most *just*, for his obstinate contempt of God and his word."

In reading the *Lambeth Articles* it was not easy to avoid reading the part about *reprobation* with that about election; because one wished not to leave a sentence unfinished. As this remark may apply to several instances, I will here *close the history* of reprobation, and of the *Article*.

30. We come then to the *explanation*.

The *title* is, "Of Predestination and Election."—Predestination is sometimes a *generic* term, including election and

11

¹ Turretin, Locus 4. Quest. ix. sect. 23. Turretin was a predestinarian | himself. Neal gives a good character of Twisse.

IV. reprobation²; sometimes it signifies only predestination to *happiness* which is its sense here, as appears from its being joined with election. And also from the first expression of the Article, “Predestination to *Life*.” Προορισμός is not in Scripture, but προορίζω is, and πρόθεσις.

31. The *first paragraph* of our Article exhibits nothing more than a *series of texts*, with a word or two connecting them together. To make such a series seems fair, yet it occasions some impediment to that conception of the Article which I think the right one. The Texts of Scripture, on which the doctrine of predestination has been built, seem to me chiefly expressions of *sentiment*, or eloquence, or even of *formality* and *decorum*. Now to put such expressions into a series, must give them more appearance of *system* and *theory* than they would have if each was read, with a right feeling, in its *place*.

When such expressions occur as, “O king³, *live for ever*,”—“the *most excellent governor*⁴ Felix”, “most noble⁵ Festus,” &c., how strange it would seem if an historian was to hold that Darius was immortal, or that Felix excelled all other men as a governor; yet when such sayings are connected together, the connection gives each a more speculative meaning than it was intended to have. I would not be understood to
12 say, that *all* the texts introduced have an indefinite meaning; but only, that when the things they mention are referred to the *predetermination* of God, *then* the meaning is indefinite.

Nor would I insinuate that even *then* the meaning is *as* indefinite as the meaning of the phrases just now mentioned, “O king *live for ever*,” &c. They are only mentioned to shew the *nature* of the inconvenience complained of, not to mark out the *degree* of it.

Still, however, it will be proper to shew, that the compilers of our Article *did* follow Scripture⁶.

32. “*Predestination to Life*,” implies that there is such a thing supposed, at least, as predestination to *death*; which is not here *denied*, but *waved*, or *omitted*. The *Reformatio Legum* says, that wicked men used frequently to allege *reprobation* as an excuse for their wickedness.

33. “*Is the everlasting purpose of God*.”—We have “*eternal purpose*,” Eph. iii. 11; and *purpose*, in this sense,

² Usher's Body of Divinity, under God's Kingdom, p. 73, 7th Edit. Arminius's Works, Disp. 15, p. 226; but Arminius prefers our sense.

³ Dan. vi. 21.

⁴ Acts xxiii. 26.

⁵ Acts xxvi. 25.

⁶ See Oxf. p. 20, &c. and bottom of p. 74.

occurs several times. Rom. viii. 28; ix. 11; and Eph. i. 11. IV. “*Everlasting*” is to be taken in a *negative*¹ sense, as that which has continued during a time to which we can conceive no limit.

“*Whereby*,” will be allowed as a connecting word, not scriptural.

34. “*Before the foundations of the world were laid.*”—See Matt. xxv. 34; Eph. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9. This expression seems *indefinite*, and meant to be so taken.

35. “*He hath constantly decreed.*” “*Constantly*,” seems again a *negative* term, signifying a decree *not interrupted* in any way assignable by man. *Decreed* might be used as *implied* in predestination and purpose; but it may be referred 13 to Jer. v. 22; LXX. πρόσταγμα αἰώνιον. *God’s decree* is a sort of *technical* term in theology.

36. “*By his counsel*,” βουλή, Acts ii. 23; Rom. xi. 34; Heb. vi. 17.

37. “*Secret to us*,” Deut. xxix. 29; Amos iii. 7. The secrecy is also implied in Rom. xi. 33, 34.

Secret seems to imply here that which belongs to *God’s part*, in the government of the world—to be opposed to *revealed*, for the guidance of *man*. If what is called secret ever appear, it is by the *event*², or at most by faint intimation.

38. “*To deliver from curse*,” Gal. iii. 10, 13, with reference to Deut. xxi. 23, and xxvii. 26.

39. “*And damnation*,” κατάκριμα, Rom. v. 16, 18: but of this enough under the ninth Article.

40. “*Those whom he hath chosen in Christ.*”—We have “*chosen in him*,” Eph. i. 4; the words “*in Christ*,” were added to the Article in 1562, though they make what comes after seem rather an harsh repetition; in order, probably, to keep close to words of Scripture³. The term “*chosen*,” is one of those which were originally used of the *Jews*, and applied to *Christians* in the way of comparison or allusion⁴. The expression, “*those whom he hath chosen*,” or, whom he hath *since* chosen, seems to me to imply that the secret purpose of God is only to be looked upon as opened by the *event*. The publication of Christianity is an event which ought to be 14

¹ Introd. to Second Part, sect. 7.

² “Made manifest by the effects.”

“Then” (when a matter is come to pass)

“it is manifest what *was* God’s will before concerning the matter.” This is

Calvinistic Usher: Body of Divinity, p. 41, 7th edit.

³ Oxf. p. 20.

⁴ Taylor on Romans, Key, par. 92.

IV. referred to the Divine Government, not limited by time. Whoever entered fully into this remark, would allow me to say, that predestination of men to be Christians, ought not to be mentioned, or thought of, till they *are become* Christians; agreeably to what was said⁵ under the tenth Article of preventing Grace; nay, that any *heathen* who pleases, may to-morrow have⁶ *been* “*chosen*” from all eternity; that is, whoever becomes a Christian in the common way, may, when he does become one, *ascribe* his conversion to the goodness of God, acting before all time that can be limited.

“*Out of mankind.*”—These words seem only for connection. They might have been omitted.

41. “*And to bring them by Christ to everlasting Salvation.*”—Eph. i. 7, 10, 11, say the same thing, only in a manner not so suitable to the course of expression in the Article. That true Christians are to be *saved* eternally, is not a thing likely to be questioned by any set of Christians. *Salvation* was one of the terms explained in the appendix to the eleventh Article⁷. The word “*everlasting,*” is not useless, as men are sometimes said to be *saved* when they are only *admitted* into Christianity.

42. “*As vessels made to honour*”—Rom. ix. 21, 23, with reference to Jer. xviii. 1, &c. These texts describe only *comparative* privileges, or distinctions; and those distinctions must be supposed to be acquired in the *common way*, by a diligent use of *opportunities*, and then *referred*, indistinctly, to the Divine Providence; though the reference to God will always be the stronger when we speak of men *collectively*, and of disposing or governing them⁸.

We have now got what may be called a *definition* of our *cause*—of the cause of *Christianity*, as existing in the Divine mind, in a *manner* unknown to us, from a *time* not to be limited by us. The *effects*, that is the *parts* of Christianity, fall more within our comprehension. If they had been mentioned *first*, and then referred to their *unsearchable* cause, in *indefinite* language, our ideas would have been kept in better order; but it might be thought that an Article ought to keep to the *synthetical* method.

⁵ Art. x. sect. 35.

⁶ Rogers on this Article, mentions, as in error, those who say, “it is in man’s power to be elected,” p. 80. Theophy-

lact is one, I see: which is a comfort.

⁷ Sect. 18, and Art. xi. sect. 21.

⁸ Art. x. sect. 49.

43. “Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent *IV.*
a benefit of God.”—I see nothing in these words but connection. “They which be,” seems to imply uncertainty about individuals; whosoever they may be, that are, in the sight of God, true Christians.

44. “Be called according to God’s purpose.”—The expression is all taken from Rom. viii. 28. See also 2 Tim. i. 9¹, invited, offered election; Matt. xx. 16. Taylor’s Key, par. 97. The invitation must have been primarily given to quit Idolatry and Paganism.

45. “By his spirit working in due season”—1 Pet. i. 2. The manner of referring conversion to God’s spirit, has been mentioned² under the *tenth Article*. It must not interfere with endeavours, nor take place till the conversion is *past*. “In due season”—I do not seem to see the whole purpose of 16 inserting these words; they fill up the sentence to the ear; they occur several times in Scripture, but not with regard to the working of the *spirit*.

46. “They through grace obey the calling.”—Obey is in Rom vi. 17, and obedience 1 Pet. i. 2. It would not have been regular to have omitted the divine assistance.

47. “They be justified freely.”—The expression comes from Rom. iii. 24; but Rom. viii. 30, should be kept in mind. Of justification we have treated under the eleventh Article.

48. “They be made the sons of God by adoption”—Gal. iv. 5, 6; Rom. viii. 15;—Heb. ii. 11. We were born in *sin*. But the principal passage seems Eph. i. 5.

49. “They be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ.”—This expression comes from Rom. viii. 29; but if we look at the 30th verse, we have after *justified* “glorified:” instead of which our Church takes a passage out of the 29th verse; from whence it seems probable that they had the same notion of the passage with Taylor; namely, that the 29th verse describes the *first* and *last* steps of our spiritual progression; and that the 30th enumerates the *intermediate* steps. If this be right, it comes to the same thing saying, we shall be finally glorified, and, we shall be made finally like the image of Jesus Christ. See 2 Cor. iii. 18. “Begotten” may be opposed to adopted.

50. “They walk religiously in good works.”—This seems implied in becoming Christians; but for the same reason the

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 21, “called,” is equivalent to becoming a Christian. ² Art. x. sect. 36.

IV. *twelfth Article* was inserted: a *plain* expression seems useful here. I conceive a reference to Titus ii. 14, and iii. 8. But Eph. ii. 10, has the most of predestination in it.

17 51. “*And at length, by God’s mercy*”—Tit. iii. 5. 1 Pet. i. 3.

52. “*They attain to everlasting felicity.*”—Matt. xxv. 34, speaks of the predestinated as attaining to endless happiness, therefore is here the proper authority.

Before we proceed we should consider whether the distinguishing characteristics of Christians admit of various *degrees*. *Salvation* does; *justification* has been said to do, under the eleventh Article; why may not *adoption*? Good *works* allow of great variety.

53. We have now had a scriptural *delineation* of *Christianity*, and we have seen the scriptural method of *referring* it to the divine foreknowledge and “*everlasting purpose.*” And what is the *use* of such referring? That we are to see next. It may be used so as to do *good*; but it, or something thought to be of the same sort with it, may be used so as to do great *harm*. Our Article proposes to attain the good, and avoid the evil. The unsearchable counsels and foreknowledge of God do so far appear to man, as to become to him a most interesting object of *contemplation* and reflection; and if rightly contemplated, they may improve *Christian piety*; if wrongly, they may promote *vice* and *misery*. But let us pursue the expressions of the Article.

54. “*As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our election in Christ.*”—The sort of contemplation allowed must be “*godly,*” that is, it must *presuppose* true piety in the mind; and it must also presuppose *admission* into Christianity—it must be contemplation of the *Christian scheme*, as referred to the purpose of God. The word “*our*” was inserted in 1562, but it might as well perhaps have been omitted.

18 If it had been wanted to shew that the meditation ought to be upon the *Christian plan*, it would have been useful; but there are other marks of that. At present, it must either be taken impersonally, and so add little or nothing to the sense; or it must come too near affirming of *individuals*, what is only intended to be affirmed of *Christians in general*.

55. “*Is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons.*”—Again, “*godly*” joined to “*persons,*” as well as to “*consideration;*” in order to make the distinction as clear as possible.

56. “*And such as feel in themselves the working of the IV. spirit of Christ.*”—We here distinguish between feeling *the spirit*, and feeling the *working, vim*, of the spirit; we mean, finding such dispositions and principles, as we piously, though indistinctly, ascribe to the assistance of the Holy Spirit, in the manner mentioned under the tenth Article. For fear of mistake, the *effects* of the spirit, or the phenomena which are to make us trust we are real Christians, in some degree or other, are next specified.

57. “*Mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members.*”—This is from Rom. viii. 13. Col. iii. 5.

58. “*And drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things.*”—More phenomena from whence we may judge whether we are such Christians as may derive *good* from contemplating the Christian scheme as settled in the secret counsels of God. Here seems to be an allusion to John vi. 44, “except the Father *draw* him.”

59. “*As well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ.*”—Suppose then a Christian with such dispositions; would it really strengthen his *faith* to refer the Christian scheme back to God’s planning it before all time? It must. The *constancy*, 19 the *duration* of it, must heighten his conceptions of its *stability* and *importance*; and the power, justice, and wisdom of God must appear in a strong and striking light.

60. “*As because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God.*”—In like manner we may ask would it really inflame the devout *love* of such a Christian as is here supposed, to dwell on the same contemplation? Unavoidably: for such a contemplation would shew him God as engaged, for endless ages, in acts of kindness to him; and would make the *connection* between a kind Deity and him seem much more intimate than it was before. “We love him, because he *first loved* ¹ us.”

61. “*So for curious and carnal persons, lacking the spirit of Christ.*”—Now we come to the persons who may make a *pernicious* use of the secret counsels of God. In the first place, they are not *Christians*; or, if they have been *baptized*, they have not the *internal* qualifications of real Christians. “Lacking the spirit of Christ,” may be still farther cleared by comparing it with the sixteenth ² Article, “after we

¹ 1 John iv. 19.

² Art. xvi. sect. 19.

IV. have received the Holy Ghost." "A Christi spiritu prorsus *alieni*," says the *Reformatio Legum*.

And the persons who would do harm by thinking much on the secret counsels of God, are not only no Christians, but they are *weak* or *wicked men*—*curious* or *carnal*.

"*Curious*," seems to be used with much meaning, and to describe that kind of men who are continually entering into such abstruse and sceptical speculations as are apt to make
20 *Atheists*; such as unsettle all principle—perplex, but never convince. "Re ipsâ curiosi," the *Reformatio Legum* calls such persons. Speculations of the sort here meant frequently engender melancholy and misanthropy, as well as impious murmuring against God.

"*Carnal*," means men of debauched morals. The *Reformatio Legum* informs us that there were many such, who took the turn of fatalists at the time of the Reformation: "differti luxu;" having recourse to predestination as a covering, "maleficiis, et sceleribus, et omnis generis perversitati."

62. "To have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination."—Here the *object* of contemplation is changed: it was before the *Christian* religion in the divine mind, here it is "God's predestination," in general—fate, destiny³. For bad men to have fatality before their eyes, is certainly what the following words express.

63. "Is a most dangerous downfall,"—*præcipitium*. The nature of a *precipice* is, that it does not necessarily destroy, but puts one in immediate danger of being destroyed, either by any one who chooses to push one down, or by a slip of one's own.

64. "Whereby the devil doth thrust them."—About referring evil to malignant spirits, I have said something before⁴. "*Duce Diabolo*," *Reform. Legum*.

65. "Either into desperation."—Despair is one natural consequence of a person's persuading himself that there is a fatality against him.

"In desperationem præsentem abjiciuntur *præcipites*." *Reform. Legum*.

21 66. "Or into wretchlessness of most unclean living."—*Wretchless* means careless, negligent; in the *Rhemish Testament* on *Rom. ix. 14*, it is spelt *retchless*, which brings it

³ Or, according to Bishop Hooper, "*fatal destiny*." See on the Commandments; or Heylin, *Quinq.* p. 557.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 50.

nearer *reckless*, which occurs several times in Shakspeare¹; IV. and a character in one of his plays, says, "I *reck not*"—for, I *care not*. At Sedbergh I have (above forty years ago) heard often, "*never reck*," for "*never mind*," (pronounced *neverack*,) do not give yourself any trouble, or concern. In the *Latin*, the word is *securitatem*—"impurissimæ vitæ." The *Reformatio Legum* has, "ad solutam quandam et *mollem vitæ securitatem*." Being *secure* is, properly, being without *apprehension* of danger; whether really *in danger* or not.

67. "*No less perilous than desperation*."—Perhaps *more* perilous. God may pity the despairing fatalist: he is more likely to be sincere than the sensualist; who must, on numberless occasions, act contrary to those principles by which he excuses his faults.

Perhaps "*desperation*" may refer to "*curious*," and "*unclean living*" to "*carnal*."

Some passages from *Latimer* and *Hooper* might be read here. (Quoted Heylin's *Quinq.* p. 556, &c.; also Oxf. p. 54, &c.; also Rhem. Test. on Rom. ix. 14, marginal note.)

68. We come now to the *third paragraph*.—So far we have been concerned with duly *regulating* a sublime and interesting *meditation*, into which men are very *apt* to run.

It seems proper not to conclude the Article, without laying down something relative to *practice*.

In the Article of 1552 the beginning of the third paragraph stood thus:

"*Furthermore*" ["though the decrees of predestination be unknown to us,"]—it seems a pity the words in hooks were omitted; they tend to keep the thoughts in the right train. Some puritanical influence might throw them out.

69. "*We must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture*."

Promises are opposed to *decrees*—that which supposes man at *liberty*, to that which supposes him *fixed*. *Promises* seem to include *threats*: they are things to *act* from; *decrees*, while "*secret to us*," or "*unknown to us*," are only to be *contemplated*.

"*Generally set forth*"—to *all* men, not to any set of men particularly *favoured*. *Electing* is partial, *promising* extends even to those at present "*lacking the Spirit of Christ*." Pro-

¹ See Ayscough's Index, Stockdale's edition.

IV. mises any man may *apply to himself*—decrees, no man may, in any *definite* manner.

70. “*And in our doings,*”—in our conduct, or practice, “in *actionibus suscipiendis,*” says the *Reformatio Legum*, more clearly.

71. “*That will of God is to be followed.*”—Here is a reference to the *scholastic* division of *will* into different kinds; which would not have been made except, as in St. *Paul’s* time, perverse men said, “who hath resisted² his will?” So in the age of the *Reformation*, men had urged the *will of God* as an excuse for their vices: “in *voluntatem Dei criminum suorum culpam conferunt.*” (*Ref. Leg.*) “*They say it is God’s will.*” (Hooper³).—I will not take you into all the distinctions of
 23 Archbishop *Usher*⁴ on the subject of will, much less into those of *Thomas Aquinas*⁵; but some distinction seems necessary. From what was said in the *elementary introduction* to this second part of the Articles, it will be easily allowed, that we may conceive a thing to be according to the will of God, or man, in two senses—as he *permits* it, and as he *chooses* it should be done; *will*, in the former sense, may be called *secret*⁶ will, in God, as containing the rules of God’s government, which must be secret to us; in the latter, *revealed*. The *secret* will of God we can only *contemplate*, in the manner now settled; the *revealed* will we must endeavour to *execute*. God wishes us to do what is right, for our own good.

72. “*Which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God*”—“*disertè revelatam:*” this means God’s *revealed* will. *Disertè*, *Livy* uses for *named*, mentioned by name; so it may be that will of God which is plainly *called* so—*called his will*, in Scripture. However, it is opposed to God’s will “*secret to us*”—to “*decrees*” “*unknown to us.*”

73. Having now gone through the several expressions of our Article, I conclude the explanation with observing, that our Article does not *deny* either *absolute* or *conditional* predestination⁷. And that it is silent about *reprobation*, has been already observed.

² Rom. ix. 19.

³ See Heylin, p. 556.

⁴ Body of Divinity, p. 40—48, 7th edition.

⁵ The Index to his works, under *Voluntas*, is really worth looking at, as a matter of curiosity.

⁶ Plaifere, pp. 342, 398. See also Whitby on Five Points, chap. iii. p. 435; and compare John vi. 39, with Matt. xviii. 14, and 1 Tim. ii. 4.

⁷ Waterland’s Supplement to Arian Subscription, p. 60; with reference to Plaifere’s *Appello Evangelium*.

Ecclus. iii. 21—23, is like the general turn and scope of IV. the Article.

74. According to our common order, I should now come ²⁴ to *proof*; but there is a difficulty in determining what is to be proved. Our Church can scarce be said to lay down¹ *any doctrine* in this Article: it only gives a series of *texts*, and declares against the *abuse* of them. I will, however, lay down *one proposition*, in order to have an opportunity of offering some remarks, tending to give the right *value* of those texts which have occasioned the strict doctrine of predestination: my proposition may be—

God has predestinated Christians, as such, to life. But, as all our knowledge of God's secret counsels is extremely indistinct, and as therefore, this proposition, in its present form, *seems* to have more meaning than it really has; and moreover, as in its present form it interferes with practical² *exertions*, I will put it into a form better suited to the real state of our knowledge, to the real sense of Scripture, and the active performance of the *duties* of human life. In its new form, then, it may stand thus:—

75. Whenever any thing important happens, or is conceived to happen, of a tendency to bring Christians to heavenly happiness, they may ascribe that to the purpose of God; not limiting the duration of his purpose; if they do it with due *diffidence*, and in *circumstances* similar to those in which the same is done in Scripture.

Still our ascribing is, from our ignorance of God's decrees and counsels, to be extremely *indistinct*, and in the *heart*, rather than the *head*; but proving this, will justify the generality of churches in holding *something* about predestination.

The only passages where predestination is mentioned *expressly*, are Rom. viii. 29, 30; and Eph. i. 5, 11. These may therefore have a precedence: others may be mentioned in the order in which they lie in the sacred volume.

Matt. xxv. 34; John xvii. 11; Acts ii. 23, and xiii. 48; Rom. ix. 23; Eph. i. 4, 9, or the whole, 4—11; 1 Thess. i. 4, and v. 9, (the latter quoted by Usher repeatedly); 2 Tim. i. 9; Titus i. 1; 1 Pet i. 2.

These may answer our purpose; and he who has a right notion of these may apply it to all the rest.

¹ Sect. 16.

² Art. x. sect. 35.

IV. 76. The remarks, by which I would endeavour to give the right *value*, of these expressions of Scripture, are much the same with those in the tenth Article; that is, applications of the elementary remarks, which make the Introduction to the second part of our xxxix Articles.

77. The *popular*³ *language* of Scripture does not lay down any *system* of speculative truth; but *each* expression describes some *feeling* for some useful *purpose*: we must see what this purpose is, in each instance, or we do not understand the expression. There is really *no theory of predestination* in Scripture. There are separate pious *references* of important and happy events to the unbounded foresight and superintendence of the Deity; and out of these *men* have *formed* theories; but such theories are merely *human*. Each passage of Scripture aims at producing *faith* and *love*: and we have no right to use any passage for any other purpose.

If this is not the case, why are *trifling* events never referred in Scripture to predestination? God is as much the author of
 26 trifling events as of important; and it has in strictness been as *long ago* determined, for any thing we know, that a man shall be *six foot high*, as that he shall be a *Christian*; yet the former kind of event is not referred to the divine counsels, the latter is: why, but because it answers a good *purpose* to the Christian, and not to the tall man? The fine reference of the privileges of a Christian to the divine counsels, in Rom. viii. 28—30, is not for the sake of *truth*, or *speculation*; but for *animating* the converts to brave all the terrors of *persecution*, rather than revolt from Christ. And whoever sees the passage for a moment without seeing it aim at the *heart*, misses what was principally intended, and of course sees something which the writer never thought of. The same may be said of the *openings* of several Epistles. The heart is to be inflamed by grand and affecting sentiments, however indefinite, in order that the work may be *studied* with a proper interest.

78. In the texts on which predestination is founded, great use is made of positive terms with *negative* significations; as may appear from the beginning of the *explanation*. It would greatly tend to prevent misconception, if we kept this constantly in mind; as also, that our meaning frequently is, when we refer to divine predetermination, no more than that it would be impious to *exclude* the Deity⁴, or fix on any time when he

³ Art. x. sect. 39.

⁴ Art. x. sect. 40.

did not foresee, or intend to confer, such or such a blessing. IV. The expressions concerning the “*eternal purpose*” of God, have had a sense in the mind of the sacred writer (as it appears to me) much nearer this than any *theorist* imagines.

79. Events, ascribed to the predestinâtion of God, are not to exclude *human agency*. They will be ascribed to the one or the other, as the *occasion* directs; sometimes to *both*¹; and when only to one, the other must be understood to be *implied*. 27

Acts ii. 23, may afford us an instance: “Him being delivered by the determinate *counsel* and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by *wicked* hands have crucified and slain.” The death of Christ is sometimes ascribed to the *will of God*², sometimes to the *wickedness* of the Jews, (in different senses indeed); here to *both*. Whatever happens may be referred to God, in one way or other. But the part which God acts, in the government of the world, does not in the least affect the moral nature of man. That nature is God’s immediate work; and men, when free, act under his government. Whenever any good purpose is to be answered by referring an event to the government of *God*, it may be so referred, even though the act be *punishable*³; only in that *indistinct* way which becomes our ignorance of the divine counsels: when any good purpose is to be answered by referring the *same event* to the choice of *man*, that may be done; and if it should happen that a good purpose would be answered by referring *one* event at the *same time* to *both* the government of God, and the choice of man, the reason still remains in force. This last mode of referring must intimate, that though man is ever so free, he is still under the control of God. By Acts ii. 23, the Jews were given to understand, that they had made a bad use of 28 their freedom, but that they depended on God; he was their Governor, and would be their Judge. Does not Mr. Pope’s expression, “*His scourge the tyrant*,” mix divine and human agency equally? “*Tyrant*,” implies *wickedness*, which implies choice, or *human* agency: the tyrant’s being a *scourge* in the hand of God, expresses the government of God, or *divine* agency.

¹ Art. x. sect. 41, referring to Introduction to Second Part, sect. 8.

² Rom. v. 8; viii. 32.

³ Art. x. sect. 50. Hecuba, (Il. Ω. 209, &c.) says, that her son Hector was

killed by *fate*; yet she desires to *punish* Achilles on account of his death.

Œdipus is said to have had an hard *fate*, but he is blamed just as if that had not been said. See Batteux, Aristot. Poet. p. 258, note.

IV. 80. We have no right to use any text of Scripture without regard to the *circumstances* in which it was used originally. How much change of circumstances will alter the *sense* of words, has been carefully shewn⁴. If then, in Scripture, we only find *past* events, or events supposed to have happened, or *viewed as* having come to pass, referred to the everlasting purpose of God, we have no right to refer events to the same, without attending to that circumstance.

This, again, will prevent any *theory*, any *abstract* propositions, about predestination, from being admitted. This would have been reason enough for changing the form of our *proposition*⁵: it was liable to be objected to thus: ‘I know of *no such* proposition in *Scripture*; give me a *fact*, and perhaps I may *refer* that fact to God’s unbounded foreknowledge.’ Matt. xxv. 34⁶. The kingdom of the blessed was “*prepared*” for them “*from the foundation of the world*;” but this is said when you are supposed to *look back* from the day of judgment. We might now say, *to any man*, Be you *good*, and a kingdom *will have been* prepared for *you* from the foundation of the world; *but* if you become wicked, and are so finally, an “*everlasting fire*” will *have been* prepared for you. Both the passages of Scripture, which mention predestination expressly, have a *retrospective* view; and refer, indistinctly, a present happy state of things to the divine secret counsels. And the same may be observed of those *openings* of the Epistles, from which any thing relating to predestination has been taken.

I think some of our reformers and writers have seen something of this notion. The *Necessary Doctrine* lays down⁷, that a man ought not to judge that he is *elected* but by his good disposition, “and by the tokens of good and virtuous living.” When *Latimer* says we should “*begin with Christ*,” he seems to say we should begin with the *effect*, and reason *à posteriori*⁸. And Archbishop *Bancroft* meant something of the same sort at the Hampton-Court conference, by “*ascendo*⁹.”—we *ascend* from effect to cause. When we reason from a known effect to a cause imperfectly known, we *finish* with that which is above our comprehension; but when we *begin* from a cause not understood¹⁰, we are misled in things

⁴ Book I. chap. x. xi. Introd. to Second Part, sect. 9. Art. x. sect. 42.

⁵ Sect. 74. ⁶ Compare 1 Cor. ii. 9.

⁷ Sect. 16.

⁸ Ser. on Septuages. quoted by Heylin, p. 557. Waterland, p. 60, (Suppl. to Arian Subscr.) ⁹ Oxf. p. 36.

¹⁰ Introd. to second Part, end of sect. 8.

which concern us immediately, and which are, in reality, level IV. to our capacities.

Attention to circumstances would hinder us from referring any *trivial*¹ events to God, or from making any references to his secret decrees, without a view to exciting some *good sentiment*; according to what has been already laid down; and would make us aware how things are referred to the *permission* 30 of God, though contrary to what is most commonly called his *will*.

The more a man studies the circumstances in which our texts were used, the fewer references to the eternal purpose of God will he be inclined to make.

81. I have several times said, that I look upon the passages of Scripture, from which the doctrine of predestination has been derived, as being of the nature of *eloquence*², and not of speculation. That will be the case if those passages are always calculated to excite good *sentiments*. And they will be, of course, much *less plain* and perspicuous, because more indefinite, than practical directions; and therefore ought to be interpreted less literally. Indeed, to interpret an eloquent expression, so as to give it its true value, and neither more nor less, seems scarce practicable. Rom. viii. 29, 30, is intended to have an effect upon the *feelings* of those to whom it is addressed. Part of Taylor's paraphrase on the next verse is, "and what effect should they ["these things"] have upon our *hearts*?" and though Mr. *Locke*, on the opening of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, gives predestination the limited sense of God's purpose to take the heathens into the Christian religion, yet he looks upon that whole epistle as a piece of eloquence and sublimity.

He says, in his Synopsis, that St. Paul displays in it "the glorious state of that kingdom" (the kingdom of the Messiah) "not in the ordinary way of argumentation and formal reasoning, which had *no place* in an Epistle writ as this is, all as it were in a *rapture*, and in a style far above the plain *didactical* way; he pretends not to *teach* them any thing, but couches 31 all that he would drop into their minds in thanksgivings and prayers; which affording a greater liberty and flight to his thoughts, he gives utterance to them in noble and *sublime* ex-

¹ Fanatics have referred trifling events to God's decree or purpose, though I have no instance at hand. Something

similar to this we have had, Art. x. sect. 39.

² Art. x. sect. 42; Art. xvi. sect. 30.

IV. pressions, suitable to the *unsearchable* wisdom and goodness of God, shewn to the world in the work of redemption." Mr. Locke himself makes one afraid of giving any very definite sense to any lofty expressions in the *opening* of such an address especially; though he may rightly point out what was to be a *distinguished* part of the sentiment excited.

Perhaps some passages may be made easy by observing the *Jewish* mode of referring all events to God. But this remark may be more useful when we say anything about *reprobation*.

82. An observation, made in the Introduction to this second part of our Articles, may be of use here. Sometimes expressions of Scripture are not considered with sufficient freedom, because they are supposed to contain *new truths*, communicated immediately from Heaven. I do not *perceive* that any sacred writer intended to teach any thing *new* with regard to the pre-determinations of God. I mean, it does not strike me that any sacred writer has intended to give us any knowledge of the *nature* of the divine decrees, which might not be derived from natural religion. The sacred writers refer *new events* to the everlasting purpose of God; but it does not follow that they taught new doctrines about them.

83. I will now make a few remarks on the particular *texts* which I have produced in support of my proposition. Of Matt. xxv. 34, Acts ii. 23, and the opening of the Epistle to the Ephesians, I have already said something. Rom. ix. will
32 come best under *reprobation*; and the openings of the first Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to Titus have nothing peculiar in them. I will therefore confine myself to John xvii. 11 (and similar expressions); Acts xiii. 48; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Tim. i. 9; and 1 Pet. i. 2.

In John xvii. 11, and other passages, Christ speaks of Christians as *given* him by his heavenly Father—a very proper and pious acknowledgement! especially in *prayer*, or devout discourse; but containing no more *doctrine* than would have arisen from our *king's* thanking God, on the day of his public thanksgiving, for *giving* him millions of affectionate subjects, rejoicing in his recovery.

Acts xiii. 48, has occasioned many discussions. I confess it seems to me to mean no more than that as many as *chose* to become Christians were *allowed* to become Christians; or as many as it *pleased* God to make so: *none* duly qualified were *refused*, though they were *Gentiles*. That was the

wonder, that *Gentiles* should be admitted to be God's people! IV. "When the *Gentiles* heard this" (that they might be Christians) "they were *glad*;" it was new to them at "Antioch in Pisidia;"—"they *glorified* the word of the Lord! and *as many* as were ordained to eternal life, believed." Not *one* or *two* distinguished heathens were admitted into Christianity, but heathens were admitted just as *Jews* would have been. Certainly the phrase "*ordained to eternal life*," to express being inclined to become Christians, is copious; and it is very solemn and *grand*; but so was the occasion. Nothing less was in agitation than what is called the rejection of the *Jews*, and the adoption of *all nations* upon the face of the earth. The phrase might seem *natural* to *Jews* in describing conversion to a religion, the characteristic of which was, to confer "eternal life" on its votaries; it must needs seem highly decorous. "Believed," is put for, becoming believers. 33

Archbishop *Sharp*¹ and Mr. *Parkhurst*² understand by ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, as many as were in a due disposition for eternal life: a sense supported in a very respectable manner³.

But if τεταγμένοι meant *destined*, the expression might mean no more than that all such of those present, as were destined to be converted, were converted *then*; that is, the conversion of the *Gentiles*, as a solemn thing, might be referred, when it had actually happened, in the way already described, to the divine purpose. Being destined to *eternal life*, might be used for being destined to *Christianity*; as *Christianity* produces eternal life of course, all things going right—no impediment arising on the part of the convert. Being admitted into *Christianity* is often expressed by the word *salvation*⁴; which is generally equivalent to *eternal life*. As many as were destined to be *saved* were admitted Christians. Acts ii. 47⁵.

1 Thess. v. 9, is twice referred to by Archbishop *Usher* in one page⁶; yet it is the conclusion of an *exhortation* to arm, therefore cannot, at least, exclude *human agency*. It, with what goes before, conveys to me this idea. Remember the state you are in—a state of *warfare*; you are encompassed 34

¹ Sermons, vol. 111.

² Greek Lexicon.

³ For Epictetus's sense of τεταγμένος, see afterwards, sect. 89.

⁴ Art. ix. end of sect. 24; Art. xi. sect. 14. Append. to Art. xi. sect. 8.

Locke on Ephes. ii. 8. Taylor's Key.

⁵ One might suppose what effect the phrase would have had, which was used with regard to *Lydia's* conversion, Acts xvi. 14.

⁶ Body of Divinity, p. 73, 7th edit.

IV. with enemies; they may come upon you by surprize; put on “the whole armour of God:” if you are surprised, you will incur *disgrace* and *punishment*; yet, believe me, that was not the *design* of your being placed in a state of warfare; it was that you might attain to honour, victory, reward. If this be right, there is a likeness between this passage and James i. 2, 12. “My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations;” that is, *trials*, difficult situations: “Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.” But no *doctrine of decrees* do I perceive.

In 2 Tim. i. 9, and what immediately precedes it, St. Paul exerts all his powers of *eloquence* to “*stir up*” Timothy to exercise his ministerial functions. St. Paul himself was a *prisoner* when he wrote, and under *affliction* on account of the Gospel: his minister seems to have been of a *mild* disposition⁷; we read of his “*tears*,” of his drinking “*no wine*,” of his being “*ashamed*,” of a “*spirit of fear*.” Such a situation of things was alarming; the ministers of the Church which we are told of seem to have been very few, considering the number of countries in which Christianity was planted. *Timothy* was to be animated in the most forcible manner; the *Gospel* was to be set in its highest light; to be shewn as existing in the divine mind time without end. Let any one read our text with these ideas, and he will see much noble *vehemence* in it, but no speculative *teaching*—nothing didactic.

35 1 Pet. i. 2, has been explained before⁸. With relation to our present subject, we have only to observe, that it is a fine *exordium* of an interesting and affecting epistle. The author, instead of addressing the converts by the bare appellation of “*Christians*,” enumerates the most striking *characteristics* of Christians; and in order to *raise* their minds the more, he directs their views *back* to the *foreknowledge* of the heavenly Father. But teaches nothing *new*—points to nothing which is not *past*.

I conclude, that to *refer* in an indefinite manner the important things of religion to the *purpose* of God, may be highly proper and *decorous*, on great occasions, as a part of *devotion* or *exhortation*; but that no *practical rule*, no *speculative*

⁷ Compare the dispirited expostulations of Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 4, 9, 10, 14.

⁸ Art. xi. sect. 22.

proposition, can be justly deduced from those passages of Scripture which have given birth to the doctrine of predestination.

84. We will now come to some proof of the *indirect* kind, or to the answering of a few *objections*; premising, that what was said in answer to objections, under the preceding Article¹, might be of use here. The *immutability* of God used to be urged by the predestinarians at the time of the Reformation, in favour of their notions. It may be proper to keep in mind the objections in the tenth Article.

85. Is not what has here been laid down too *intricate*² for common people to attend to? It does not seem so to me. Indeed, common people do in reality know as much of the subject as the learned, if they would not frighten themselves with 36 fancies; and as all ranks may feel uneasiness from what they hear of predestination, all should be provided with the remedy. In our method, all distinctions between absolute and conditional predestination are set aside—all theory is dismissed; nothing remains but what is to be dispatched by common feeling and common sense. Nay, no man is required, as matter of duty, to think *anything* about predestination; only it is a pity any one should lose a species of meditation, which “is full of sweet, pleasant and unspeakable comfort,” when rightly performed. Mr. *Whitehead* says, that sages formed civil *societies*,

By heaven's *permission*³, or by heav'n's *command*;

and afterwards,

And men are *born* to trifle, or to reign.

In these two lines are couched all the mysteries of God's different *wills*, and of each man's *destiny*; but they give no sort of trouble, so long as men have no superstitious fear about them. If we would carry the feelings and sense with which we read these, to Scripture, that would occasion no greater perplexity. The plainest things seem abtruse whilst we are obliged to examine them minutely; but use soon makes examination unnecessary.

¹ Art. xvi. sect. 30. In Heylin, 557th page. Oxford, p. 64.

² Art. x. sect. 45.

³ See William Whitehead's Works, vol. II. Elegy iii. addressed to the present Earl Harcourt, (1796). Marmontel puts these words into the mouth of one of his characters in his tale of *La Bergère*

des Alpes, (*Contes Moraux*, tome II. p. 50.) “Puisque je suis pasteur”...“il faut bien que je sois né pour l'être.” Any common expressions, of the sort here quoted, used without any idea of their being abtruse, or of their having relation to religious disputes, are to our present purpose.

IV. In short, we seem to have little to do in referring events
37 to God's purpose, but to let our feelings⁴ *ply freely* to the case.

86. Is not the general language of Scripture as if men were *free*⁵? yes; and so is the language of our Article. "In our *doings*," we are to conceive ourselves free; though looking *back*, we may acknowledge our dependence on God in every thing. Our moral and *accountable* nature is immediately⁶ from God. The texts about predestination are *few*, and so are the occasions on which they ought to be used. It may not be *necessary* to use them *ever*. Even those men who favour predestination in the way of theory, have such faint notions of it that they do not *act* from it. *Calvinists act* from free-will as much as other men. Sometimes men may *evade* their duty by *pretending* to act from a belief of destiny, but I do not call this acting from such a belief; they act from the notion of their being free in every thing else.

Bishop *Bütler*⁷ proves that the doctrine of men's not being at liberty, if it could be true in *theory*, must be false in *practice*: we must *act* as free; therefore there must be a fallacy somewhere.

87. Is not the doctrine of predestination hurtful to *virtue*? No. Virtue is, in our Article, *presupposed*, before men are allowed to meddle with predestination. Those who are to hope that God's purpose will prove favourable to them, must "walk
38 *righteously in good works*:" those who may meditate on the Christian dispensation as having been planned in the divine counsels, must not be "*carnal*," but "*godly persons*." And even these, according to our notions, ought only to dwell upon the decrees of God, *as far* as it will promote and strengthen their virtue. Besides, those texts which mention predestination are so *linked* with the mention of virtue and holiness⁸, that no ingenuous man can take the former and leave the latter. If, on reading any text seeming to favour predestination, we ask, *whose* virtue could this hurt? we shall find that it could hurt no one's, without some misapplication.

88. Does not the doctrine of predestination interfere with

⁴ Hecuba does this, in the passage mentioned sect. 79, II. Q. 209, &c. She uses *fate* to raise a *sentiment* of consolation—refers an event back to fate, though she has no precise idea what fate means.

⁵ Art. x. sect. 46.

⁶ Sect. 79.

⁷ Analogy, I. 6.

⁸ Eph. i. 4, "he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be *holy* and without *blame*," &c. See also Eph. ii. 10, *created unto good works*, "*ordained* that we should *walk* in them;" and so in other passages.

the duty of *prayer*¹? No more than with any other exertion IV. for attaining good; no more than with any virtue. Indeed, according to the representation of our Article, referring important and sacred events to the divine purpose is itself a species of *devotion*.

Of *prophecy* I have said enough before².

89. I would lastly propose the same question which I have proposed in some *preceding* Articles³. Will not the doctrine before us *disgust* thinking men? I think it *ought not*; particularly if our observation be true, that the Scriptures give *nothing new* upon it. If, as a Christian, I were asked what I *meant* by predestination, I should give an answer which would suit natural religion, as well as revealed. I should say, 39 I mean that, which, in the divine mind, is the cause of order and regularity—of such order and regularity, as, in man, would be ascribed to foresight and predetermination. To this, events have been ever ascribed, in all ages of the world. *Epietetus* uses *τεταγμένος* much like the author of the acts of the Apostles⁴; and certainly reasonable men could, in no age of the world, *deny* or *limit* the predeterminations of God. If we can only turn reflections upon the divine decrees to a *moral* purpose, we may be well satisfied.

90. But while I am upon the subject of natural religion, I should take notice of the famous difficulty arising out of the Divine *prescience*. If God foreknows my actions, they are fixed, though seemingly voluntary; therefore I have no *choice*, I am no *agent*. But, according to our notions, repeatedly⁵ stated, we have no right to ascribe to God a *certain foreknowledge* of our voluntary actions, if we have no such thing ourselves, nor any idea of such a thing. Do we know that it is not an *impossibility*? We have *analogies* by which we can

¹ Art. x. sect. 47.

² Append. to Art. xi. sect. 27.

³ Art. ix. sect. 40; Art. x. sect. 49. See the Heads of Lectures in each Article, and the Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 29.

⁴ The passage to which I mean to refer I find in cap. xxi. in a Glasgow Edit. with a Latin translation, p. 30. In *Stanhope's* Edit. with *Simplicius*, about the 26th or 27th chap. *Simplicius*, in his comment, makes the passage belong rather to the *tenth Article*; to which might perhaps be referred the *prayer* with

which *Simplicius* concludes his comment. (*Lardner's Testimonies*.)

Epiet. Enchir. cap. xxix. Τῶν δὲ βελτίστων σοι φαινομένων οὕτως ἔχου, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμένος εἰς ταύτην τὴν τάξιν.

Here the true end of referring actions to God seems to be discerned; not speculative truth, but moral feelings—assisting virtuous principles of human agency, and mixing it with divine.

⁵ Art. xvi. beginning of sect. 30; Art. ix. Introd. sect. 8.

IV. *conjecture*, with great probability, how men will act; and God
 40 must have something of the same sort in an unbounded degree; but these must, by their nature, fall short of certain knowledge. This is a different thing from *denying* the prescience of God, as the Socinians are said to do. God has certainly all *possible* knowledge; but if he has a certain foreknowledge of our voluntary actions, it is a thing of a kind⁶ of which we know nothing; and therefore if we admit it, and act from it, we are answerable for the consequences. We must not, through a fear of detracting from the wisdom of God, endanger our own morals; they are the principal objects of the divine administration.

91. I would also recall⁷ to your mind, that there may be two different *trains* of thought, seemingly inconsistent with each other, and yet in either you may go on without coming to an end. Study the regularity of God's government, the constancy of the *rules* or laws of nature; you come to no end. Study the *freedom* of voluntary agents, and the interpositions of God's particular *providence*; again you come to no end. What remains but that here, as in former instances⁸, we leave two things to exist together as they may, though we are unable to make them fit and suit each other? assuring ourselves that there *is* some way of reconciling them, though we may not understand it, now or ever.

What we have said of the Divine prescience and immutability⁹, may put us into a right way of understanding the
 41 *repentance*¹⁰ of God, and other things ascribed to the Deity, which seem rather to belong to man. Each is, (as before, repeatedly) the cause, in God, of those effects which, in man, would be ascribed to that quality; and each quality is ascribed to God in any situation, as far as, in that situation, it is a *perfection*.

We speak of *rules* of the Divine government; but, in strictness, we know no such. When any thing goes on *uniformly*, we presume and suppose a rule; but we know not the mind of the Lord: the unexpected violation of that uniformity which we have observed, may be as much from rule as the uniformity itself.

I conclude this topic of natural religion, with observing, that I do not see how the divine predetermination makes any

⁶ It is one of the *secret things* which belong unto the Lord our God. Deut. xxix. 29.

⁷ Book III. chap. xv. sect. 9.

⁸ Sect. 5. with references.

⁹ Art. xvi. beginning of section 30.

¹⁰ Compare Num. xxiii. 19, with Jer. xviii. 8, 10.

difference in the doctrine of *liberty and necessity*, which was IV. laid down¹ under the tenth Article; and therefore I do not say anything here on that subject.

92. I now come to say something of the doctrine of *reprobation*. As in the tenth Article I reserved to the last the subject of referring *evil* to God, so I do in the present Article. Evil has been referred to God as *inspired*² by him, or *decreed*; the former part was treated in the tenth Article, the latter must be mentioned here.

I should imagine, that as we have already seen the manner of referring good to God, if we gave some account of the *etymology* of reprobation, and shewed in what respects referring *evil* to God is more *complicated* than referring good, (and therefore how any scriptural expression ascribing evil, should be construed *less strictly* than one ascribing good,) we should, with the help of what has been already said, be prepared to examine any particular *texts* of Scripture.

Probo signifies to try, and so, in the common course of 42 things, to *approve*: a *tried friend* is an approved friend. *Reprobo* is, *after trial*, to throw away, as refuse, that which has not answered the trial.

In the trial of *metals*, what is thrown away is in English called *dross*, in Greek³, *ἀδόκιμον* (*ἀργύριον*). In any contests, in *running*, &c. the loser was called *ἀδόκιμος*: to this, St. Paul seems to allude when he says, of himself, *μήπως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένομαι*⁴. *Man* is in a state of *probation*; if he does tolerably well, he is *δόκιμος*; but if he is so bad as to be deemed incorrigible, he is *ἀδόκιμος*, or *reprobate*⁵. I do not see why *Locke* and *Taylor* should run away from this sense. There is nothing more frightful in it than in the expression, "*he gave them up*;" when it is seen what they were given up to.

Reprobation seems generally to give more alarm by the *sound*, than *condemnation*; yet one had rather be neglected as *refuse*, than adjudged to positive punishment. A man may be *comparatively* reprobated—as when another who is *preferred* to him is said to be *elect*; reprobated being the correlative. Nay, one might conceive one, who is *reprobated* in comparison

¹ Art. x. sect. 49.

² Art. x. sect. 50.

³ Prov. xxv. 4. Isai. i. 22, according to the LXX.

⁴ So that with us a *distanced* horse is a *reprobate* horse.

⁵ In our *Homily*, *reprovable* is the word for reprobate. On Faith, beginning; from Titus i. 16.

IV. of *one* man, to be *elected*, in comparison of another: as a thing thrown aside may be used for some other purpose from that it was tried for, and in preference to something else.

93. The difference, between referring *good* and *evil* to God, seems to consist in this: God may have *evil* ascribed to him, because none can happen which he does not *permit*, and which, therefore, does not, in some sense, make a *part* of his *government*; (and every part of his government is *good*;) or because there is no evil which he does not control, so as to prevent its operating beyond certain *limits*⁶. Evil may also be ascribed to God when he *punishes* it, and thereby produces *good*; but more directly when the evil ascribed is used as a *punishment*. It is also ascribed to him when he brings *incidental* good out of it. *Language* must, to be sure, be *far* from *literal*, which ascribes *evil* to God in *any* sense; but it is usually a *fact* which is ascribed, and that fact is good in some *respects* and evil in others. *At bottom*, it is only *good* which is ascribed to God, or what is good to him who ascribes it; and common sense sees this, though it may not be conscious of every step in the process. When God only *permits* evil, there is, no doubt, good, if it were only in the liberty, accountableness, &c.; and in every other case just now mentioned, the good appears more plainly.

But *good* is ascribed to God more simply and *directly*. It is unmixed; he not only permits it, but *rewards* and encourages it; so that both the liberty of conferring and attaining good, and the encouragements to use that liberty, are his.

Though *language* in which evil is ascribed to God is more imperfect than language in which good is ascribed, yet even the latter is capable of being perverted. God is "the author of *peace*;" then what occasion, says a man who wants to *evade* his duty, for me to be a *peace-maker*? Perhaps this evasion might be too gross to pass; but others do pass which are of the same *kind*.

When one man is *preferred* to another, we sometimes hear the comparative disadvantage called *evil*, *injury*, or even *punishment*. Of such evil God may be the immediate author. He may prefer one of his creatures to another, or make them into different *ranks*, in any kind of life. (Rom. ix. 15.)

⁶ Some references might be made from this section, and the next, to the 50th section of the tenth Article; but the best

method would be to look at that, before reading this part.

There seems to be reprobation spoken of *à priori* and IV. *à posteriori*.

94. Some have had a notion, that God, by a *direct act*, ordains a number of men to misery; but there is no warrant in Scripture for saying any such thing. Take an *evil, a fact*, and you may *refer* it to the divine government, with that indistinctness which your ignorance demands, if you can answer a good *purpose* by so referring it—if you can excite a pious or virtuous *sentiment*; but not otherwise. An attention to *circumstances* is required in referring *evil* as well as in referring good¹; nay, a greater degree of attention. But let us take some *instance*.

Let us take first the *rejection of the Jews*; as a great part of the doctrine of reprobation has been taken from scriptural expressions relating to that event. The *plain fact*, if told in common language, was, the Jews, or part of them, rejected the Christian religion; but when this fact was taken in a religious light, and considered as part of God's government, and referred to God, the expression then was, *God rejected the Jews*; which to the Jews themselves would seem natural and easy language.

The Jews, in this case, were *reprobated*; and important good, no doubt, they lost; but they might any of them embrace Christianity when they pleased; and then, when their conversion was spoken of in a religious light, and as part of divine government, they would be said to have been *elect, predestinated*, according to God's purpose. In both cases, of rejecting and embracing Christianity, the *fact* must come *first*, and then be referred back to the divine counsels. In such reference, language implying divine agency would be rightly used.

95. Now let us take a few particular *texts*. I will take them chiefly, or entirely, from Archbishop *Usher's* proof of reprobation², which he favours. I do not perceive Jude 4 amongst his texts, which I wonder at.

Prov. xvi. 4. gives me no other idea than this: God's government is universal; what he *created* he always designed to superintend: he created all things as subjects of his government; it extends to the punishment of the wicked. Though God *hates* sin, yet the permission of it, and the punishment of it when committed, is as much a part of his plan, as even the rewarding of goodness.

¹ Consider Matt. xxv. 41, in this light, | as before, section 80.

² Body of Divinity, pp. 73, 74, 7th edition.

IV. Let us now go to the 9th Chapter to the Romans, and first take the 13th verse—"Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." This whole chapter is written to prove that God might set aside the Jews, or leave them out of the kingdom of the Messiah, that is, reprobate them, notwithstanding his promises to their forefathers. Their notion seems to me to have been this:—the Christian religion cannot be the true, or if it is, we need not be anxious about it, because we must be of the true, in consequence of the promises of God. No, says St. Paul, that reason is not valid; you cannot depend upon descent, because you inherit from Jacob, and he was not regularly descended from Abraham; Esau was his elder brother. That instance of quitting the direct line, St. Paul well knew, the Jews would not object to; the preference of the descendants of Jacob, that is, of the Israelites, to those of Esau, or the Edomites, was a favourite subject. But, say the Jews, Esau was disinherited, because of his bad character: that, replies the Apostle, was not the reason; for the disinheriting was announced before the birth of the twins; therefore God may make a similar change when it seems good to him. The expression of the Apostle, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated," is, very properly, borrowed from a prophet³; and the language of the prophet means, that the Israelites were a much more prosperous people than the Edomites. There is not the least mention in the passage of any individuals, or of any punishment in a future state.

The 17th verse is another support⁴ of reprobation: it contains another instance, which the Jews would readily adopt—the punishment of the enemies of their forefathers, the punishment of the Egyptians, and Pharaoh their king. It is mentioned in the Book of Exodus⁵. God raised up Pharaoh in order to shew his power. The plain fact was, while Pharaoh was under the rod, under any of the plagues, he was humble and submissive; when they were remitted, he exalted⁶ himself, and grew arrogant again.

But though in plain language he exalted himself, yet when the transactions were considered as a part of God's government, the expression was, God exalted him, or raised him up, by allowing him that relaxation from punishment which occasioned his insolence. And this was very suitable to Jewish phrase-

³ Mal. i. 2, 3. Obadiah seems all on this subject.

⁴ Rhemists on the place. Usher, p. 74.

⁵ Exod. ix. 16.

⁶ Exod. ix. 17.

ology. The effect of Pharaoh's insolence was, to make God's IV. protection of the Israelites much more striking, and much more *celebrated* than it would otherwise have been; which is, in like manner, as a part of divine government, thus expressed—"that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." Now why might not God, in the same sense, *raise up the Jews*? The more they exalted themselves, and the more obstinate they grew in rejecting the Gospel, the more would the fame of the Gospel be declared throughout the world. Indeed, the situation of the *Jews* has been, and is, most wonderful; and has, in fact, greatly assisted in proving the divine authority of the Gospel. But the passage before us is so little to reprobation, in the usual sense of the word, that we have lost all idea of reprobation merely by examining it.

We must take one more passage out of this famous chapter—the 22d verse: "*vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction.*" But we must look back, perhaps as far as our last instance, the 17th verse. My idea of the whole passage, is this:—a *taunting Jew* had said, we make God's name¹ to be glorious! do we so? then God cannot be angry with *us*; in truth, as yet (continuing the sarcasm) we have suffered no *great* harm! On this the Apostle is indignant. Insolence! he exclaims, You know your cavil to be insolent, as well as sophistical: but dare you insult *God*? Are not you, according to your own prophets, in his hands, as clay in the hand of the potter? may not you be appointed to a more or less noble office? He might *destroy* you, and he does not; is this your complaint? forgive 48 him this wrong; it may not continue. *He* only knows how near your destruction is: He only knows how soon you may weep over your *temple*, and find not one stone left upon another! Because destruction is not actually arrived, do you conclude that Christianity is not the kingdom of the true Messiah? that would be a most unwarrantable conclusion. Remember how God acted with the *Egyptians*; if, in the same manner, he makes your refusal of the Gospel the means of promoting its *honour*, you cannot, after praising the measure in one case, blame it in another, exactly similar.

Thus we see, that the passage has no relation to *individuals*, or to *Christians*, or to punishment in a *future life*. There is some appearance as if St. Paul had not been wholly without an idea of the destruction of Jerusalem; but how far he was in-

¹ Ezek. xviii, a *Jew* makes a taunting cavil; see the ninth Art. sect. 38.

IV. formed of that event, does not appear. One thing seems evident—that St. Paul by his reasoning was endeavouring to promote *conversion* to Christianity; and from thence we may conclude, that any *individual Jew* might have escaped from any kind of destruction which was impending over the Jewish *people*.

We have now only 1 Pet. ii. 8, and Jude 4, remaining. They are so much alike, that I will take them together; indeed, they seem so little different from Prov. xvi. 4, that if that is explained, so are these. All three consist in referring evil to God; in order to shew that the most daring offenders cannot *exempt* themselves from the restraints of his government. You will find learned² and ingenious solutions of them all; but I am most inclined to solve them from what has been
49 laid down, about the difference between referring³ good and evil to the Supreme Being. When men run into great crimes, they are apt to *triumph* in their freedom from those fetters in which they fancy the good are confined. Nothing tends more to humble them, and make them sober-minded, than to make them feel that they are totally under the government of God; and that, though they are really guilty, yet their very crimes may be instruments of good in the hands of God. This makes them feel impotent and despicable; and the more if they are made sensible of the *boundless duration* of the divine schemes of government. These are the ideas which seem to me to prevail in the minds of the sacred writers when they throw out, “*appointed*” to this evil—“of old *ordained* to this condemnation.”

And we should really consider what a world we should be in, if God was *ignorant* of man’s wickedness; or if the profligate were really *lawless*; or if evil was simply evil—if no good came out of evil; or if a sin was never made the punishment of a sin. It frequently happens that the *good* which springs out of evil incidentally is so great, that we dare not wish the evil had not happened. To be sure, when we express God’s permission, regulation, improvement of evil, by speaking as if he were the *author* of evil, our language is very imperfect; but so indeed is the generality of our language—often, I apprehend, not less imperfect. Custom reconciles us to it, and practising upon it serves to define it. The case might soon be the same with language ascribing evil to God.

² In Benson, Le Clerc, Whitby on the Five Points, &c.

³ Sect. 93.

It has been easy and familiar to the Jews : it might become so IV. to us.

96. At length we come to our *application*. If what has 50 been said is just¹, we may have here an Article of *natural religion*².

‘ I have already³ returned thanks to Providence for making me a member of my religious *association*. Its laws and regulations must improve me and bring me to happiness ; but I cannot think that those laws existed *first* when I first knew them. How *long* then may the plan have existed in the divine mind ? the heavenly planner only knows !

‘ When I reflect on the blessed institution, as *settled* by divine wisdom before all time, I am filled with sacred *wonder*. Could I flatter myself that I was a worthy *member* of it, I should be happy. I try my *principles* and my *conduct* ; and in proportion as they satisfy me, I feel a *confidence* in God as the protector of it, and an *affectionate* gratitude towards him. Yet I can see, that if a *bad* man was to act from a notion that all things are settled, it could only lead him to *despair*, or *licentiousness*.

‘ No ; the decrees of God may be an interesting subject of *contemplation* to a good mind ; but *practice* must spring from the endeavours of man, animated by the hopes of *pleasing* God, and being *rewarded* by him.’

97. A Christian might say thus :

‘ That I am a member of the Church of Christ, is matter of sincere rejoicing to me. What a privilege ! to be *invited* into such a society, to be considered as free from any great 51 *fault*, to be regarded in the light of a *brother* to my Lord and Saviour ! to be led naturally to *imitate* his perfections, and to be put into a way which leadeth to eternal life ! The importance of the blessing still grows upon me when I consider, that the Church of Christ has been an object of attention in the Divine mind ever since the fall of our first parent. So far I am expressly taught ; but had not the Christian dispensation been conceived or planned *before* the Fall ? I must not say or think that it had not. I look back, and time keeps opening

¹ End of sect. 82.

² These forms proceed according to the hint at the end of sect. 42. First comes the *fact*, then the *cause*, in God’s purpose, formed before any assignable

time ; then the good and bad *use* of *contemplating* God’s purposes, or *decrees* ; then the nature of *practical* rules.

³ Art. xiii. sect. 27 ; Art. xii. sect. 26 ; Art. xi. sect. 30.

IV. upon me. I can fix no period when it seems at all probable that the gracious design had a beginning.

‘Christianity, existing in the divine mind before the foundation of the world, and opening gradually upon mankind, is the most *august* and *affecting* object which a human being can contemplate. And when an examination of my heart and actions gives me any reason to think that I am really a member of it, my *hope* is confirmed, and my devout *affections* enlivened, by the *constancy* of the divine benevolence. Nevertheless, it is intelligible how an opinion, that all things are fixed by the Deity, may lead a man into a state of *despondency*, or into a *negligent* and dissolute course of life.’

‘Though therefore I am happy in having such a subject of *meditation* to raise my mind to piety and devotion, yet I shall endeavour to strengthen and improve my *practical* principles, by attending to the *promises* of God, and to the revealed descriptions of that conduct, which he wishes man to pursue, for the improvement of human happiness.’

98. With regard to *mutual concessions*, I would not say much. *Dupin*⁴ makes no objection to this Article. There is
52 great room for *candour* in debating about it. If divine agency does not *exclude* human, nor human⁵ divine, and both are *indistinct*—different *modes* of *referring* events, to God and man, should be allowed; and different *phrases*, according to men’s different feelings and conceptions. St. John seems to have been of an affectionate temper, and that influences his style. And if you and your adversary may get into two different *trains* of thought and expression, and both be right⁶, to what purpose is dispute? Our form of assent seems to be such (as we said on a former occasion⁷) as an *heathen* would subscribe to, except in those particulars which must be *common* to *all Christians*; and if it be so, no denomination of Christians need dissent from it. But till it appear how our method would be accepted, one cannot tell what concessions to propose. Even *Usher*, speaking of reprobation⁸, seems to have had some ideas of referring evil to God, which might, with some tempering, be made to coalesce with ours. Indeed our method has favoured reprobation as much as election; and possibly might be acceptable to some as

⁴ Mosheim, vol. vi. p. 77, 8vo.

⁵ Sect. 79, 86.

⁶ See sect. 91, referring to Book III.

chap. xv. sect. 9.

⁷ Art. x. sect. 53.

⁸ P. 74, Body of Divinity, 7th edition.

setting aside *no texts* of Scripture, in order to favour com-IV. monly-received notions of human¹ philosophy.

99. We come, in the last place, to *improvements*. Shall we, in imitation of *Melancthon*, *strike out* this seventeenth Article? I had much rather our method of explaining and defending it were accepted. The mind wants something to *lean* upon with regard to the divine counsels, and those passages of Scripture which speak of them. The disquisitions and meditations on such passages might be called a fine species of *devotion*—they are all sentiment and sublimity. One would do a good deal to suit weak brethren; but there is no sufficient reason why those who are *not* weak should lose such sublime devotion; especially as those who are perplexed by meditations on the benign purposes and plans of the Supreme Being are under no sort of *obligation* to dwell upon them. (Sect. 86.)

A *transposition* of the former and latter parts of the first paragraph², might prevent some wrong conceptions.

It must be *tried*, in natural theology, heathen writings, the Scriptures, and common discourse³, whether the observations which have been hazarded are just.

100. When *Milton* assigned to his *fallen* angels the employment of reasoning⁴ on our present subjects, I hope he did not mean to deny, that, when *rightly* conceived and made the subject of our contemplation, they are “full of sweet, pleasant, and *unspeakable comfort*”⁵.

ARTICLE XVIII.

54

OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST.

THEY also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

¹ Dr. Powell's 3d Charge.

² Sect. 42.

³ Art. x. sect. 54.

⁴ Paradise Lost, Book II. 557.

⁵ It may be a satisfaction to some

hearers of the Lectures, who took notes, to know, that the five last sections of this 17th Article were omitted April 1, 1791, for want of time; even though the Lecture that day was supernumerary.

IV. 1. In treating of this Article we will proceed in our usual method, though much of what was said upon the thirteenth Article might be applied here. The thirteenth seems to relate to *individuals*, and this to members of *society*; but yet as these may be the same persons, their neglecting Christianity in the capacity of individuals, must be nearly connected with their neglecting it in their social character.

According to what was said at the opening of the Introduction to the second part of our Articles, the THIRD PART begins here.

It has probably been the custom in many different ages to say, that all honest men will be saved, whatever religion they may be of; but this sentiment must be most prevalent when men are most divided into religious parties; then the difficulty of forming a judgment is most striking. It must, on this account, have been very prevalent at the time of our *Reformation*, and that era is probably of the most consequence to us at present; nevertheless, if we make historical remarks, we may as well look back as far as we can.

2. Bishop *Burnet* says, that "The impiety that is condemned in this Article was first taught by some of the heathen orators and *philosophers* in the fourth century;" who pleaded, that God was more honoured by *various modes* of worship, than if all men agreed in one mode. I should rather apprehend that the compilers of our Article would have chiefly in view some error held by *Christians*, or by such as might have the Scriptures proposed and urged to them: scriptural authorities would only affect persons so situated.

Philaster does give an account of a sect called *Rhetorians*, who held that *all sects* were right; and some have imagined that these were *rhetoricians*, or orators of the fourth century; but *Philaster* lived in the fourth century himself⁶, and places this sect much earlier. Our business does not seem to be to enter into nice questions on ecclesiastical history: and therefore I shall content myself with referring you to *Lardner's* account of *Rhetorians*⁷; and with observing, that though *Augustin* thinks it incredible that any sect should justify all sects, it has often appeared to me, that each sect *sets out* on some right principle, though it may afterwards go too far, or deviate from the right path.

⁶ A. D. 380, *Lardner*.

⁷ *Works*, vol. ix, p. 232.

3. We may now take notice of the *fifth century*. One IV. part of the *Pelagian* controversy was about the *universality* 56 of *redemption*—was intended to determine whether *all men* were *redeemed* by the death of Christ, and whether all men were *called*. I believe disputes on such matters referred chiefly to *predestination*, and were intended to determine whether Christ could be said to have died for the *reprobate*: but yet perhaps they might have *some* relation to our present Article; for if all men were so redeemed by Christ as to be upon *one footing*, it would not signify what religion any man was of. It seems, moreover, as if the Pelagians had held notions, which were not approved by the orthodox¹, about the justification and salvation of the holy men mentioned in the Old Testament. Yet this salvation was, in some measure, ascribed to *Christ*—to their having *foreseen* his coming.

4. *Mohammed* lived partly in the sixth century, and partly in the seventh, (571—633). Bp. *Burnet* observes, that the Koran represents “all men in all religions” as “equally acceptable to God, if they serve him faithfully in them.” He also remarks, that this candour was intended as an *inducement* to embrace Mohammedanism, and was followed by great severity towards those who were desirous to apostatize. We may give a passage from the Koran to our purpose: “Sciendum generalitèr, quoniam omnis rectè vivens, Judæus seu Christianus, seu lege suâ relictâ ad aliam tendens, omnis scilicet Deum adorans, bonique gestor, indubitantèr divinum amorem assequetur².”

5. But, for the reason already assigned, we are chiefly concerned with the age of the *Reformation*. In the *Racovian*³ 57 Catechism it is laid down, that since the coming of Christ no one is justified without faith in him, but before his coming good men were justified by faith in *God*⁴. *Erasmus* not only speaks of Cicero as inspired⁵, but as probably *saved*. *Paulus Jovius* died in the year 1552, when King Edward's Articles were published. In his lives of famous men, he gives an account of *Galeottus Martius*, who was persecuted by some monks (though accidentally protected by Pope Chrystus, or Sixtus the fourth, as an old acquaintance) for teaching, in a book of

¹ See Augustin's Works, ed. Antv. vol. x. Appendix, p. 75, in a Pelagian Creed, or Confession of Faith.

² Azoara 2d page 10, Edit. Bibliandri. Zurich 1564, quoted by Forbes, Lib. IV. cap. x.

³ This quoted Art. xiii. sect. 6.

⁴ De prophetico Jesu Christi munere; or p. 212.

⁵ Mentioned Art. x. sect. 2. Ep. ad Jo. Ulatt, in Cic. Tusc. Disp.

IV. sacred and moral philosophy, “omnibus gentibus, integrè et puritè veluti ex justâ naturæ lege viventibus, æternos cœlestis auræ fructus paratos,” &c. This person died in 1478. We have already⁶ mentioned the decrees of the Council of *Trent*. I do not see anything more to our purpose than what was quoted under the thirteenth Article⁷.

The *Scotch* confession seems very strenuous on the necessity of being of the true Christian church in order to attain⁸ salvation: “*Extra quam*” (ecclesiam) “*nec est vita nec eterna felicitas. Itaque prorsùs detestamur illorum blasphemiam qui dicunt homines viventes secundùm equitatem et justitiam, quamcunque religionem professi fuerint, servatos iri.*” The Scotch might be the more zealous, as being inclined to *Calvinism*: to such it must be shocking to have any one speak as if there were no *elect*.

The authors of the *Reformatio Legum* are also very warm; perhaps thinking the notion opposed an affront to Christianity:—“*Horribilis est et inanis illorum audacia, qui contendunt in omni religione vel sectâ quam homines professi fuerint, salutem illis esse sperandam*”⁹, &c. In the same chapter is a declaration against the notion that *all* men shall be saved *at last*, after undergoing some punishment; which notion is the subject of the last of King Edward’s Articles. Perhaps it might seem that universal salvation, though after some evil suffered, was not agreeable to the scriptural accounts of salvation by Christ.

This *Reformatio Legum* professes to censure only heresies actually prevailing at that time; as appears from the Epilogus after the twenty-second chapter.

6. We have sometimes carried our historical remarks lower than the times when the Articles were compiled: if we do this in the present case, we may take notice of *Milton*, *Hobbes*, and *Pope*.

Milton may not at first seem a proper instance, as he did not, in the latter part of his life, adhere to *any* sect, but thought he might be saved though separate from all sects;

⁶ Art. xiii. sect. 5.

⁷ To what was quoted Art. xiii. sect. 5, from *Hume’s History*, should be added the latter part of Hume’s sentence, which belongs to the 18th Article: “Any one who presumes to maintain that an heathen can possibly be saved, is himself

exposed to the penalty of eternal perdition.” *Hume’s Hist.* 4to, vol. III. p. 334, 1st edit. quoted by Gilpin in his *Life of Cranmer*, p. 159.

⁸ Sect. 16, *De Ecclesiâ*.

⁹ *De Heresibus*, cap. ii.

but if the fault condemned in the Article be that of not found- IV.
 ing our hopes of salvation on our being members of the *Church*
 of Christ, and on our acting as such, the great poet might run
 into that fault by depriving himself of opportunities of per-
 forming *social acts* of Christian worship. His biographer,
 Dr. Johnson, seems to disapprove of his conduct in this respect.
Hobbes is mentioned by Bishop Burnet as requiring no man to 59
 take farther care what religion he is of, than that it be the
 religion established in his own country by *law*. I would men-
 tion Mr. *Pope* only in order to introduce those two lines of
 his, which may have contributed, perhaps more than he
 intended, to promote the notion condemned in our Article:—

For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
 His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.

Near end of 3d Ep.—*Essay on Man*.

We might again¹ read the passage where Dr. Priestley af-
 firms, that “nothing is requisite to make men” objects of
 God’s favour “but such moral conduct as he has made them
 capable of;”—with what follows.

7. After history we come to *explanation*.

Ought this eighteenth to be considered as belonging to the
*second*² or *third part* of our thirty-nine Articles? I think, ra-
 ther to the *third*; it seems a kind of *Introduction*; and the
 idea is this: a man must not think that he may be sure of sal-
 vation as a member of *any* sect, or religious *society* which he
 may happen to engage in: salvation can only be hoped for,
 according to the *Scriptures*, from being a member of the *true*
Church of Christ, whatever may be the right idea of that
 Church: and what it *is*, is settled in the subsequent Articles.
 The *Scotch* confession introduces the error opposed in our
 eighteenth Article, under the subject *Ecclesia*.

In the Articles of 1552, indeed, there is an Article *between*³ 60
 our eighteenth and nineteenth, against evading the *moral law*,
 either under pretence of its being *Mosaical*, or of immediate
inspiration; and so the connection might be, though mere vir-
 tue cannot *save* men, it is not to be *neglected*. In 1562, the

¹ Near the end of Art. xii.; from
 Hist. Corr. vol. i. p. 279, end of Atone-
 ment.

² These *Parts* see, opening of Intro-
 duction to second Part: before Art. ix.
 and opening of this 18th Art.

³ Why should Bishop Sparrow, in his
 Articles of 1562, insert this Article of
 1552 *before* our 18th? was he unwilling
 to interrupt the series of Articles relating
 to the *Church*?

- IV. part about the moral law of Moses was added to the *seventh* Article, (about the Old Testament), and the part about inspiration was omitted.

The *title* of our eighteenth Article speaks of obtaining salvation “by the *name* of Christ;” in compliance with the text which is introduced into the Article. The force of that expression may therefore be noticed when we come to that text.

8. “*They* ALSO are to be had ACCURSED.”—To what does the word “*also*” refer? No persons had been pronounced accursed before; but several sets of persons had been *condemned* for holding different errors, though not by the same expression. In the fourteenth Article we have, “works of *supererogation* cannot be taught without *arrogance* and *impiety* :” in the sixteenth, “they are to be *condemned* which say they can no more sin,” &c. : in the seventeenth, a doctrine is said to set men on a *precipice* from which they are liable to fall headlong into despair, or licentiousness : in the eighteenth, “they *also* are to be had *accursed*,” &c. “*damnandi*”—*et*—“*anathematizandi*.”

Indeed, it might be proper to take notice of the meaning of the word “*they*.” The persons spoken of must be supposed, at least, to *know* of Christianity, if not to be, in some sense,
61 *Christians*. In 1552 the title was, “*We* must trust to obtain eternal salvation only by the name of Christ;” and in the body of the Article we have, “holy *Scripture* doth set out unto *us* only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved.” This cannot belong to those who know nothing of the Holy Scriptures⁴: the persons condemned are supposed to make a wrong choice—to rest their hopes of happiness on a wrong foundation, when they *might* rest them upon a right one.

If it be said that “*sect*,” and natural *virtue*, considered in regard to a power of conferring salvation, are opposed to *Christ*, and therefore *sect* may mean a religion *not* Christian; I answer, there may be sects not Christian, which may be within *reach* of arguments for Christianity, though too careless in attending to such arguments; and there may be *Christian* sects too careless about approaching as near to the *truth* as possible. (Art. xiii. sect. 1, near the end.) Probably at the *Reformation* many took up this mode of talking: it signifies but little whether you are Papist or Protestant, or Puritan, or even a Jew, if you are a good *man*. And many might float about, as kind of nominal Christians, without paying much attention to

⁴ See opening to the thirteenth Article.

any reasonings on religious subjects. This might retard the IV. Reformation, as well as seem an affront to Christianity. One cannot conceive a person to be strongly impressed with the idea, that he can only be saved by being a member of the Church of Christ, and not anxious to know wherein genuine Christianity consists.

“*To be had accursed,*” in the Latin, “*anathematizandi sunt*”—are to be anathematized. Something was said of the meaning of this expression in the third Book¹. It has an harsh 62 sound, but should be, like all other expressions, interpreted by custom. Now it has been very much the custom to condemn errors in such form as this: if any one holds such an error, “*anathema sit*”—let him be accursed: we may see instances in the acts of the Council of *Trent*, or of any other council. And in our readings on Bishop *Pearson* we meet with² *Cyrril’s* twelve anathematisms against Nestorius; and those of the Council of Sirmium and others, against *Photinus*³. Indeed, this has been the *established* language of the Church. Its general meaning seems to have been, that men who ran into such particular errors did not deserve to be united to the holy Church of Christ—did not appear to be so in the sight of God; but ought to be looked upon as *separated* from it: and as anathemas accompanied *excommunications*, the ideas of them became *associated*⁴. This account agrees with the expressions in Bingham’s *Antiquities*; where the expression, “cast out of the Church,” used by Pope Vigilius, seems equivalent to “*anathema esto,*” used by the first Council of Bracara. And in *Wall’s*⁵ translations from Augustin, we find *renounced* and *anathematized* put as meaning the same thing. The anathematizing was not only the language of the high *orthodox* party, but of *Pelagius* himself⁶. It was indeed taken from the New Testament, which often took its expressions from the Old. Consult Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8; Rev. 63 xxii. 3. In Rom. ix. 3, *accursed* answers to the marginal *separated*: ἀνάθεμα is from ἀνατίθημι to separate. Ἀνάθεμα amongst the *heathens* signified any thing put aside, or separated for the use of the gods; that is in effect, most commonly,

¹ Chap. ix. sect. 1. vol. i. p. 393.

² P. 325, fol. ³ P. 120, fol.

⁴ See Du Fresne under *Excommunicatio*. The *excommunicatio major* and *anathema* are said, I think, to mean the same thing.

⁵ On Infant Baptism, p. 188, 4to; or i. xvi. 24.

⁶ See his Creed, in Augustin’s Works, vol. x. Pref. edit. Antv. Vossius’s *Hist. Pel.* l. 1. Wall. i. xix. 29.

IV. for *destruction*. *Sacer*, means set apart, or *devoted*, in the sense of *cursed*. In 1 Cor. xvi. 22, St. Paul uses both the term of the LXX. ἀνάθεμα, and the Hebrew *maran-atha*⁷, *cursed art thou*; changing, according to custom, the final *m* of מחרם into *n*. In Gal. i. 8, ἀνάθεμα seems to imply separation, devotion, curse. It is on Rev. xxii. 3, that *Hammond* gives his explanation of ἀνάθεμα, and makes it relate to *excommunication*.

In the *Old Testament*, חרם generally, if not always, implies separation for the purpose of destruction. And with us, *devoted* conveys the same idea; yet *Corban* amongst the Jews, *oblation*, from קרב to approach, implied something consecrated and *not* to be destroyed; but when anything was devoted to destruction, there was a previous separation of it, either actual, or supposed. The heathen idols⁸ were actually set apart and devoted; the city⁹ of Jericho, when devoted to the Lord, or accursed, is *supposed* to be set apart; the besiegers are commanded to “*keep*” *themselves* “from the accursed thing.” *Christ*, by an ignominious death, was “made a curse¹⁰ for us,” was devoted to destruction. “*Curse*” often means a devoted¹¹ *person*.

From hence we may conceive how the early Christians
64 might come to use the word *curse*, or *anathema*, and how they might esteem any cooler word a sign of lukewarmness or disrespect: though we should not omit to mention the *example* which they had in Deut. xxvii. 14—26.

The expression of the Article in 1552 was, “They also are to be had accursed *and* *abhorred*,” &c. which looks more like the “*damnandi*” of the sixteenth Article, than “*accursed*” alone.

9. “*That presume to say that every man shall be saved.*” —What is here blamed may not perhaps appear without some attention. The words may lead some to think that it is called an accursed thing to *hope* that virtuous heathens *may* be saved; but they do really express a different idea: they do not blame candour, but *presumption*. It would be presumption to *acquit* a culprit, or *reus*, without authority, as well as to *condemn* one. We need not condemn, but we must not acquit: to do either properly we should be *judges*. It is neither our business

⁷ Parkhurst's Lexicon: this is Parkhurst's etymology, but not the common one.

⁸ Deut. vii. 25, 26.

⁹ Joshua vi. 17, 18.

¹⁰ Gal. iii. 13. Deut. xxi. 23.

¹¹ See Hammond on Rev. xxii. 3.

to *confine* the mercy of God in its operations, nor to *dispense* IV. it according to our fancies.

Nay, suppose that in particular cases it were allowed us strongly to hope that the divine goodness would be exerted, yet even that falls far short of the presumption of affirming that “*every man shall be*” made eternally happy in a way prescribed by ourselves.

10. “*By the law or sect which he professeth,*” &c.—Bishop Burnet distinguishes between being saved *by* a law, and *in* a law; and with reason. A man may be saved *in* an imperfect religion *by* the mercy of God, or even by the merits of *Christ*; though not by virtue of the religion which he professes. It may be considered whether the word *whereby*, which comes afterwards, does not rather confirm this notion. Indeed, in the *Latin* Article the expression is “*in lege*;” but we cannot say that the English is a wrong translation because the English 65 and Latin are equally authentic. “*In sectâ*” therefore means, as a *member* of a sect. We have¹, in Eph. iv. 32, ἐν Χριστῷ translated, “*for Christ’s sake*;” it may mean, as a *member* of *Christ*, or of that *society* or *body* of which he is the Head. It is scarcely needful to observe, that our being saved *by Christ*, or *in Christ*, cannot exclude² *human agency*. (ἐν ᾧ is translated *whereby*.)

11. “*Only the Name,*” &c.—In order to see the force of this expression, which is taken from Acts iv. 12, we must conceive different men to worship³ different deities, and *invoke* them and praise⁴ them, and *swear*⁵ by them under their different *names*. The contention between Elijah and the priests of *Baal*, related in 1 Kings, chap. xviii., may give us an idea of the case; particularly ver. 24 and 26. Through association and habit, sentiment and passion are excited by the mere sound of a name; so that enthusiasm might rage on sounding the name of a much-honoured Deity, and the whole of his attributes might seem to be centred in the appellation. We find similar effects from the names of political or other parties⁶; the very sound of them excites animosity and virulence⁷.

¹ Art. xii. end of sect. 11.

² Art. x. sect. 32.

³ Joshua xxiv. 15.

⁴ Psalm Lxviii. 4.

⁵ Psalm Lxiii. 12. 1 Sam. xvii. 43.

⁶ The chorus in the Oratorio of Sam-

son, in which the Israelites and the Philistines contend in invocation, the one party invoking *Jehovah*, the other *Dagon*, must tend to enliven our conceptions of what is related, 1 Kings xviii. 24, &c.

⁷ Nov. 1793, the French are changing names of streets, cards, months, &c.

IV. And when men do not distinguish between the power of
66 the person to whom the name belongs, and the combinations of
letters or sounds which compose the name, then the name itself
comes to be regarded as endued with some *charm* or super-
natural influence.

12. The last thing which can come into our explanation
is the word “*saved* ;” and we have *before*⁸ considered its mean-
ing. Here we may observe, that salvation (and in like man-
ner damnation) may admit of an endless variety of *degrees* ;
and it might be wrong to omit wholly, that *saving* has in Acts
iv. 12, a particular reference to deliverance from *bodily* evil.
Peter and John had healed a lame man ; they are asked
solemnly, “By what power, or by what *name* have ye done
this ?” they answer, “By the name of Jesus Christ of Naza-
reth.” “Neither is there *salvation* in any other : for there is
none other name under heaven given among men whereby (ἐν
ῶ) we must be saved ;” (δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς). Suppose this
meant merely that the lame could only be healed in the name
of Christ, yet the healing meant was miraculous ; and there-
fore that would be saying, that real miracles could only be
performed in support of Christianity. But the Apostle, with
what he says about the miraculous cure, mixes a great deal
of reasoning about the nature of the Christian dispensation ;
and we⁹ know that mere admission into Christianity was called
being *saved*. What he says, ver. 12, seems to be delivered as
an *universal* truth.

13. Having finished our explanation, we come to the
proof of what is affirmed in our Article. And I do not see
that we need make more than *one proposition*.

67 14. ‘The Scriptures do not allow any one to consider it
as an indifferent matter, whether he acts as a member of the
true Church of Christ, or not.’

We have already produced many texts which are really to
this purpose¹⁰, though they relate immediately to acts of *indi-
viduals*. There would be no propriety in our being represented
as branches of a *vine*, as the *flock* of a shepherd, as the *spouse*
of Christ, as *elect*, *knit* together, forming an *edifice* built upon
the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ him-

⁸ Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 17 ; and
several other places.

⁹ Art. ix. sect. 14 ; and Appendix to
Art. xi. sect. 18.

¹⁰ Art. xii. sect. 21 ; Art. xiii. near the
end of sect. 17, and near the end of sect.
22.

self being the chief corner-stone, if we were under no *obligation* IV. to act socially as Christians, or if we could attain to Christian *salvation* without acting so.

15. As to *indirect* proof, or answers to *objections*, we have before given what is abundantly sufficient. No objections of any force seem to occur, except those from Acts x. 34, and Rom. ii. 14—27; and these¹ texts have been already considered.

16. We may therefore proceed to our *application*.

We might, at this time, give our *assent* to the Article before us in some such form as the following:—

‘Whatever degree of happiness it may please God, in his mercy, to confer on the virtuous *heathen* or *Jew*, who continues such to the end of his life without any *fault* of his own, no man can *voluntarily neglect* the provision which God has made for us under Christianity, or encourage others to neglect it, or be *careless* about getting as near *truth* and perfection as possible², in Christianity, without meriting a severe *condemnation*, and rendering himself *unworthy* to continue in possession of the inestimable privileges of that society of which Christ in heaven is the Head, and to³ purchase which he shed his precious blood.’ 68

17. With regard to *mutual concessions*, little more seems wanting than for disputants to acknowledge that, when they disagree, they do not sufficiently consider the different *points of view* in which they see the subject of contention. When we approve such expressions as that of Mr. *Pope*⁴, we suppose men to have done their best, humanly speaking, to acquire right religious principles: when we disapprove men’s notions, and call them horrible, blasphemous, *accursed*, &c. we suppose men not doing their best, but neglecting, with absurd presumption, contemptuous ingratitude, and profligate insensibility, every thing that has been done and suffered for mankind, in order to give them a blessed religion, and bring them to the never-ending enjoyment of supreme felicity. While men dispute without entering into each other’s views, they are not likely to come to any end of disputing; but there are persons so reasonable as to allow of candour towards those who really do every thing in their power to be upon a right footing in respect of religion, and at the same time to abhor, especially in themselves, every degree of voluntary negligence. Not to act

¹ Art. xiii. sections 23 and 26.

of St. Peter’s second Epistle.

² Phil. i. 9; iii. 13, 14. Conclusion

³ Acts xx. 28.

⁴ Sect. 6.

IV. as Christians may in some be only a misfortune, in others a great fault; but yet in either case it may be attended with great and important *evil*⁵.

69 18. I am not prepared to suggest any *improvement* relative to the present Article; unless it might be *expressed* more precisely than it is. Perhaps it might be so expressed as to shew *for whom* it is particularly intended; how far it conceives those of whom it speaks to be members of religious *society*; and how it supposes those whom it condemns to be informed of the nature of Christianity.

70

ARTICLE XIX.

OF THE CHURCH.

THE visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

1. Before I enter upon another Article, let me say, that it is my intention, in this part of my undertaking, to make a change in my manner of treating the subjects which may come under consideration. I mean to treat the remaining Articles in a more *summary* way than I have treated the preceding. For this change it may be natural to ask some reasons. The first is, that without some change our system would be *too extensive*, if it be not so already; considering that, in order to obey the directions of our Founder, I have been obliged to make Bishop *Pearson* on the Creed occupy every third Lecture. It may indeed be said, that if I had treated the preceding Articles more briefly, I might have treated the following more fully; and without taking more time. That is true; 71 but yet it seems better to go to the bottom of some subjects, and give a summary account of others, than to treat all with an

⁵ Dr. Balguy's Sermons, p. 158, &c. to the end of the 9th Discourse.

intermediate degree of fulness. This might be said, though IV. there were no other reasons for the change I am about to make; but it may be added, that the remaining subjects have been already much better treated than those which we have gone through, and are therefore much more easy for the student to consider by himself. Bishop *Burnet* writes better on the Articles which are to come than on those which are past; and the refutation of the *Popish* errors is now reduced into a small compass, by Archbishop *Secker* and Bishop *Porteus*. It seems to me likewise, that the first eighteen of our xxxix Articles may be considered as more important than the rest, as belonging more to mankind in general. Religious society is indeed a subject of great importance to all men; but that was attentively considered in the third Book of our system.

Nevertheless, though I propose to speak more briefly on each subject than I have done hitherto, or at least than I have done since I entered upon the Articles of our Church, I would keep the same method in view; as that seems founded in reason. What facts are mentioned should be mentioned before we use the expressions which allude to them; and the terms of propositions should be explained before their truth be proved.

2. With regard then to the nineteenth Article, some few *historical* remarks may be made. The propagation of the Gospel was treated in our first Book. Here we may observe, that before¹ the Church of *Rome* came to be famous in the west, the Churches mentioned in the Article had existed in great celebrity: so I conceive. The Church of *Jerusalem* must of course be eminent, as it was planted where our Saviour and his apostles resided. It might be considered as the *source* of Christianity, where it was most pure: the first bishop of it is said to have been St. *James*. 72

The Church of *Alexandria* was the capital of the churches of *Africa*, and has been said to be founded by St. *Mark*. In like manner the Church of *Antioch* was the capital of the

¹ The history of the beginnings of the Church of Rome is, I believe, too obscure for us to dwell much upon. I would not speak positively. The Bishop of Rome must be above *neighbouring* bishops: people would have to go to Rome about various concerns; when a precedence was wanted, it would naturally fall to the bishop of that church

which was in the capital. By the year 325 the Bishop of Rome must have grown great: about the year 250 there were at Rome 1500 widows and other indigent persons supported or relieved by Christians. See Lardner, Index, *Rome*. The Bishop of Rome was not at Nice in 325—only *presbyters*; why not suffragan bishops, if he had any?

IV. churches of *Asia*, and has been said to have had St. *Peter* for its first bishop. These became three *patriarchates*, and we have in *Bingham's Antiquities*² three *maps* of them³.

In *what* these three churches "have erred" seems but of little moment; because the Article is only against the *Romanists*, and they would not deny the fallibility of the Eastern churches. Yet these three churches might have made as high claims, of any kind, as the Church of Rome, having under
73 them primates and metropolitans. The errors alluded to, however, seem to have been, favouring *Arianism*, and condemning⁴ *Origen*. Acts for these purposes were passed in councils⁵ at these cities; and the decree of a *council* at any city must include the opinion of the *church* there. (Councils occur again in the twenty-first Article.)

Several *subjects* relative to our present Article have been much discussed; but it does not seem necessary for us to enter into them at present;—such are, the *marks* of a true church⁶, the power of the *Keys*⁷, the nature of *binding*⁸ and *loosing*. The Romanists, after we had separated from them at the Reformation, held that we were no true church; and the disputes which took place on that matter were probably one immediate *occasion*⁹ of our present Article.

3. Let us next see what may be wanted in the way of *explanation*. Our Article consists of two paragraphs: the first seems to be definition and theory—the second, fact.

4. The definition is, of "*the visible Church of Christ.*" Now previous to that, we should conceive that Christ formed all his disciples into *one society*; the members therefore must live in different *ages*. It is not needful to consider the deceased at present; therefore our views are confined to the "visible church," that is, to the society of all *living* Christians. But how, you say, do these form a *society*? First, we may answer, as all men form a society. God has made *good* to
74 follow from men's acting as a society, and *evil* from their *not*

² Book IX.

³ For the dignity of these churches see the canons of the Council of Nice, canon 6 and 7. Also Bishop Hallifax on Prophecy, p. 335. Heylin, on Episcopacy, mentions Saint James, Saint Mark, and Saint Peter, as having been the first bishops.

⁴ Socrates 6. 10.

⁵ Berti's Compendium, vol. i. p. 126.

⁶ Hales, G—13—49, Cambr.

⁷ Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

⁸ Matt. xviii. 18.

⁹ The Trent creed is called by the Romanists, that faith "*extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*:"—quoted in Bennet's Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 426.

acting as a society: this shews them that they *are* a society. IV. Secondly, we know that all Christians constitute one society, from the *Scriptures*¹.

5. “*Congregation*,” *cætus*, rather seems to imply, as does *ἐκκλησία*, that all living Christians can assemble at one time, in one place. This is *suivable* enough to *theory*, and is Dr. *Balguy’s*² first supposition, when he is describing the nature of a church. The contrivances which become necessary, when it is found that all cannot make one congregation, are only *mechanical*, as it were; and do not affect the nature or essence of the thing which accidentally requires them.

The compilers of our Article would be led to use the word “*congregation*” by the language of our Old Testament; the *whole body* of Israelites, (the *Church* of God before Christianity) being called the *Congregation*. See Numb. xvi. 3; xxvii. 17; Josh. xxii. 17; 1 Chron. xxviii. 8; Psalm lxxiv. 2: in all which places we have *συναγωγή* in the lxx.; except 1 Chron. xxviii. 8, which is *ἐκκλησία*. In the *New Testament*, the whole body of Christians is called the *Church* of God; but the Greek is always *ἐκκλησία*. *Taylor* however looks upon this calling the whole body of Christians the *Church*, as an *imitation* of the language of the Old Testament, in which the whole body of Israelites was called the *Congregation*.—*Taylor* on Romans, Key, par. 52, 133.

6. The word “*faithful*” seems technical: *fideles* used to be opposed to *catechumeni*.

7. “The *pure* word of God”—is also *theory*. It is that to which Christians may continually approach, though they may never attain to perfect purity of doctrine. “*The sacraments*” are introduced as *essentials* of a Christian Church; and it is at the same time implied, that though they are essential, some *circumstances* about them are not so. This is more clear in the Latin than in the English. A religious society under natural religion might perhaps have no essentials—I mean, they might pursue the ends in view by such methods as their wisdom should suggest; but that is not the case in a Christian society: they cannot teach any doctrines but those of Scripture, nor set aside the holy *sacraments*. We may observe how very little was thought necessary³, by our English

¹ Art. xviii. sect. 14. Also Book III. chap. xi. sect. 4.

² Vol. of Sermons, p. 89.

³ P. S. See a passage quoted by Dean Tucker (Letter to Kippis, p. 56) from the enlarged confession of Augsburg.

IV. Reformers, to constitute a Christian church. Prayer is not mentioned, though it is in Acts ii. 41, 42, nor any kind of discipline. This seems to imply that no Christian church could be supposed to meet without prayer, or that prayer is included in pure *doctrine*; and that no modes of administering the sacraments destroy the *essence* of a Christian church.

8. In the second part, there is a sort of ambiguity. A doubt is left whether the three churches only erred in *general*; or erred, like the Church of Rome, in morality (*agenda*), ceremonies and tenets (*credenda*): but either sense may be taken by him who gives his assent.

76 In the English, we have “*in their living*,” (Church of Rome), but in the Latin, “*quoad agenda*.” The English seems to regard *conduct*; the Latin, moral, practical *principles taught*, or allowed. Hence, in examining the wickedness prevailing in Popish countries, we should always keep in mind how far it is permitted, or encouraged.

The Church of *Rome* is here allowed the *essence* of a true church⁴: it aims at preaching scriptural doctrines, and it does not set aside the sacraments. Archbishop *Laud*, on his *trial*⁵ before the inveterate enemies of the Roman church, maintained this to be the truth; but did not, I think, refer to this Article to prove it. That the Church of Rome is here declared *erroneous*, as well as fallible, needs no remark. The Church of Christ in *theory* is *pure*; in *practice* every part of it is *fallible* and imperfect.

9. Thus we have looked through the Article; but yet a few things remain to be mentioned. If “the visible Church of Christ” be the society of *living* Christians, what is *opposed* to it? or what Church of Christ is *invisible*? the Romanists do not
77 allow of *any*⁶. There may be, seemingly, *two* notions of it:

“Ad veram unitatem Ecclesiæ satis est consentire de *doctrinâ* Evangelii, et administratione sacramentorum.” This does not mean a consent about all *particulars*; as appears from what follows, which answers to the beginning of our 34th Article: “Nec necesse est ubique similes esse traditiones humanas, seu *ritus* ab hominibus institutos.” *Synagma*, p. 12.

⁴ The Puritans did not allow this. See Neal, i. 96, 4to.

⁵ Index to Neal’s Hist. Pur. et alibi. When Protestants say, that a Christian

may be saved in the Church of Rome, they mean, or ought to mean, supposing the Christian not to think it *wrong* to be of that church. Therefore Papists cannot use their famous argument to those who do think it wrong. The argument is, all sides own, that a man may be saved in the Church of Rome; but all sides do *not* own that a man may be saved in a Protestant church; therefore it is most *safe* to adhere to the Church of Rome.

⁶ “The pretended invisible church of the heretikes.” Rhemists on Acts ii. 47. The Romanists seem to *mean*, that the Scriptures,

one, that the *invisible* church contains *all Christians*—the IV. living, and all who have departed this life in the faith of Christ; another, the Calvinistic, and most common, that it consists of those who *in the sight of God* are considered as true Christians: and Romanists, I think, make a difference between *vera* and *viva* membra of the Church. Perhaps the term “*visible*” might be used in order to prevent Romanists from objecting; and to satisfy *Calvinists* that it was not intended to speak here of the *elect* or *predestinate*, as seen by God himself.

10. We often hear of the *Catholic* Church. If we go only by etymology, it may signify the whole visible Church of Christ, or even invisible; or all Christians of all ages. When I say, I believe in the Catholic Church, I mean, I believe that Christ intended to form all Christians into one society; though when I speak of the Church at large, I have only in mind the present generation. (Art. viii. sect. 3.) And the Church of Christ may be “therefore called catholic, or universal, because it consists of *all nations*; whereas the Jewish Church” consisted “only of one nation¹.” As words are made for use, one may often get the right *sense* of a word by considering for what *use* it might be made; and this is generally to mark out some *distinction*—as just now was the case. *The* Church might be called *Catholic*, to distinguish it from *a* church, or a *particular* church; that is, a set of Christians whose minds cannot be satisfied without joining in some peculiar regulations for carrying on social religion amongst themselves, within certain limits. But perhaps the most common use of catholic is to distinguish, in an honourable manner, a *large* and respectable body of Christians from a small body who affect singu- 78 larity in some doctrine or ceremony. To call the large body the Catholic Church, or Catholics, seems to make the small one sink into nothing—as if it only made an exception not worth mentioning.

11. A *particular church* may be a legitimate Christian society, but should always regard itself as a constituent part of the Catholic Church². In any nation, it may help to promote civil subjection, and may itself receive support and protection,

Scriptures, when they speak of the *Church* of Christ, do not mean to speak of those who are true Christians in the sight of God, but of Christians such as we find them.

¹ Bp. Porteus's Brief Confutation, p. 14.

² Dr. Powell, p. 26, alludes to him “who refused to be made a citizen of Athens, because he was already a citizen of the world.”

IV. or even honour. This has been more fully explained in the third Book³. The definition of our Article seems not wholly unsuitable to a particular church⁴.

12. I know not that any other terms need be mentioned except *militant*⁵, as opposed to triumphant. This distinction supposes men *good*, popularly speaking; then, while they are in this life warring a good warfare, under the banner of the Captain of their salvation—while they are fighting the good fight—they are called the church *militant*; and after death, when they receive their crown of glory⁶, the church *triumphant*.

The *Scotch* church calls those whom we suppose good, the 79 *elect*—the church, strictly speaking, (in their idea) *invisible* to the eye of man, but the *true* church in the sight of God⁷.

13. We may now best see the connection of this Article with the one preceding it. Salvation is not to be hoped for out of the *Church*, by the eighteenth Article; agreed, says the Romanist, therefore continue *Catholics*; no, say the Protestants, we may, if we think we cannot lawfully communicate with you, form another *particular* church, still conceiving our particular church to make a part of the catholic visible Church of Christ. And what we assume to ourselves we allow to others.

14. But let us come to our *proof*. We seem to have at least *two propositions*.

1. Christ has formed his followers into one society.

2. The Romish church “hath erred”—in practical principles, or morality, (“agenda”); in ceremonies; and also in doctrine or tenets, (“credenda.”)

15. The former proposition has been very lately *proved*⁸. To what was said we might add 1 Cor. xii. 5, 10, 12, 29, which shew, that the miraculous powers given to the Apostles, &c. implied religious society; and our Saviour’s various *prophecies* concerning the fortunes of the Church, imply the same thing.

³ Chap. xiv.

⁴ Wheatly (p. 394) observes, that our *Church Catechism* was so made as to suit the *Catholic Church*. Any youth in our *particular* Church, according to him, is catechized, or grounded, in no doctrines *peculiar* to that Church. Yet all Christians do not allow of water-baptism; nor that the death of Christ is a sacrifice, speaking without figure.

⁵ Scotch Confession, 16. *de Ecclesiâ*. Div. Leg. vol. iv. 8vo, p. 470, calls the

Church triumphant those who accompany Christ at his second coming.

⁶ See 2 Tim. iv. 7; 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Tim. i. 18; 1 Pet. v. 4.

⁷ Pet. Heylin, in his *Divinity-Act* at Oxford, put up as a question, “An *Ecclesia unquam fuerit invisibilis?*” and determined in the negative. He was an Arminian.

⁸ Art. xviii. sect. 14. See also Book III. chap. xi. sect. 4.

He foretells its durability, &c. as *one* body (Matt. xvi. 18, IV. 19).

16. That the Romish Church hath erred in morality, or "agenda," need scarcely be proved, not only because the popes and clergy¹ have had amongst them men remarkably immoral and profligate, but because things have been *allowed* and *forbidden* wrongly. This, as well as the Popish errors in ceremonies and doctrine², may be left to be proved by the subsequent *Articles*. Pope *Liberius* favoured the *Arians*³, *Zozimus* the *Pelagians*, and *Honorius* was condemned as a *Monothelite*⁴.

This direct proof seems easy, but the Romanists quote *Scripture*. The general answer to all texts expressing the perfection of the Church, is the same with that to all scriptural expressions of the perfection of a Christian; they describe *theory*⁵, not *fact*. This has been already hinted in explaining the word "*pure*"⁶.

17. The subject before us has been made so intricate by controversy with the Papists, and by the Calvinistic notion, that the Church means the elect and predestinated, that it may be worth our while, in the way of *application*, to conceive a form of *assent* to our Article.

'All Christians constitute a society, the end of which is to attain perfect purity of manners, and unerring religious truth. The means of promoting this end are left to human prudence; so long as the *doctrines* taught are founded on Scripture, and the *sacraments* instituted by Christ are held to be indispensable. Could all Christians agree, they might act under one ecclesiastical authority; but if any number are fully persuaded that they cannot lawfully unite with the rest, they may form a separate society, still conceiving that society to make part of the whole society of Christians, till some general agreement can be effected.

'When we judge from experience, we must conclude that unanimity is not at present to be expected; and we must allow

¹ See Sir Edwin Sandys's *Europæ Speculum*, under *Life and Conversation*. Though wickedness does not prove indisputably the inculcating of bad moral principles, yet when it is very prevalent it affords a strong presumption: besides, that "wickedness is destructive of good principles," as *Comber* observes, in his

tract against Popery, p. 33, from Aristotle, Eth. lib. VI.

² Maclaine's *Mosheim*, vol. i. 4to, p. 278, note.

³ Berti, vol. i. p. 123.

⁴ Forbes, B. V. Chap. x.

⁵ Art. xv. sect. 19. ⁶ Sect. 7.

IV. that every particular society of Christians falls far short of perfection.'

18. The remarks and distinctions here made might be the ground of some mutual *concessions*; but Dr. *Du Pin*, in his negociation with Archbishop *Wake*⁷, about an union between the English and Gallican churches, gives up the matter in dispute. "Though all particular churches," he says, "even that of Rome, may err, it is *needless* to say this in a confession of faith." It is not more to our purpose that this learned man gives up the *fallibility* of the Roman Church, than that he speaks of it as a *particular* church.

19. In order to promote *improvement*, I would recommend an attentive perusal of Dr. *Balguy's* two Consecration Sermons, and his Charge on "Subscription to Articles of Religion."

ARTICLE XX.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

1. We begin with *history*.

At the time of the Reformation some of our countrymen were desirous (as we have often occasion to observe) of departing farther from the Church of Rome than we have done, and others wished not to go so far. The Reformers had, on this account, a difficult task to execute. The Puritans hated

⁷ Mosheim, 8vo, vol. v. p. 130. It might be worth while to read Archbishop *Wake's* compliment to Dr. *Du Pin*, p. 123: and what the Archbishop thinks may be *Du Pin's* own judgment about the English Articles.

The *people* amongst the Papists are not taught, I suppose, according to *Du Pin's* candid notions: he seems to make a great difference between the *people* and the enlightened.

the Church of Rome, and every thing that seemed to characterise it; but some, though they saw the errors of Popery, retained their prejudices in favour of those things which implied no error or impiety. The Reformers wished to comply with both, as far as they might lawfully. The difficulties arising in this manner did not relate so much to important matters, as to things indifferent in their own nature, as *ceremonies* and *habits*, or what might be called *ceremonies* in a large sense. 83

The aversion of the Puritans to appointed ceremonies, &c. seems to have been on two grounds; as *Popish*, and as profaning worship by the introduction of the *fine arts*¹. Indeed, the application of music, painting, &c. to religious worship, is itself rather Popish; but independently of that, the Puritans were void of what we call taste and elegance. The three ceremonies they chiefly objected to were, the sign of the *Cross* in Baptism, the wearing of *surplices*, and *kneeling* at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. These have been called the three² *nocent* ceremonies—only by way of opposition, I suppose, to *innocent*. Indeed all these savoured of Popery—the last, as keeping up the idea of the mass. But the Puritans always petitioned against *organs*³; and were enemies, I think, to pictures and images. The rights of toleration were not allowed till the Revolution⁴; and therefore Puritans, though enemies to the Church of England in many respects, were members of it, and ministers. They were forced to complain and dispute: separation was not a thing easy to be accomplished; otherwise disputes would have been more rare.

One dispute related immediately to this twentieth Article. The question was, whether the *first clause* was genuine or surreptitious⁵? It is a curious question. To read Neale's account, one would think it must be spurious; yet Bennet, in his *Essay*, has arguments on the other side, which appear to me the stronger. In King Edward's Articles the clause is not; but in the fifth of those Articles there is something relating to 84

¹ Book III. chap. xv. sect. 10.

² See John Burges, p. 28, mentioned in Hampton-Court Conference. Neal, Index.

³ Convocation of 1562; in Neal, 1. 119, &c. Strype, and others.

⁴ Book III. chap. xiv. sect. 15.

⁵ See Neal, 1. 118; and Bennet's *Essay*, passim. Also "Priestcraft in Per-

fection," Cambr. Bb—10—47; and Bennet's Answer to it in his *Preface* to his *Essay*, addressed to Anthony Collins, Esq. the infidel.

From the Life of Peter Heylin it appears, that he kept his act for D. D. at Oxford on the clause, taking its genuineness for granted. Strype's *Annals*, chap. xxviii.

IV. the subject, which is omitted in our sixth (the corresponding Article). When the Bishops in 1562 were to sign the Articles revised, a copy seems to have been *prepared* for them to sign before they met, from King Edward's; but when they met they seem to have made several alterations in it, and then to have signed it. Yet, though they signed it, they did not make it a *record*, because *after* the signature they agreed upon the *clause* in question. And as it was not a record, the Archbishop kept it in his own private custody, and left it to Bene't College. At last a fresh paper was signed, which *had* the clause in question; and this was lodged regularly, as a *record*, in the Register's Court of Canterbury, from whence Archbishop *Laud* had a copy⁶ on his trial, in 1637.

The Bishops also ordered the Articles with the clause to be *printed*; yet there are some printed copies which have *not* the clause; but Bennet argues, that such are *spurious*, if in English, and that those in which it is found are genuine. The
85 Records were burnt in the great Fire of London in 1666⁷. This question is now merely historical; for by an Act of Parliament, made in 1662, all the clergy are obliged to sign a copy in which this clause is contained.

The matter about the power of the *Church*, with regard to ceremonies, became mixed with a dispute how far the *civil magistrate*⁸ could enjoin observances for religious societies, in matters indifferent. The Puritans always held that the Church was *independent* of the state; and few saw, that when the magistrate used a coercive power in spiritual matters he used it as the ally of the Church, as far as he acted without any view of securing the state. However, in this twentieth Article we have nothing about the civil magistrate; nor has the thirty-seventh, "Of the Civil Magistrates," any mention of rites and ceremonies.

In the time of King Edward VI. there was a great controversy about the *habits* of the priests and bishops. The Puritans found them Popish and fine; others thought them commendatory of religion; and, considering the poverty of some of the clergy, almost necessary for decency. Bishop *Hooper* had lived at *Zurich*, and perhaps had there contracted a love of plainness and simplicity, and Swiss ideas of church-government. He refused the bishopric of Gloucester because he

⁶ *Heylin's short account* (p. 19, Life of *Laud*) agrees, I think, with this.

⁷ Vol. i. p. 483. Intr. to Book IV. sect. 4.

⁸ Neal, i. 95—98: always quarto.

could not be consecrated and appear at court, and in his diocese, without wearing some habits which he esteemed to be Popish; but his refusal was not admitted; he was imprisoned some months, either in his own house or in the Fleet Prison, and treated with great rigour. At last a compromise was adopted, and he became a prelate. He was a person of great worth, and very instrumental in completing the Reformation. 86

It is not to be concluded, from what has been said, that the Puritans really wished religious society to have little *power*. Their view was rather to prevent those particular ceremonies from being enjoined, which they saw the Church of England was, at the time, most likely to adopt; and to make *Scripture* a guide in every thing¹: though, I think, Scripture was, at bottom, rather a pretext for refusing, than the ground of making regulations.

The *Romanists*, however, were for requiring an implicit obedience to the Church;—such an obedience as if the Church of Rome was in fact, what the Church of Christ is in theory, “without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing².” Dr. *Middleton*, in the Preface³ to his Letter from Rome, gives us a passage from a Popish writing called “The Catholic Christian,” which may answer our purpose: the subject is transubstantiation: “The unerring authority of the Church has declared it to be true, and enjoined the belief of it:” after such a decision—“it is the part of an infidel rather than a Christian to ask, how can this be?” The Papists have said that the Church is even superior to Scripture⁴: how? because the Church judges what *is* Scripture; there have been many spurious writings pretending to be Scripture; these the Church rejects, keeping only such as are genuine and authentic. But have they any right to settle those as Scripture which are *not* genuine and authentic? and when they have accepted any thing as Scripture, does it govern them, or they it? The moment any writing has an existence as Scripture, it is superior to them.—Here we close our *history*. 87

2. Our first remark in the way of *explanation* is, that we should conceive our Article to be divided into *two paragraphs*: the first against *Puritans*, the second against *Papists*. Puritans are opposed as setting aside all use of human prudence, in providing the *means* of exercising social religion: Papists, as

¹ Warburton's Alliance, i. 4, p. 46, 8vo. edit. 1766, note.

² Eph. v. 27.

³ P. LXXVII.

⁴ Gilpin's Life of Wickliff, pp. 61, 62.

IV. aiming to advance human authority above the word of God. In this matter, our Church seems to say, let us avoid both *extremes*.

“*The Church*.”—How does this expression suit what was said under the preceding Article? does it mean *visible, catholic, particular* church? or what? That is left to be decided by the state of things. If all Christians are united, it means the Catholic Church of one generation; if not, it means any particular church which can properly be called a church; it means any society of Christians, as far as they constitute a legitimate church. In what part of such society the government should be lodged, whether it should be of a monarchical or democratical form, is left undetermined.

“*Hath power*.”—*Power* here means *rightful* power—no uncommon use of the word—what is more commonly called *authority*, and perhaps more accurately; for a tyrant may often have power to do that which he has no right to do, that is, no authority. But “*authority*” comes immediately afterwards in another sense.

88 “*To decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith*.”—Here “*authority*” means only *weight* or *influence*; which is not a wrong use of the word. This latter influence, here called authority, is much less than the former, here called power. It may be proper for you to respect a person’s judgment, when he has no right to insist on your obedience. The expression, “*in controversies of faith*,” implies, that you are not expected to give up your judgment to the judgment of the Church, except in doubtful and *difficult* points.

But is the meaning that your Church is to command you with regard to *all* ceremonies whatever? yes, it seems as if private judgment should comply in matters *indifferent*; and if so, you are not accountable while you think it right to continue a member. Respectful expostulations might be made; and if at last *much* folly or superstition remained⁵, a separation might be allowed. But the effect of ceremonies depends upon uniformity⁶; and you should be sure you can meet with better ceremonies than those you quit. *Ceremonies* might be taken in a *large* sense, including *Liturgies*, &c. Though the governors of the Church are not to submit to your judgment immediately, yet *after* you have obeyed, they are *finally* to be

⁵ See Powell, p. 27, top.

⁶ Book III. chap. iv. sect. 2.

accountable to the ordinary members for the use of any *discretionary* power entrusted to them. What follows limits the power of appointing ceremonies :—

“*And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s word written.*”—Some things that next occur in our Article seem self-evident; but they probably mean to guard against abuse, and against excess of that deference which ought to be paid to the Church in difficult 89 doctrines.

Indeed, if each private man is to judge whether an ordinance recommended by the Church is contrary to Scripture, or whether any doctrine makes one part of Scripture to contradict another, or is over and above Scripture, there is but little danger of *abuse*. But the meaning seems to be, that the Church has no *right*, “*ought*” not, to decree such things; though, if it does, it should be respected, and perhaps sometimes obeyed. Still the rules here laid down might be the ground of calling ecclesiastical governors to account; and, in the end, of proposing and effecting a reformation.

“*A keeper of holy Writ,*” refers to Rom. iii. 2, and ix. 4. I conceive them to be allusions; but the only thing of any moment is, that “*besides*” the Scriptures, the Church ought “*not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.*” Ceremonies are generally something “*besides*” the Scriptures, and the Church can enforce them; but then they are not “*anything to be believed.*” Some *notions* too may be implied in ceremonies¹, or forms; but then they are not to be enforced as necessary² to *salvation*. Puritans would have nothing to be enforced, either to be believed or done, which is “*besides*” the Scriptures. It should be recollected that we had a great deal about traditions under the sixth Article.

3. The next thing is the *proof*. We might have three propositions.

4. Every society must provide *means* of answering the 90 ends of its institution. In religious society the general end is the promoting of religious *sentiments*³. In *Christian* society some means are prescribed by divine authority; namely, scriptural *doctrines* and *sacraments*. But means are to be devised

¹ This seems the meaning of that part of the 5th Article of 1552, which is omitted in our 6th Article.

² *Necessary to salvation*: the thing to

which this was opposed, seems to be, “*received of the faithful as godly, and profitable for comeliness.*” Article V. of 1552. ³ Book III. chap. iii.

IV. of using these means—something must at last be left to the wisdom of the Church. I cannot but consider this as self-evident. The puritanical idea, that a church is not like other societies, or that nothing is to be settled and fixed for a church but what is found in Scripture, seems totally impracticable: no meeting of dissenters⁴ could ever be carried on without arranging several things not specified in Scripture. The directions are *general*, as 1 Cor. xiv. 40. It is impossible that this precept should be obeyed without the intervention of many other observances not mentioned. Tell a set of men to *write* themes for a prize; there must be pens, ink and paper, &c., and the art of writing and spelling must have been learned. If the *Jews*⁵ had some liberty, whose religion was confined to one people, and the ceremonials of which made so essential a part of it, what liberty may not Christians expect, whose religion is to be exercised amidst all the variety of customs of all nations!

5. In *doctrines* to be *believed*, the judgment of the Church ought to have great *weight*, especially with all its *ordinary* members. This was insisted on in the second Book⁶, where men were divided into *philosophers* and *people*; and it seems 91 unavoidable. Those who pretend to avoid it do not⁷, and cannot⁸.

6. In *doctrines*, if anything is imposed by the Church, as necessary to salvation, it need not be received as such, if it be not contained in *Scripture*. This was in the sixth Article.

7. What remains must be proposed as *application*.

A new form of *assent* seems unnecessary:—but mutual *concessions* may be worth considering. Some dissenters have declared, that whilst the first clause of our twentieth Article continues in force, there is no possibility of a reconciliation⁹. Yet, let not anything be neglected which seems likely to weigh with a man of real *candour*. Mistakes seem to have been made, both by those in power and those out of power. The first have taken for granted that things indifferent in their nature might be enforced without difficulty; the second, that because an aversion was real, it was rational and invincible.

⁴ Tucker to Kippis, p. 19.

⁵ Burnet, Matt. xxiii. 23. The things not to be left undone were not Mosaic: mostly, if not all, traditional.

⁶ Book II. chap. iv. sect. 3, 4.

⁷ Tucker to Kippis, pp. 43, 44.

⁸ One chief reason urged by a fellow of a college for turning Papist, was, I have heard, that so little respect was paid to the Church of England by its ordinary members.

⁹ Tucker to Kippis, p. 9.

But, in the first place, men in power should be aware of the IV. strength of prejudice, or of association of ideas. To see its force, we need only ask any man whether he should choose to see any of the vessels which commonly receive the *evacuations* of the human body used at a feast to drink out of; or, if he be a man of piety, in the most solemn rites of religion? Yet what more indifferent, as to right and wrong, than shape? And in the next place, those who are called to comply and obey are not always without blame: they are too apt to neglect the result of experience with regard to curing prejudices which at 92 first feel incurable. To raise a prejudice in favour of anything, associate it with some good. I have hated a certain kind of *food*; in very great hunger I eat of it; my pain was relieved, and that kind of food got associated in my mind with the pleasure of the relief: I have relished it ever since. Now mutual concessions in case of ceremonies, &c. should consist in mutual *compliances*. Those who have authority should be tender about enforcing; those who are to obey should labour to lessen their aversions; so might the contending parties meet in some middle point.

This is applicable to the *fine arts*. Those who have a taste for them ought not to act as if all men had the same; and those who are insensible to them ought to be aware that men may differ in imaginations as well as in senses or intellects; and therefore ought in some measure to comply, for the sake of others.

Bishop Warburton, in his *Alliance of Church and State*¹, mentions the judgment of foreign divines in the question about *habits*. It was this: "That the Puritans ought to conform rather than make a schism; and that the Churchmen ought to indulge the others' scruples, rather than hazard one." "A wise decision," adds Warburton, "and reaching much farther, in religious matters, than to the single case to which it was applied." He means, probably, that the principles of mutual concessions respecting ceremonies ought to make men candid in matters of faith.

With regard to matters of faith, Dr. *Du Pin*² says, that the Church certainly has not "the power of ordaining anything 93 that is contrary to the word of God;" but he says, "it must be

¹ Warburton's *Alliance*, p. 314, 8vo, Book III. chap. iii.

² Appendix to Mosheim, as before.

IV. taken for *granted* that the Church *will* never do this, in matters *quæ fidei substantiam evertant.*"

I need not endeavour to suggest any *improvement*, after what has been said on the subject of improving religious societies in the last chapter of the third Book³.

ARTICLE XXI.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

GENERAL Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

1. Our *history* here might be very extensive. I will endeavour to confine it within bounds suitable to our present plan, without omitting anything very important. Nothing is more natural to men than to consult with each other when they are in difficulties. We are led to consultation both by our reason and our feelings. And we may conceive that, in teaching the Christian religion, and adapting it to the various customs of different nations, consultation must be frequently desirable. We have a memorable instance in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were at Antioch. It there appeared that the Jews who favoured Christianity, or were admitted into it, could not bring themselves to give up the religion of *Moses*:—it was divine; they had been brought up in it; it had distinguished them from idolatrous heathens; nay, they were not contented with retaining it themselves—they thought that even the heathen converts ought to conform to it. Christianity they seem to have thought a new and improved species of *Judaism*. Now the Apostle saw that Christianity was intended to supersede Judaism; and that it would be a very great hinderance to the conversion of

³ Book III. chap. xv. sect. 12.

the heathens if they must bear the troublesome burdens of the IV. Law of Moses, in favour of which they were by no means prejudiced. To manage so as to lose neither Jewish nor Gentile converts, required much prudence: it required *consultation*. Paul and Barnabas thought it worth while to travel from Antioch to Jerusalem; in order to consult the “Apostles and Elders, with the *whole Church*,” in so critical a juncture. We have some account of the meeting: *James*, the bishop¹, seems to have given the final determination. Here was a *genuine* consultation: the Church was not only “assembled with one accord,” but with one accord they attended to their proper business: their minds pure from indirect motives—from pride, ambition, rivalry, and worldly interest. This meeting has frequently been called the first *council*².

As Christianity spread, any assemblies, aiming to collect the sense of Christians *at large*, must consist of members convened from a greater extent of country; but *Mosheim* tells us that, till the middle of the second century³, *churches* acted independently of each other, and did not meet together with any such view. He adds, that there was no *general council* 96 till the fourth century⁴: yet there was a council held at *Antioch* in the year 270, against Paul of Samosata; where were present, according to Cave, bishops innumerable.

In proceeding farther, I will first mention some *facts*, such as a scholar is supposed to be informed of, and then make a few *remarks*. Councils, of one sort or other, have been very numerous. *Baxter*, in his account, mentions particulars relative to 480. With regard to the number of *general councils*, writers are not agreed; some calling only *seven* or *eight* of the councils-general, others *eighteen*.

2. I will now mention some of the *principal* councils. That at *Nice* was held in the year 325, by order of Constantine the Great, against the *Arians*; and is always called the *first general Council*. That at *Constantinople* was held in the year 381, by order of Theodosius the Great, against the Macedonians. The third of those, held at *Ephesus*, was very eminent: it was assembled in the year 431, by Theodosius Junior, against *Nestorius*. We may add the council held at *Chalcedon* in the year 451, by order of the Emperor *Marcian*; or, in effect perhaps, by the influence of his empress, *Pul-*

¹ Art. vi. sect. 25.

² Held A. D. 47, or near. Cave.

³ Mosheim, cent. II. part II. chap. ii. sect. 3.

⁴ Cent. IV. II. ii. 1.

IV. *cheria*, on account of the adversary or opponent of Nestorius, *Eutyches*. These four are called the *first four general Councils*. Gregory the Great compared them to the *four Gospels*. The reformed are spoken of as having a very high respect for them⁵. I must pass from these to some of much later date. The Council of *Constance*, which began in 1414, was called with the consent of the see of Rome⁶, and by means of the Emperor Sigismund, to decide who should be Pope; and against the Reformers, John Wickliffe and John Huss, and Jerom of Prague. Wickliffe indeed was dead; but the council condemned his doctrines, and ordered his bones to be dug up and burnt. The Council of *Basil* began in 1431: it seems to have been agreed upon at the Council of Constance, and to have been assembled by the Emperor and Pope jointly, against the Reformers; particularly against the Bohemians, who had *Zisca* for their head. But the council were so afraid of their adversaries as to invite them to defend their notions; a measure which had as much success as might be expected. The Council of *Trent* is not mentioned by Baxter or Cave; but we often refer to the Acts of it. From these we see that it began Dec. 13, 1545; and from the *Bulla* prefixed, it seems as if Pope Paul III. had relied chiefly on the Emperor Charles V. and Francis I. of France. History says⁷, that the Emperor was very desirous to have the council continued after the death of Paul III. The council was held in order to check the reformation: its suspensions and interruptions cannot be entered into here.

Of the Synod of *Dort* I said something in the History of the tenth Article⁸.

3. It seems as if our ideas of the councils now mentioned will be very indefinite and imperfect, if we do not mention something of the *numbers* of persons who have been said to be present at each; and the *time* of its continuance. These are by no means agreed upon, but I shall satisfy myself with delivering to you the report of any respectable author. The Council of *Nice* is often called the Council of the 318; that is, of 318 bishops; but Lardner shews that this number is not by any means to be depended upon⁹. It probably became the favourite number, because it was the number of *Abraham's* servants¹⁰,

⁵ Rhemish Test. on Acts xv. 28.

⁶ Baxter, p. 430, or chap. xiii.

⁷ Mosheim, cent. XVI. sect. 1. chap.

iv. sect. 3.

⁸ Art. x. sect. 15.

⁹ Works, Vol. iv. p. 187.

¹⁰ Gen. xiv. 14.

by whom he conquered his enemies. But besides bishops we IV. are told that there were at Nice an incredible number of presbyters, &c. At *Constantinople*, Cave says there were only about 150 orthodox bishops; and 36 of those bishops who were followers of Macedonius. About 200 bishops are said to have been at *Ephesus*, and six hundred at *Chalcedon*. For the Council of *Constance* I refer to Fox's entertaining account¹; but the cardinals and bishops were allowed to consult at their own homes. Cave does not mention the numbers at *Basil*², nor does Baxter; but there are many histories of that council: it was a confused affair, and the numbers must have varied, At *Trent* the introduction to the Acts of the Council tells us, that there were five cardinals, besides legates, 3 patriarchs, 33 archbishops, 235 bishops, 7 abbots, 7 generals of orders, and 146 divines, and orators from the Emperor Ferdinand (called Cæsar), successor of Charles V. in 1558, and many European princes: but at what time these were present is not said, or whether at any one time.

4. The *duration* of the above-mentioned councils was very unequal. The *Nicene* continued only about two months and a few days. That at *Constantinople* was interrupted, and held at two different times³. The *Ephesine* seems to have 99 continued from about the twentieth of June to the beginning of September. The Council of *Chalcedon* seems to have begun the 15th of October, and to have ended very early in November⁴, if not the last day of October. The Council of *Constance* lasted between three and four years⁵, that of *Basil*⁶ eleven, and the Council of *Trent*⁷ *eighteen*—reckoning these two from the first session to the last; taking no notice of suspensions, interruptions, decrees for removals, &c. &c.

¹ Acts and Monuments, vol. i. p. 785; quoted also by Gilpin in his Lives of Reformers. Hume mentions a larger council than this, at *Placentia*, A. D. 1096, called by Pope Martin II. in the time of William Rufus, in order to determine upon the first crusade.

² Dupin's Compend. gives a short and intelligible account of this council.

³ The first meeting seems, from Cave, to have been in May, and to have continued till August: the next, to have been in the next year, with rather fewer bishops. Dupin's Compend. says, we should conceive a third council to have

been held. Cave's Hist. Lit. may easily be consulted on any councils.

⁴ Cave. There are 16 Acts; the first on the Ides of October, the 14th Prid. Kal. Nov. I do not see a date for the 15th and 16th Acts; but the *histories* of the council seem voluminous.

⁵ Cave, as I understand him: Fox says four years, vol. i. p. 782. It began Nov. 7, 1414, and ended April 22, 1418. Dupin, Compend.

⁶ It began 1431, and ended 1442. Baxter.

⁷ The first session is dated Dec. 13, 1545, and the 25th is dated Dec. 4, 1563.

IV. General councils have been of late *discontinued*; probably from their appearing not to answer their purpose.

5. Their *authority* has been greatly extolled in words⁸, chiefly by the Romanists; but when we enter into particular inquiries about them, they seem very disorderly in fact, whatever they may be in theory; and they seem to have been frequently hostile to the papal power, and sometimes destructive of it in particular popes⁹. And popes have also made free with decrees of councils¹⁰.

6. After mentioning these *facts*, I may make a few *remarks*—I mean such as are historical.

The manner of carrying on disputes in the larger councils was such as promised no decision. To form or change a solid opinion in religion, much nicety of attention is requisite—much candour, and openness to conviction; but no one came to a council to be convinced. Every one took for granted that his own opinion was right, and aimed only at convincing others, or at attracting them by eloquence. Every one took up every difficult subject with *passion*; he was shocked at the profaneness and impiety of his adversary; he felt more horror than doubt. Yet when he was opposed, he was perplexed; but this only served to irritate, not to soften or conciliate. Inability to answer¹¹, and clear up a point, never fails to exasperate him who attempts it¹². And thus would arise expressions of indignation, and in the end furious persecutions. “The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water¹³.”

7. It was a great fault in councils, that the members of them should be all on one side of a question—called, not so much to *argue* as to *overpower*. Considering how absurd this is, its frequency is astonishing. What a number of debates have been held, which were only apparent, or a sort of sham debates! expressing uncertainty, whilst every thing was fixed!

8. And yet it seems possible, that, for a time, warm and passionate debates, however unreasonable, might be void of malice, and corrupt design: inexperience and thoughtlessness,

⁸ See Rhemists on Acts xv. 28.

⁹ Baxter, pp. 431, 444, from Acts of the Council of *Basil*. That council deposed Pope Eugenius IV.; and the Western Church was very adverse to the Council of Constantinople, as held in the East—did not reckon it *general*, if at all valid.

¹⁰ Baxter, pp. 261, 450.

¹¹ Some *specimens* of replies may be seen in Baxter, p. 101, &c.—105.

¹² Baxter observes, that the effect of councils has been to *exasperate*. Page 100.

¹³ Prov. xvii. 14.

with religious zeal, might be sufficient to produce them. Good IV. canons of controversy must be the result of much calm observation. But after a few ages, pride, ambition, a desire of rule, or even interest and selfishness, might insinuate themselves; and mixing with bigotry, or superstition, might generate malice and corruption: then indirect motives would operate, for maintaining a doctrine, or humbling a rival. In fact, at the last, through the indulgence and admiration given to religion by the ordinary people, these faults did certainly grow to an enormous height; and some persons, even in the most eminent religious stations, became, not wicked men, but monsters in human shape.

Nevertheless I am persuaded, that though particular facts may raise our abhorrence, if we take a comprehensive view of all the larger councils together, we must acknowledge, that great abilities were often exerted in carrying them on, and great piety; and that many venerable prelates and divines must have exposed themselves to great hardships merely with a view to promote a grand and solemn meeting for the purpose of settling religious truth¹, and unanimity amongst Christian brethren².

9. I will close this history with mentioning a few *writers* on councils. In the council of Chalcedon there is a book referred to called *Codex Canonum*³ *Ecclesiæ Universæ*, which 102 must have been a body of the decrees of only general councils. I fear we have no such book now, that is genuine, at least; but we have very good collections of councils. That by *Labbé* is an able work, but there is a finer published at Paris in 1644, in 37 volumes folio. This is the largest I know: the smallest is *Berti's* compendium⁴. Bishop *Beveridge* has written on the subject a work in good esteem; and I have often used a book in one volume folio by *Long*. I think *Baxter's* book, to which I have now referred, contains some acute observations, and some candid ones; but allowance should be made for each man's particular views and principles.

I have satisfaction in consulting *Cave's Historia Literaria*, which gives short accounts of councils, and at the same time refers to others much longer. *Binnius* is an author in good

¹ See *Baxter's* account of African Councils, p. 73.

² A good panegyric on councils may be seen in *Warburton's Alliance*, II. iii. 2, or page 198; from *Hooker*, I. 2.

³ *Cave's Hist. Lit.* I. p. 386.

⁴ The writers on *Eccles. Hist.* *Bingham*, *Cave*, &c. refer to a book called *Hist. Conciliorum*, or nearly that. *Hume*, in his *History of England*, only quotes *Concil.* tom. x. There are many accounts of councils.

IV. repute; but the original records of councils were not so well preserved as to leave no uncertainties or contradictions in the accounts which we have of them at this time. Some writers you will find, who, though ingenious, are too ludicrous and flippant upon the subject of councils, for my judgment—as Voltaire and Dr. Jortin⁵. These indulge a boyish kind of pertness, which shews, to me, a want of entering into the circumstances of those whom they ridicule; that is, in truth, a narrowness of mind. And indeed not to distinguish between the nature of anything and the abuse of it, is always a sign
 103 of narrow views, or hasty reflection—of an intemperate love of wit, and a desire to be rather humorous than accurate.

10. Let us now come to the *explanation*.

“*General Councils*.”—A council, in common language, may signify any meeting of persons who consult with each other; but in church-history it seems always to imply some representation; and the term is never used for any less significant meeting than when delegates are sent from the different churches in a *diocese*⁶. A diocese was once a very small district; but of that another time. If all the dioceses in a *province* send delegates, or representatives, the council is *provincial*, and the president is a *metropolitan*, (for some one must preside); if all the provinces in a *nation*, it is *national*⁷; and if all the nations *τῆς οἰκουμένης*, it is *æcumenical*, or *general*; and the president must be elected. In fact, delegates are never sent from all nations of the world; and therefore, according to the strictness of this last definition, there never is, nor has been, a general council; but people will talk big sometimes—as when a large body of Christians call themselves
 104 *Catholics*; and we must sometimes follow them when they quit plain literal language. As we have no council between

⁵ Art. ix. sect. 8.

⁶ The meeting at *Jerusalem* (Acts xv.) may be called a council or not, as we follow or not these definitions. If all Christendom, however small, appeared there, virtually, it might, in some sense, be called a *general council*, if it was a council at all.

⁷ I know no name for the head of a *national church*, taken independently of the state. Our *convocations* have had *prolocutors*, answering to the *speakers* of the Houses of Lords and Commons.

Primate may be the name; if so, our Archbishop of Canterbury may be *primate* as head of the *English Church*, and *Metropolitan* as head of a *province*. The Archbishop of *York* is called *Primate of England*; the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Primate of all England*. *York* was once a residence of Roman Emperors. Union of nations may (as in *Aquitain*, &c.) have *left* a title, which now seems too extensive, though it did not when first given.

national and general, if a council be composed of delegates IV. from several nations, and notice be given to others, who are likely to be interested; it may be called a general council without much impropriety¹. A general council would be the most regularly formed, if each church was to choose a representative for a meeting of the churches in a diocese; if each *diocese* was to choose, out of those representatives, a representative for a provincial council; each provincial council one for a national council; each national council one (or more, according to its extent,) for a general council: then, if all Christian nations sent representatives so elected, one does not see why such general council would not fairly represent the Catholic Church. And if some nations neglected to send, supposing they had proper notice, it would be hard if their negligence could frustrate the undertakings of the rest of the Christian world.

I do not know any difference between council and *synod*, except that the latter is Greek, and the former Latin. The laws of councils seem always to be called *canons*, though that be Greek.

11. "*The will of princes*,"—supposed *Christian* princes, opposed probably to *popes*;—in a republic, &c. the *sovereign* power. Because general councils are composed of national councils, and a prince is the head of a nation. It does not follow (whether true or not) that *provincial* councils may not be gathered together without consulting princes: some Christian councils were held before Constantine became a Christian.

12. "*All be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God*;"—that is, some have sometimes *worldly* views. The expressions of our Article are directly opposite to one in the *Rhemish*² Testament: "Holy Counsels"... "have ever the assistance of God's *Spirit*, and therefore cannot *erre*," &c. And the Council of Chalcedon cry out, "these are the words of the *Holy Ghost*³."

13. "*May err*"—*à priori*;—and *à posteriori*, "*have erred*," "even in things pertaining unto *God*." It was, in 1552, "not only in *worldly* matters, but also," &c. This comparison makes our expression more intelligible, and the change makes our assent more easy. It was a needless trouble to prove that

¹ Cave reasons in order to settle whether the Council of Constantinople against images, in 754, was a *general* one: so do

other writers.

² Rhemists on Acts xv. 28.

³ Baxter, p. 101.

IV. councils had erred “in worldly matters.” Worldly matters are not expressed in the *Latin* of 1552.

Our church respects councils, though it will found salvation on the Scriptures. It says, “they” *sometimes* “have erred:” and “things ordained by them as necessary to salvation,” must be tried by *Scripture*; but this implies, that, in anything short of that, councils ought to be respected. And accordingly, our Homily on Fasting speaks handsomely⁴ of the Council of *Chalcedon*.

“Unless it may be *declared*,” &c.—This seems rather obscure; or however less clear than the Latin, “*nisi ostendi possint è sacris literis esse desumpta*.” But if salvation is to be founded on Scripture, the councils may seem to have nothing to do with our principles; yet they may suggest, argue, interpret; and their opinion, when they do so, may afford us
106 light, and is to be attended to, and treated with reverence. It may have *weight*, sometimes great weight, with those who are not qualified to judge.

14. We come to our *proof*.

There seem but two propositions to be noticed:

15. General councils cannot be called without the consent of *princes*.

General councils are made up of delegates from national councils; and according to us, the prince is the head of the national Church. How far the consent of the sovereign is necessary for a man’s quitting his own country, is a matter of *national law*; but I think moralists deem such consent necessary, either express or *tacit*—at least when subjects travel in any considerable numbers, or for ends affecting the state to which they belong. The Christian religion leaves the political obligations of subjects in their full force. (See Matt. xxii. 15, &c. Rom. xiii. 1, &c.) If some spiritual magistrate could call a number of every nation out to a distant region, it must greatly interrupt internal government; and if people so called out could make what rules they pleased about religion, including discipline, morals, spiritual courts, &c., and the magistrate at home must execute those rules, he would be thwarted and impeded in some very important parts of his administration.

16. General councils have *erred*.—If we give any farther proof of this than has already appeared, it will be for the sake

⁴ Page 217, 8vo. See also *Reform.* | xiv; which is more clear and full than
Legum de Summâ Trinitate, &c. cap. | our Articles.

of reflecting on the history of the Church. Indeed, it would be IV. sufficient if we proved that Romanists must own general councils to have erred, for our present Article is only against the Romanists; and in this view we might repeat what was¹ before said about councils deposing popes, and popes neglecting 107 councils. And we might add the instance of Pope *Honorius*; who was deposed as a Monothelite by the general council of Constantinople in the seventh century². General councils have *contradicted*³ each other, in which case one must err; that at *Rimini* was⁴ at last *Arian*. And I fear, if we examined the first four, we should not find them all free from error. Lardner does not find the Council of *Nice* such as he approves—chiefly with regard to toleration. As I remember, it orders people to *stand* during prayer—a small error perhaps. The *Papists* must think it sets the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, too high.

For the first general Council of *Constantinople*, we may refer to Gregory⁵ of Nazianzum, or to the expostulations of the Bishop of Rome: it was noisy and disorderly, and ambitious to have all church-business done in the East⁶. I do not scruple to say, that the general Council of *Ephesus* erred in treating Nestorius⁷ with too great *severity*. The riot and warm opposition of John of Antioch; the calling in of a military force; fraud, prison, banishment—all these may be said not to be chargeable upon the *council*; they were not likely to make the council free from error. Riots in any assembly are always a disgrace to it, and a great hinderance to right decisions, though rioters can never be all on one side. The Council of *Chalcedon* 108 was a scene of contention, as far as concerned the Eutychians. The claims made at it are scarcely intelligible; and the Legates of the *pope* protested against the eighteenth canon⁸. The Eutychian debate in that council was curious enough. No one knew how to oppose Eutyches without favouring Nes-

¹ Section 5.

² Art. ii. sect. 10.

³ Long's Councils, p. 266. Baxter on Councils, p. 99, 445; or compare p. 98, sect. 9, with p. 100, sect. 17: and the Council at Constantinople in 754, with the second Nicene Council in 787, about images. See also Bishop Porteus's Brief Confutation, p. 30.

⁴ Bennet on the Article.

⁵ Baxter, pp. 67, 69. Gibbon, vol. 111. (Contents.)

⁶ Baxter, p. 70, sect. 2.

⁷ And see Baxter, p. 94, sect. 20; and Art. ii. sect. 8.

⁸ Cave, l. 485. Its design was to make the Bishop of Constantinople equal to the Bishop of Rome—Constantinople being new Rome. The breach this occasioned between *East* and *West* has never been healed to this day. Baxter, p. 70.

IV. torius, who had been deposed at Ephesus; nor therefore without condemning the preceding general council. This difficulty I can conceive to have been the occasion of irritating and exasperating the Fathers; and so, of much riot and disorder, both before and at the Council of Chaldeon. The difference between Nestorius and Eutyches (if any⁹, at bottom) was so subtle and refined, that no one could explain himself clearly upon it.

Here Bishop *Porteus's* chapter¹⁰ might be introduced.

17. I will carry the proof no farther, but see what can be said in the way of *application*. No new form of assent seems wanting. And I doubt whether any proposals of mutual concessions would be effectual, so bigotted is Du Pin¹¹ in this matter. Except indeed he means, that supposing a general council such as it *should* be, it would be absurd for a *private* man to set up his own judgment against it. If he means this, we might agree with him. And the chief part of what is said in order to inculcate a veneration for general councils, is derived from their *nature*, and excludes all supposition of their being *abused*. But if we speak of general councils as what they have been in fact, it seems to me that *Papists* have full as much reason to declare them fallible as *Protestants*.

As to *improvement*, the *idea* of improving general councils is quite simple: take away their *faults*, and they are improved, and useful. A council of Christians literally *general*, seems scarcely attainable in our age, because the Greek Church must be admitted to it, as also Asiatic and African churches; though anything *might* be done by carrying representation far enough, or, what means the same, by reducing the number of representatives.

Yet we can scarce conceive, that in *fact* a small number of representatives would be allowed to bind the universal Church, without having their acts ratified by their constituents; and such ratification would consume so much *time*, as, in many cases, to render the councils useless. Indeed, the time spent merely in the *journeys* of very distant representatives to the place of meeting would make an insuperable difficulty. What would be the case if we supposed both *America* and *Asia* wholly Christian?

No council would be so bad now, as some were when the clergy were ignorant and profligate; but we are not yet arrived

⁹ Baxter, p. 102.

¹⁰ Brief Confutation, part 1, chap. vi.

¹¹ Appendix to Mosheim, as before.

at a manner of disputing productive of mutual conviction. IV. Let controversy then be improved and humanized; by our *writings* let us shew, that we are *fit to meet*; and then let our councils at first be small, and let them be enlarged as we find them produce unanimity.

If we could thus proceed on till there was a probability of some good from consulting with our most distant brethren, it would be a cheering prospect; it would fill our minds with hope, that the Church of Christ might, in some finite time, become in fact, what it always was in theory, *Universal*.

ARTICLE XXII.

111

OF PURGATORY.

THE Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

1. Although this Article is intitled, "Of Purgatory," it contains several other subjects. We will make some *historical* remarks on them in the order in which they occur: but it may be observed, of every one of them, that it began in a time of superstition; that it became popular because it flattered or interested men's feelings and imaginations; that it got fixed in the dark ages; that it became lucrative to the sacred orders, or advanced their power; and therefore, as well as because it had become associated with religious principles and sentiments, at the revival of learning, it was not given up.

2. With regard to *purgatory* in particular, though it may not be founded in either reason or Scripture, it is not *unnatural*. Who can bear the thought of dwelling in *everlasting* torments¹? yet who can say, that a just God will not inflict them? The mind of man seeks some *resource*: it finds one only in conceiving that some temporary punishment after death may purify the soul from its moral pollutions, and make it at last acceptable even to a Deity perfectly pure. Hence the notion

¹ Isai. xxxiii. 14.

IV. of the soul's *transmigration*; and hence it is, that the epic poets² represent departed spirits as uttering complaints at the continuance of their sufferings. Yet some make a difference between men professedly *wicked*, and such as only are compassed about with *infirmities*: the wicked they give up to punishment eternal, but the weak they hope may be made perfect by temporary sufferings; or, in other words, they conceive that those who have committed *mortal* sins, and not repented of them, will be punished for ever in hell; but that those who have committed only *venial* sins³, will only suffer for a time in *purgatory*. We have already⁴ mentioned the last Article of 1552 concerning the final salvation of all men; containing Dr. *Hartley's* doctrine; and that of *Origen*⁵. But that relates to all kinds of sins, and to a termination of all kinds of punishment.

Some have fixed upon the element of *fire* as the instrument by which men were to be purified from their venial sins. That element was little understood, and is exceedingly powerful; which is enough to occasion mystical and superstitious opinions and feelings about it⁶, and even to make its operations to be ascribed to *personal* causes. The soul has been thought to be itself fire⁷; and different nations have entertained conceptions of departed spirits being affected by fire⁸; but we must not go far into such matters at present. There are expressions of *Scripture*, which may have helped forward the adoption of such an opinion into revealed religion;—as Ps. civ. 4; Mal. iii. 2; Matt. iii. 11; Acts ii. 3. See Cruden's Concordance, under *Fire*.

Some *Christians* seem to have had, in very early times, some notions of a temporary punishment after death, purifying the soul: *Carpocrates*⁹ and *Montanus* are particularly mentioned. The oriental Christians were disposed to believe the

² Homer, Virgil, mentioned by *Burnet*; who also mentions a *platonick* notion to the purpose; but he refers to no *passage*. Forbes, xiii. 2, refers to Plato, Cicero, Virgil, &c. but not to Homer, that I see.

³ Art. xv. sect. 12, 21, 23.

⁴ Art. xviii. sect. 5.

⁵ Aug. *Hær.* 43. "purgationem maiorum," &c. *Reform. Legum de Hær.* cap. ii. See the end of *Somnium Scipionis*. In this 43d *Hær.* Aug. says, that he has opposed "diligentissimè" Origen,

and the *philosophers* from whom he borrowed his doctrine. *De Civitate Dei*.

⁶ Cic. *de Nat. Deorum*, i. 15; ii. 15; iii. 14.

⁷ Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* i. 9, end, "*vulgò*;" and sect. 2. "Si ignis, extinguetur." (anima).

⁸ See Michaelis, *Introd.* sect. 101, p. 245, quarto.

⁹ See Fulke on the *Rhem. Test.* from Irenæus and Tertullian. *Matt.* v. sect. 1. He adds the *Origenists*, *Matt.* xii. sect. 6. Forbes's *Instruct.* xiiii. ii. 4.

transmigration of souls, from their belief of the impurity of IV. matter. The *Manicheans* in particular did profess that doctrine¹. Yet the *Greek Church*, though Eastern, never held any purification after this life.

Augustin was, in his youth, a Manichean, though only an auditor, never one of the elect. He, in some way or other, had acquired a notion of an *ignis purgatorius*²; but he made no article of *faith* about it—he only went so far as to say, “non *incredibile*³ videtur;” and on other occasions he expressed great doubtfulness⁴; and when he treated of the *limbus infantum*, in which children, dying unbaptized, were supposed to exist, he proved, in general, that there was *no third state* besides heaven and hell⁵;—at least that of such state we are perfectly ignorant, and that it is not mentioned in the Scriptures. 114

After the time of *Augustin* the notion of purgatory kept *growing* in the Church; but it was only supposed to purify men from slight faults⁶, as immoderate laughing, or inordinate domestic cares, &c.

The *schoolmen*, as usual, run into minute particulars. *Thomas Aquinas*, for instance, mentions that it is the *same fire* which torments the damned in hell, and the just in purgatory⁷; and that the least punishment in purgatory exceeds the greatest in this life. But I do not see that he mentions from whence he derives his knowledge.

The Council of *Trent* rather seems to take for granted the doctrine of purgatory, as fixed by fathers, councils, &c., than to define it. In the sixth session, about justification, it anathematizes all who say⁸, that sins are remitted in Christ, in such sense as to leave no *temporal* punishment due. And in the twenty-fifth session⁹ it decrees, that the *sound doctrine* of purgatory shall be preached, setting aside all nice and subtle questions; but does not say wherein that sound doctrine con- 115

¹ Lardner, vol. III. p. 476. Vol. IX. pp. 421, 422. See also Append. to Book I. sect. 4; or vol. I. p. 351.

² Enchiridion, cap. xxix.

³ Ad Dulcitii Quæst. 1.

⁴ Vener on this Article refers to passages: Enchir. 66, 68. Quæst. Dulc. I. *De Fide et Operibus*, cap. xvi.

⁵ *De Verbis Apost.* Ser. 14. Hypognost. cont. Pelag. l. 5. (reckoned spurious). Fulke on Rhemish Test. Matt.

xii. sect. 6.

⁶ Fulke, *ibidem*, from Gregory the Great, A. D. 590. Vener observes, that the 5th Gen. Council, in condemning the Origenists, did not mention any *other* purgatory.

⁷ Quoted by Forbes, XIII. i. 5. in 4 Sentent. dist. 21. quæst. 1. Farther subtleties are mentioned by Forbes in the same place.

⁸ Canon 30.

⁹ Opening.

IV. sists. It mentions nothing of *fire*—perhaps in order to avoid abstruse speculations. But in the Rhemish Testament, the notion of a fiery¹⁰ purgatory seems to be kept up. *Du Pin*, in his negociation with Archbishop Wake, observes, “that souls must be *purged*, that is, purified from all defilement of sin, before they are admitted to celestial bliss; that the Church of Rome doth not affirm this to be done by fire;” &c.

I here close the history of *purgatory*.

3. The next thing mentioned in the Article is “*pardons*.” This means the same as *indulgences*, the Latin being *indulgentiæ*; but from the Rhemish Testament it seems likely that *pardons* was the more common term at the time of the Reformation¹¹. I have explained the nature of these under the fourteenth Article. We may add here a few instances. Extravagant indulgences or pardons, were granted to those who would undertake to join in the *Crusades*¹². And in order to encourage men to appear at the Council of *Trent*, the legates and Archbishop of Trent granted three years and one hundred and sixty days of deliverance from purgatory to any one that should appear at that city at the opening of the council. As I am not considering history with the most scrupulous nicety (though I would not willingly make any mistake) I take the account of Mr. *Voltaire*; who adds, that indulgences are still
116 sold very cheap at Rome, so as to be re-sold in the Swiss Cantons at *four sols* apiece; but that the great profit made of them is in *Spanish America*, where people are more rich and more ignorant than in the small Swiss Cantons¹³.

Jubilees were instituted in order to grant indulgences. *Bower*, in his Life of Pope Boniface VIII.¹⁴, says, that, in the year 1300, on some rumours of pardons having been granted at the end of the preceding century (year 1200), the pope appointed the first Christian jubilee; and gave public notice, that every man, repenting, confessing, and fully absolved, who should, during the last year of any century¹⁵, visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul (at Rome) once a day, for thirty days, should have a full indulgence: the extent of which has

¹⁰ On 1 Cor. iii. 15.

¹¹ In the Index we find, “Indulgences, see Pardons.”

¹² In the crusade of Richard I. the expedition was to answer to sinners instead of all penances. Innocent III. was liberal of indulgences. Cave.

¹³ Vol. x. quarto, pp. 151, 162.

¹⁴ Bower's Lives of Popes, vol. vi. p. 354. Chambers's Dict. *Jubilee*.

¹⁵ Perhaps 99 is most properly the last year, but, if 101 be called the first year, 100 must be the last.

not always been understood in the same sense¹. It has been IV. computed that two hundred thousand strangers have been at Rome in one jubilee-year, and that the mere brass money, offered by the lower people, exclusive of silver and gold offered by the more opulent, has amounted in one year to fifty thousand florins of gold. Since the year 1300 the jubilees have been made to return more frequently: there has now long been one every twenty-five years².

4. The history of *images* might be long; because the use of them is calculated to produce disputes. To contemplate resemblances of persons, whom we love or admire, is naturally pleasing and interesting to the mind. And if persons, who have greatly promoted or suffered for the cause of religion, are departed out of life, still the devout may be greatly affected by a lively representation of their appearance and manner. But when the person represented seems to have any claim to religious adoration, the resemblance occasions some danger. The heathens had images of their gods; but it is probable that at first each image was only regarded as a mere resemblance. Continual association of the ideas of the invisible original and the visible resemblance, united them in the mind, and took away the distinction between them. Ere long the very sight of the image raised all those sentiments—those devout affections which at first seemed appropriated to the original. 117

This transition of the feelings from the original to the image, may take place, on different occasions, and in different degrees. Suppose then images in any place of worship; to remove them is to take away a great deal of that on which the devout mind feeds, and by which it supports itself: to leave them, is to draw the mind on, nearer and nearer, to idolatry. What disputes and contentions might not arise on the proposal of such measures! And disputes of this nature might be forwarded by a conflict between love and hatred for the polite arts³. We might give more or fewer examples of these things; but they would suggest only this general observation.

As the *early Christians* had occasion to contend against idolatry, it seems natural that they should have an abhorrence of images. We may well therefore consider the accounts of the statue of Christ sent to King *Abgarus*, and the paintings 118

¹ Art. xiv. sect. 1. See also Fulke on 2 Cor. ii. 10. (Rhem. Test.)

² Chambers.

³ Art. xx. sect. 1 and 7.

IV. of St. *Luke*, as fabulous⁴. The Emperor *Theodosius* forbade all incense, &c. to idols, (*sensu carentibus simulacris*), under penalty of forfeiture of the houses or lands where such act of superstition was committed⁵. *Augustin* seems uneasy⁶ at the multiplying⁷ of paintings and statues in his time, though the political and historical use of them was not denied. In the fifth and sixth centuries, they multiplied still more; no one had time to lay any restraints, so busy were the leaders of the church with other matters. About the year 600, *Serenus* Bishop of Marseilles began to attack them with violence; Pope *Gregory* half commended him, but rather soothed men's desire for images upon the whole. However, it got fixed for some time, as a compromise, that it was right to *have* images, but wrong to *worship* them⁸.

We may pass on to the Emperor *Leo* III. called the *Isaurian*, a man of an imperious and violent spirit. Provoked by something of no very great consequence, he published an edict against images in 726, and demolished them in great numbers; and in 754, they were condemned at a council at *Constantinople*, called a general one⁹. In 787, was held the second *Nicene* council, on which the Romanists found their worship of images.
 119 They speak of it as if it had been the unanimous act of all Christians, and opposed to no other act¹⁰. Yet it was called by an abandoned empress, *Irene*; who had caused her husband to be poisoned, and afterwards put out her son's eyes. The opposition had now caused much effusion of blood, as well as the revolt of the exarchate of Italy (*Ravenna* the capital) from the eastern empire. In 794, *Charlemagne* held a council at *Frankfort*, intending to moderate the fury of the contending parties; and he also published some writings. In 814, there was another council at *Constantinople* against images; and one at *Paris* in 825, but in that the adoration of the Cross was encouraged.

⁴ See Forbes, vii. viii; and Dr. Middleton's Letter from Rome, p. 173, &c.

⁵ Leg. 12, p. 15, quoted by Middleton, p. 158.

⁶ The *Anthropomorphites* might be mentioned here: Aug. Hær. 50. Baxter's Councils, p. 76, sect. 39.

⁷ Ep. 102, (al. 49,) tom. i. p. 212. edit. Antv.

⁸ This seems to be adopted by the *Necessary Doctrine*; as mentioned Art. vii. note at the end of sect. 13.

⁹ Cave argues for its being called a general one. Compare, in Baxter's Councils, No. 228, with No. 232; partic. p. 226, sect. 55. Some mention made of this council, Art. xxi. sect. 10.

¹⁰ Rhem. Test. end of 1 John. Trent, session 25, p. 202, duodecimo.

In the succeeding centuries, till the Reformation, the passion for images grew still stronger; but men of sober minds grew to be offended: and that was one cause of the Reformation.

The favourers of images have been called *Iconolatæ*, and *Iconoduli*; and their adversaries, *Iconomachi*, and *Iconoclastæ*. Cave calls the eighth century *Seculum Eiconoclasticum*.

John of Damascus, called usually *Damascene*, whom Lardner and Cave place in 730, was a famous writer in favour of images. He was of a great family, and eminent for his learning; but on account of his credulity, which was the fault of his time, he is not always to be depended upon. Pope *Adrian I.* wrote against Charlemagne, but got no fame¹.

After the Reformation began, the demolition of images was considered as part of the destruction of Popery. The Puritans wished the demolition to be total. 120

Popish countries abound with images still². They have, or have had, images of the *Deity*³; but what we hear most of are those of *Christ*, and his earthly *parent*, and some *angels*, and many *saints*. Some of these are very rich⁴, others so mean as to be ridiculous to any but the lowest people. An image "of Christ upon the Cross, with Mary⁵ and John standing by," used to be called, in England, a *Rood*.

At *Lisbon*, as I have been told by one who spoke of what he had *seen*, there is a statue of the Virgin in a large full-bottomed wig, with Jesus, as a boy, dressed in a sword and bag-wig, with a violin in his hand. Sir Edwin *Sandys* says, that "Where one voweth to Christ, ten vow unto her," (the

¹ The *Collyridians* (Epiphan. *Hær.* 79) might be mentioned, as it was to the image of the Virgin that they offered their *cake*, (*κολλύρα*, its dim. *κολλυρίς*). See Fulke on Rhem. Heb. ix. sect. 4.) And what Forbes relates of *Theodore Eliota* (a new way of preferring sacrifice to mercy,) might be read in *Latin*; if it is, the approbation of Adrian I. and the second Nicene Council, should not be forgotten. Forbes VII. ii. 30.—VII. xi. 33.

Here also might be mentioned "the doctrine of *school-authors*" (Art. of 1552) from Forbes VII. ii. 26, 27, 28. And it might be seen, at the same time, how "the *Romish doctrine*," (Art. of 1562) differs from the scholastic. In the Arti-

cle of 1552, the expression is, "The doctrine of *school-authors* concerning purgatory," &c. In ours, of 1562, "The *Romish doctrine* concerning purgatory," &c. In other things the Articles are much the same.

² Middleton's Letter from Rome.

³ Rhem. Test. on Acts xvii. 29, shews how images of *God the Father* were made from Dan. vii. 22; also with a *globe* in his hand, from no Scripture; and of the *Trinity*, from Gen. xviii. 2; and defends them.

⁴ Our Lady of Loretto, &c. Midd. pp. 154, 155. *Speculum Europæ*, p. 4.

⁵ Neal, Hist. Pur. i. p. 102. Holyrood House.

IV. Virgin); “and not so much to herself, as to some peculiar
 121 image,” &c.—“for one miracle reported to be wrought by the
 Crucifix, not so few perhaps as an hundred are voiced upon
 those other images⁶.” This traveller speaks from his own
 observation; and so does Dr. *Middleton* in later times, when he
 tells us of several women whom he saw sitting before the altar
 of a saint, each a child in her lap⁷, “in expectation of his
 miraculous influence on the health of the infant.”

The Council of *Trent* mention the Romanists as kissing
 images, and prostrating themselves before them, as well as being
 uncovered in paying them respect. The images specified are
 those of *Christ*, the *Virgin*, and *other* saints, to whom *due*
 honour is to be given. *Due* honour should certainly be given
 to every thing.

The alteration made by the Romanists in the second *com-*
mandment was mentioned Art. vii. sect. 13.

5. There is a connection or analogy between images and
relics; both deriving their efficacy from association of ideas
 between the thing and an interesting person. What was said
 of images will, in great measure, apply to *relics*. It is
 natural to be affected by a relic of any one loved, admired, or
 venerated: the sight of it makes our regret, affection, &c. lively
 and strong; and the place where the remains of any departed
 friend are deposited, will come under the notion of a relic.
 Virgil's tomb has been visited with a tender interest. Some
 persons of our own country would, in the last century, have
 very highly valued, and passionately contemplated, any relic of
 122 *Charles* I. or a twig of the Royal Oak by means of which his
 son escaped.

But religion, in this as in other things, heightens our
 feelings. In Mr. Mason's *Caractacus*⁸ we find a sentiment
 excited by Druidical relics. I can conceive a degree of affec-
 tion or enthusiasm to have arisen from a relic of one of our
 venerable martyrs in the time of Queen *Mary*.

It requires meditation and knowledge of antiquity, rather
 than reasoning, to see what the *early Christians* must have felt
 on contemplating what they believed to be remains of saints,
 martyrs, apostles, their blessed Lord himself! agitated by
 continual danger, harassed by passionate exertions to spread the

⁶ Sir Edward Sandys's *Speculum*
Europæ, pp. 4 and 5. See also Midd.
 p. 152.

⁷ Letter from Rome, p. 167; if there
 be no *image* near this altar, the instance
 may belong to sect. 6. ⁸ Line 236.

religion which they professed! I do not mean that the IV. *primitive* Christians imagined themselves to be really in possession of remains of Christ and the apostles; for the primitive times are charged with no weakness of the kind; but when a passion for relics once began to prevail, it spread more easily because of the habitual feelings of Christians; and, we may add, because of the credulity of the times. A passionate attention to the fate of *martyrs*, and to every thing belonging to them, one cannot wonder at in Christians of any age. Put yourself into the place of Christians in the fourth century, for instance; conceive how highly they must regard those whom they had seen suffering with constancy to the last extremity; imagine how they must be united together, and how their union must heighten their mutual sympathy; and you will not be surprised that they should meet at the *tombs of the martyrs*, and there offer up their *prayers*¹ to God and their Lord, as Christians, 123 and confirm their resolutions of following the noble example of the deceased, in case they should be called upon to so severe a trial. But it is to be feared that the scene was sometimes too much for their sober reason. They fancied things without just foundation, they believed without sufficient proof; and some, thinking the spirit good, must have transgressed the bounds of truth in *inventing* what might nourish and inflame it. If this was the case, any number of false relics might be produced and circulated—any voices might be heard².

Augustin must have been sensible of a foolish excess in this matter, by the terms in which he abuses the *idle monks*, some of whom *wandered* about. “Alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, venditant.” (*De Op. Monach.* cap. 28.)

About the end of the fourth century the fondness for relics was ridiculed by *Vigilantius*, possibly with too little caution. *Jerom.* writes against him, but not exactly as one would wish; however, he is rather to be called over serious and declamatory, than extravagant³, or wrong in his fundamental opinions.

¹ See *Aërians*, in Lardner's Works, vol. iv. p. 306. Also a quotation from Tertullian *de Coronâ Militis*, c. 1, 2, 3, in Wall's *Inf. Baptism*, p. 480, quarto.

² The word *memories* is often made use of: Du Fresne gives several different senses of it, but I think not that of what we call *apparitions*. *Memoria*—a sepulchre; in pl. a *celebration*, which seems to have been passionate, with some ges-

tures and salutations—a receptacle of a corpse—a chapel—a *box* holding relics—anything which had been used by the deceased, as his *staff*, &c.—*funeral* rites—and *festivals*, such as we call *saints' days*.

³ See Fulke on Rhem. Test. Argument to St. Luke's Gospel; and on Acts xix. sect. 8.

IV. John *Damascene*, in reasoning on images, takes relics as a ground or axiom⁴.

124 In dark ages the passion for relics probably grew stronger, and the veneration paid to them more solemn; but I know of no great events which they produced.

The Council of *Trent* says, that all those are to be condemned who affirm that “*worship*” (*venerationem*) and *honour* is not due to relics, or that it is paid unprofitably, or that the *memories* of saints are celebrated in vain. It also prescribes rules for the admission of new relics.

The lower ranks of *Romanists* have carried their veneration for relics to such a childish excess, as to give occasion to numberless forgeries, such as bring contempt and disgrace upon Christianity; and by being believed by the superstitious, though incredible to any man of sense, promote *infidelity* in things of importance. Every traveller into Popish countries recounts numberless stories about them, and the miracles⁵ which they perform.

6. The last thing to be mentioned is the invocation of *saints*. Saints are often invoked by a person present with their *images*, or their *relics*; but the ideas of their images or relics should be kept distinct from that of invocation. I hope no man is foolish for being affected when he meditates on the manner of existence of his departed friends; or for indulging some indistinct hope of seeing them again: nor any Christian, for feeling an interest in all those, of all ages, who have departed this life in the faith of Christ, as well as in those of his own generation; or for conceiving that there subsists between them that degree of intercourse, fellow-feeling, sympathy, which their respective natures are capable of. Such a supposed common interest is the communion of *saints*.

125 *Cicero*⁶, speaking in the character of Cato Major, describes every good man as warmly interested, both in those who have departed this life before him, and in those who are to live after him. His “*divinum concilium cætusque animorum*,” makes one imagine that the communion of saints would have been to him a very pleasing article of faith, had he lived under Christianity. In saying this, Cicero is seldom considered as foolish

⁴ Forbes, VII. ii. 27, end. If I am to adore the original cross, the spear, the sponge, why not images of man's making, for the glory of Christ? &c. in this way.

⁵ In the decree of the Council of Trent, sess. 25, the word “*beneficia*” is used, not *miracula*.

⁶ *De Senectute*, ad finem.

or culpable; but had he paid religious honours to any of his IV. worthies, had he made *images* of them, or procured some forged *relics* as belonging to them, and had he kissed these, prostrated himself before them, *invoked* the worthies, and desired their intercession with Jupiter or Pluto; we should now have different notions of his wisdom from those which we do entertain. How weak then should we have thought him if he had done such things towards men of no value, or on account of persons whose real character was wholly unknown¹ to him!

We are told, that invocation of saints was a thing unknown to Christians for at least² three hundred years; and that none of the Fathers, in plain serious writing, said, that *servitus* was due to saints, for six hundred years.

How soon Christians ran into excess in worshipping saints, appears from the second African council, held A. D. 401, (Cave). In this it is ordered that the *altars* which are set up every where in the *fields*, or in the *ways*, to martyrs, be overthrown by the bishops, except the body, or some *undoubted* relics be there. It is also said, that altars had been set up by 126
“*dreams and vain revelations.*”

Invocation of saints probably proceeded much in the same manner with the other abuses mentioned in this Article—it is so intimately connected with them. What *Vigilantius* wrote, against *martyrs*, extends to *saints*. Martyrs were often sainted: and his reasoning affects the invocation of saints; as he affirms, that the souls of saints were not, as was usually presumed, present with their bodies, or at their monuments, much less could they be present at every place where their relics happened to be preserved³.

The Council of *Trent* joins invocation of saints with relics and images. All men are to be condemned (*damnandi sunt*) who do not own that the saints reigning with Christ offer their prayers to God for men; and that it is useful to invoke them in order to get their assistance, in asking God for blessings through Christ.

Cardinal Bellarmin says, as we find in Forbes, vii. i. 12: “*Sanctis angelis et hominibus deberi cultum aliquem religiosum;*” (de Sanct. Beat. cap. 13;) but then he explains *religiosum* by “*majorem merè humano.*”

¹ Middleton's Letter, pp. 173, 174.

² Bishop Porteus, Part II. chap. i. and Forbes, vii. i. 17.

³ On this and the preceding paragraph, see Fulke on Rhem. Test. Apoc. vi. sect. 1.

IV. Bishop *Porteus* gives us⁴ a collection of terms in which Papists address the *Virgin Mary*; and mentions alterations of the Psalms, *Te Deum*, &c. made in order to suit them to her. Forms may be found in the Popish Liturgies, and in *Forbes*⁵, and in *Rogers* on this Article.

127 For other instances of modern invocation of saints, I will refer to Dr. *Middleton's* Letter from Rome⁶, and to books of travels which are in every one's hands. It may be as well not to omit the idea, which some have encouraged, in order to obviate the difficulty arising from the limited knowledge of the saints, that *angels inform the saints* what is addressed to them. *Forbes* mentions this notion⁷, but he does not say by whom it was held. It may also be right to refer to the same writer in order to shew that the schoolmen held the same with the Romanists; as the Article of 1552 affirms of the *schoolmen*, what the Article of 1562 affirms of the Church of *Rome*⁸.

7. But I will not pursue this history farther. I will now proceed to some *explanation*.

Purgatory may be defined, a state, in which the souls of men, popularly called *good men*, (according to what was said under Art. xv.) though not wholly free from *faults* and infirmities, are confined, till they are *purified*, probably by suffering, from all those faults and infirmities, and fitted for an entrance into *heaven*, and the more immediate presence of a Deity of perfect holiness.

Why the title of the Article should be "*Of purgatory*," when it includes other doctrines, might possibly be in some measure explained. All the things mentioned in the body of the Article, after purgatory, have been chiefly used as means of shortening the duration of its pains⁹. *Indulgences* have that end chiefly and immediately in view. And adorations
128 are offered to *saints*, through the medium of *images* or *relics*, chiefly in order to prevail upon them to assist in delivering souls out of *purgatory*. So that the Article might have been entitled, 'of Purgatory, and the means of abridging its pains,' were it not that each subject may require some separate consideration. Indeed, as it is, the whole chain of subjects is

⁴ Bishop *Porteus*, Part II. chap. ii.

⁵ *Forbes*, VII. ii. 19. See also *Fulke* on *Rhem. Test.* John xvi. sect. 3; and I Cor. ii. sect. 4.

⁶ Dr. *Middleton's* Letter from Rome,

p. 176. The passage, quoted sect. 4, might have been here.

⁷ *Forbesii Instr.* VII. i. 20. ⁸ *Ib.* VII. ii. 4.

⁹ The Council of *Trent* mixes these doctrines, sess. 25.

spoken of as one doctrine; what the Romanists teach concern-IV. ing them is called "*a fond thing*."

8. "*The Romish Doctrine*."—In the Article of 1552, it was, "The doctrine of the *school-authors*"—" *Scholasticorum doctrina*." What that was, with regard to the leading subject, purgatory, has been briefly mentioned in our history¹. If the old expression had continued, the Romanists might have said, we do not defend the doctrines of the *schoolmen* in every particular². The present expression confines all dispute to the doctrines which the *Romanists* professed, whatever those were; and it denotes the degree of each doctrine *actually existing*; so that it would not avail for the Romanists to defend *some* regard for sacred painting or sculpture, some respect for real relics, unless they could defend what actually appeared in Popish countries relating to one or the other, *when the Article was made*.

9. "*Worshipping and adoration*;"—in Latin, "*veneratione et adoratione*."—These words have by no means so determinate a sense as to prevent all disputes, or even to suggest one invariable idea to the mind of a thinking man. They may express our regards to the Supreme Being; they would not be too strong for our attentions to a sacred human character. "Worship" in modern English seems appropriated to the Supreme Being; but at the time the Articles were made it signified merely respect³, reverence, honour; as indeed appears by the Latin word of the Article, "*veneratione*." Worshipping seems sometimes to be used in our English bibles for the eastern *prostration*; and may therefore correspond to the expression of the Council of Trent, "*procumbimus*"⁴. *Adorare* seems to mean, to address any one with respect, and with some idea of obtaining a favour. Such address seems to have been conceived to be attended with some bodily gestures of a respectful, suppliant sort; as bowing, &c. The word was

¹ Sect. 2.

² Bellarmin professes to differ from the schoolmen about *images*: see Forbes, VII. ii. 27, &c. One might say, in general, that the Romanists have, since the complaints of the Reformers, endeavoured to moderate the doctrines of the schoolmen, in expression, explanation, theory; but so as to leave room for the *people* to be as weak and credulous as their education inclines them to be. Yet from Forbes,

VII. i. 17, we see, that even some schoolmen did not like *dulia* for worship of saints; because men are their fellow-servants. Bishop Hurd opposes solemn forms of rituals, canons, and councils, to the private writings of Romish divines. On Prophecy, p. 384.

³ This will appear more fully in Art. xxv. sect. 6.

⁴ P. 202, edit. Antv. 1596, sess. 25, *Decretum de Invocatione*, &c.

IV. sometimes⁵ used for addressing an heathen *god*, which would be called *prayer*; but Tacitus uses *adorare vulgum*⁶ for, to bow or cringe to the common people, as canvassers would do.

10. *Invocation* seems to be desiring assistance, intercession; though, in fact, it has occasioned formal *worship*.

11. The word "*fond*," is not modern, but the meaning
130 of it appears sufficiently from the Latin⁷ "*futilis*." The word occurs in the Rhemish Testament twice⁸. "*A fond thing*"—in the *singular* number: the system of doctrines (as before) is reckoned as *one* single doctrine.

"Vainly invented,"—"inanitè conficta,"—foolish and unfounded; in the eye of *reason*. This seems contradistinguished to "grounded upon no warrant of *Scripture*."

12. "But *rather* repugnant"—immò, which we should now translate *nay*—*nay* "rather repugnant to the word of God." We had this word in the thirteenth⁹ Article, in the same sense. In our Latin, the expression is, "*immò verbo Dei contradicit*"—in that of 1552, "*imò verbo Dei perniciosè contradicit*;"—though the *English* is the same in both; which indeed might be the reason why the Convocation of 1562 left out "*perniciosè*;"—or there might be other reasons.

13. We have now gone through the Article, in the way of explanation; but it seems proper to mention the Popish distinction between *λατρεία*, and *δουλεία*, and *ὑπερδουλεία*;—as also that between *image* and *idol*. The Romanists, wishing to avoid the charge of idolatry, have said, that there are
131 different sorts of adoration; *λατρεία* is that which is due to God; *δουλεία* that which is due to man; *ὑπερδουλεία* that which is due to Christ in his human nature, or to his Mother, the blessed *Virgin*. Augustin has something of the distinction between *λατρεία* and *δουλεία*, and uses *servitus* often; but he

⁵ Cooper's Thesaurus.

⁶ Ainsworth's Dictionary.

⁷ I cannot help comparing *fond* with the French *fou, folle*: they seem to have been used much in the same way—to express want of *understanding*, and want of *prudence*, and being under the influence of passion, not controlled by reason. The Council of Trent blames those who hold, "*stultum esse*," to pray to saints, sess. 25, p. 203, bottom. As this session was in 1563, it might aim at the Article made in 1552; or at some con-

fession of Reformers to the same purpose.

⁸ More strictly, the word *fond* occurs in *Fulke* on the Rhemish Testament, folio 224. I say *folio*, as only every other page is numbered.

⁹ Art. xiii. sect. 15. Bishop Hallifax has expressed the same thing in his eleventh sermon on Prophecy. "All the observances mentioned here are not only not commanded in Scripture, but are in direct violation of it." P. 351.

does not mention ὑπερδουλεία, nor is it in any Greek author. IV. Augustin was a Latin Father, and might know but little of the Greek language. I do not see any foundation for the distinction between λατρεία and δουλεία, except that λατρεία is more frequently used for *serving* God than δουλεία. Λάτρις is a servant, and δούλος is a servant. I should guess that the λάτρις was more ingenuous than the δούλος, but they, or their derivatives, seem to be used interchangeably¹; and sometimes in Scripture λατρεύειν is used for serving *men*², and δουλεύειν for serving God³. But it is proper to mention in what senses the Romanists use these words, whether they be right or wrong.

With the same view, of avoiding the charge of idolatry, the Romanists blame us for not making distinction enough between *image* and *idol*—between εἰκὼν, I suppose, or *simulacrum*, (the word of the Vulgate,) and εἶδωλον. It seems the English Testament had once, instead of “Little children, keep yourselves from *idols* ⁴,”—little children, keep yourselves from *images*⁵. Εἶδωλον in Greek seems to be used for any resemblance⁶ or effigy; but *idol*, in English, does seem to mean a visible object which has divine *worship* paid to it. The authors of the Rhemish Testament say thus⁷, “*neither every idol is an image, nor every image an idol.*” That every image, or resemblance, is not an idol, that is, not worshipped, is clear enough; as well as that an image *may* be an idol. The second commandment forbids making a graven *image*, or the *likeness* of any being⁸, in order to *bow down* to it, or *serve* it. But I feel some doubt whether all idols are not *made* for images, that is, resemblances, even though they have no original really existing. There is no such animal as a *dragon*, yet those who made the *idol* called by that name⁹ might have some rude belief that there was such an animal. 132

Peter Lombard (from Origen)¹⁰ seems to make an idol the copy of something only *fancied*; an *image* he understands to

¹ Compare Rom. i. 25, with Gal. iv. 8. Compare also the sayings of Tigranes and his wife, in the third Book of Xenophon's Cyropædia, pp. 144, 147, 8vo. Forbes, VII. i, mentions them, from Valla, and has more on the subject.

² Deut. xxviii. 48. Lev. xxiii. 7, 8. Exod. xii. 16.—Ἔργον λατρευτῶν.

³ Matt. vi. 24. Ro n. vi. 22. See par-

ticularly 1 Thess. i. 9, in the Greek.

⁴ Conclusion of 1 John.

⁵ See Rhemists on the passage.

⁶ Or a ghost. See Greek primitives, under εἶδω.

⁷ On the same place, 1 John v. 21.

⁸ Exod. xx. 4, 5.

⁹ Apocrypha.

¹⁰ Lib. III. dist. 37, B.

IV. be a resemblance of something *real*. According to this, no image could be called an idol. The LXX. says, *οὐ ποιήσεις σεαντῶ εἰδωλον, οὐδὲ παντὸς ὁμοίωμα*: if here the *εἰδωλον* is one thing, and the *ὁμοίωμα* another, (which does not seem to me the meaning,) then again a *likeness* cannot be called an *idol*. Yet, in customary speech, any substance seems to be called an idol which is an object of religious *worship*¹¹. But in whatever sense we take the words, these observations will have the same
133 tendency to cut off disputes, and to prevent the Romanists from blaming us.

14. We come now to *proof*. This might afford us a number of propositions if we carried it to its utmost length; for we should then have to shew, that the system of doctrines here mentioned is not founded on reason; that every text of Scripture produced in its support is invalid; and then, that some texts of Scripture are repugnant to it. And this we should have to shew also of the five particulars: Purgatory, Indulgences, Worship of Images, Worship of Relics, and Invocation of Saints. We will be as brief as possible.

15. First, concerning the Article *in general*. ‘The *set* of doctrines condemned in it are not, on a *general* view, founded in reason, or warranted by Scripture.’

When religion possesses the mind, so that the devout affections are strong, they are apt, if not very carefully regulated, to draw the mind imperceptibly into folly and absurdity. For a while such folly may be encouraged; but ere long it will be lamented by every wise and disinterested person. A good man must indeed venerate, in some degree, every thing that springs from religion, even to its very faults; he therefore will not restrain even what he cannot approve, nay, he is afraid to destroy religious principles, though erroneous. But when we may judge freely, we see that such folly is a more important evil than some men think it. When it consists in taking presumptions for facts, and acting upon them, we can see that it is nothing less than man’s taking upon him to be the Author of Revelation; which may produce any evils whatever. When
134 it consists in forming acts of affection into a system of religious ordinances, we can see that the effusions of our best passions, though not condemned at the moment, naturally

¹¹ See also abridgment of H. Stephens, under *Εἰδωλον*. In Stephens himself this is the *ecclesiastical* sense: there are in-

stances of *εἰδωλον* and *εἰκων* being used as synonymous.

excite an ingenuous shame on a calm review, and are much too IV. frivolous to be collected into a *code*, and made *duties*; though, in some cases, their frivolousness can be better felt than demonstrated. When religious folly consists in enlivening the affections towards invisible objects by the use of visible representations of them, we can see that the attention gets more and more fixed on what meets the senses, and continually more detached from that which is invisible; till the judgment is perverted, and the mind debased. That Christians should be *Anthropomorphites* without such imitations, may surprise us; but we see plainly, that all attempts to enliven devotion by their means, have a strong tendency to confound the ideas of God and man in the human mind.

Lastly, when religious folly consists in unreserved dependence on the power of an interested priest to punish or forgive, we can see, that what might have been a reasonable ground of hope and confidence to a dejected penitent, becomes a temptation to sin.

These observations are calculated to shew, that the *set* of doctrines before us, considered in a general view, are not founded in *reason*; we are next to shew that they are not warranted by *Scripture*. We find several passages of Holy writ which shew a kind of jealousy of what men might call *improving* upon Christianity;—as 1 Cor. iii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Gal. i. 8, 9; Eph. iv. 14; Col. ii. 8; 2 Tim. i. 13, or Jude 3; and Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

And I seem to see many passages which intimate that human appointments may be carried so far as to disappoint 135 their own purposes;—as Matt. xv. 1—9¹. Jewish ordinances seemed, probably, *improvements*, at the time they were made.

And particularly we find passages which might guard us against making our Christian *worship* to be performed in any way by means of the *senses*:—John iv. 24; Gal. iii. 3².

I suppose, that if the Jews had made a statue of Moses³, and, using solemn gestures before that, had invoked Moses, and desired him once more to mediate between God and

¹ Art. vii. sect. 4. One might also consider Art. xiv. about *will-worship*. Bishop Hurd, Proph. p. 393, speaks of will-worship as an opprobrious name: not so Dr. Hammond.

² Those who took notes at Lecture should be informed that some texts in

this section were omitted for want of time; and the whole of sect. 13th by mistake.

³ The Melchisedecians are said to have had a statue of Moses, in Arabia, and to have worshipped it. Epiphanius. *Hær.* 55. Rhein. Test. on Heb. ix. sect. 4. Fulke.

IV. them⁴, they would have broken the second commandment. It seems probable that they were forbidden to make to themselves the likeness of anything in heaven or earth, because it would gradually have disposed their minds to idolatry.

16. From these general proofs of the Article, we pass on to some more *particular*. And first of *purgatory*. That there is such a state of purification, by suffering, after death, appears inadmissible, because it seems unreasonable that we should be expected to allow what is wholly passed over, when it was most likely to be noticed. In Matt. xxv. we have only two states mentioned, and they were both "prepared" without
136 any hint of any temporary sufferings to the "blessed." The same might be observed of other passages. If such a state as purgatory is to be allowed by all men, is it not unaccountable that Christians should have been so long ignorant of it⁵? Its being admitted at last may be accounted for, from the notions of the ancients, from its suiting the wishes and alleviating the fears of the people, and from its being lucrative to the sacred orders.

In order to prove that purgatory is "grounded on no warrant of *Scripture*," one should examine all the texts alleged in support of it: this would be what we have called indirect proof. These texts (out of the *New Testament*) may be found in the *Rhemish Testament*, and all in *Veneer*⁶ on this Article. But they seem to me to have so little weight, that I may safely venture to omit them, referring to Bishop Porteus⁷ for a specimen. Indeed, some of them have been explained, in our discussions, or in Bishop Pearson on the Descent into Hell.

The last thing with regard to purgatory is to shew, that the notion of it is "*repugnant* to the word of God." This we should call direct proof; the negative form of the Article makes here a trifling difference.

⁴ Exod. xxxii. 11, 32.—Numb. xvi. 22, 46, &c. See also Deut. v. 5, and Lev. xxvi. 46, though the two last relate only to mediation concerning the law.

⁵ See a passage from Bishop Fisher at the conclusion of this Article.

⁶ Texts for purgatory copied from Veneer, p. 460, on this Article; only the order changed: some seem to be false

prints:—Exod. i. 15. Numb. xiv. 32, 33. 1 Sam. iii. 2 Kings i. Psalm lxxvi. 12. Isaiah ix. 18. Mich. vii. 8, 9. Zech. ix. 11. Mal. iii. 3. Matt. v. 22; v. 25, 26; xii. 32. Luke xxxii. 42 (qu. 22?) Acts ii. 24. 1 Cor. iii. 15; xv. 29. Phil. ii. 10. James ii. 25 (qu. 13?). 1 Pet. iii. 19. 1 John v. 16.

⁷ Bishop Porteus, p. 48.

Now under the twelfth Article it was shewn, that what are IV. popularly called the good actions of a Christian, though imper- 137 fect, are “pleasing and acceptable to God, in Christ.” If so, there is no need of *suffering*. That our forgiveness through Christ is *immediate*, the Scriptures¹ declare, as is shewn by Bishop Burnet on this Article. I will therefore conclude my proof with 1 John i. 7,—“the blood of Jesus Christ”... “cleanseth us from *all* sin.”

17. In the next place we should prove, of the Doctrine of *Pardons*, or Indulgences, that it is unfounded in reason, and has no warrant of Scripture, but is even repugnant to it.

In the way of reasoning, it appears that the doctrine of pardons is groundless, because their business is to dispense the treasures of *merits* amassed by works of *supererogation*; whereas under the fourteenth Article it was shewn that there are no such works, and, of consequence, no such treasures to dispense. The effect also of indulgences is to relieve souls out of *purgatory*; whereas we have just now shewn that the existence of such a state is not admissible.

This doctrine is not warranted by Scripture, because the passages alleged in its support are only those², as I conceive, which appoint the governors of the Church to be the *agents* of Christ. Now all appointments of agents must be understood with this limitation, so long as they act in the *character* of agents. If an agent undeniably and grossly exceeds his commission, his principal is never obliged to ratify his acts. Being the agent of God for the purpose of conducting religious society, does not make man to be God—any more than an embassy makes an ambassador to be a sovereign.

This doctrine is repugnant to 2 Thess. ii. 4, without con- 138 sidering that passage as predictive of Popery. Whatever state it foretells, that state is a wrong one.

18. The next subject which occurs is the worshipping of *images*. And first we should reason on the subject, in order to see whether it has any foundation. But something has been already said on the effect of images on the mind³. The use of them has been shewn to be attended with danger of debasing our religious sentiments and principles. Disputes relating to the use of them are kept up by the various degrees of adoration; but our Article takes the degree actually *subsisting* at

¹ Heb. ix. 27.² Matt. xvi. 19. John xx. 23.³ Sect. 4 and 14.

IV. the time it was made; this was *cultus religiosus*—to which our former observations are applicable. The only forcible argument for the use of images seems to be, that which is contained in the favourite expression, ‘Images and pictures are the *books of the unlearned*’⁴. And it is true that delineations are less arbitrary than words, strike more quickly, convey ideas to more persons;—more easily seize a reluctant attention⁵. No
 139 one will hear me speak anything but praise of Macklin’s Bible, or of the charming west window at New College Chapel. I am sure any reasonable Protestant may receive good from the contemplation of them; but then it is because they have not the least connection, in his mind, with *worship*. The *Papists* use resemblances as *media* in the very *act* of worshipping. If I was called upon to gaze upon the best statue or picture in the world, as the means of heightening my *devotion* in prayer, I should turn aside from it: a *west* window cannot well be intended for such a purpose. Take then the books of the unlearned into their proper place, and there they may be studied with profit, and without danger.

I am happy to find *Augustin* expressing himself in the manner he does on this subject:—“Et Idola quidem omni sensu carere quis dubitet? Verum tamen cum his locantur sedibus, honorabili sublimitate, ut a precantibus atque immolantibus attendantur, ipsâ similitudine animatorum membrorum atque sensuum, quamvis insensata et exanima, afficiunt infirmos animos, ut vivere et spirare videantur: accedente præsertim veneratione multitudinis, quâ tantus eis cultus impenditur⁶.” This passage finely describes the bad tendency of images when used as *media* in worship, and would be an answer to all that

⁴ Rhem. Test. on John v. 21. Comber, in his advice to Engl. Papists, p. 85, quotes this as a saying of “Porphy. apud Euseb. Præpar. Evang. Lib. III.”

⁵ Mr. Collier, once high sheriff of the Isle of Ely, told me, that, in order to get the jail at Ely repaired, he had presented to the privy council *drawings* of the prisoners, loaded with more irons, &c. than would have been needful to secure them, had the jail been properly repaired; and expressing their feelings by their countenances and attitudes. Without this measure he had despaired of gaining the attention of the privy council at that time. It was doubtful whether the

Bishop of Ely was obliged to keep the jail in repair. The scheme, I have understood, produced an early decision from the privy council, to the great alleviation of the sufferings of those under confinement at that place.

⁶ August. Ep. 102. al. 49. (Sid. Y—1—1, p. 212,) note 18. In answer to six questions from pagans, this is the third; about abolishing rites. It is commended by Lardner, Works, vol. VIII. p. 239, note. It gives one a good idea of the conversion of pagans to Christianity—I mean, that their conversion was made on good grounds.

is urged by the Papists about the people being *taught* that IV. there is no Divinity in them¹, nor any trust to be placed in them—even supposing no adoration paid them which could properly be called religious.

The Romanists betray a consciousness of something wrong 140 with respect to the worship of images, by leaving the second commandment out of the Decalogue. This was mentioned under the seventh Article².

Nor is there any warrant in Scripture for worshipping images, in any sense. The only passage urged, which seems at all worth mentioning, is that in the Book of Exodus³, where God commands Moses to make some forms called *cherubims* on the mercy-seat; but these were not (as far as is known to man) images, but *emblems*⁴. There was no danger of the people's worshipping them, because the people never came into the place where they were, and the high priest only once a year. Jehovah never bound *himself* to order nothing sensible to be used in the Jewish worship: he only said, "*thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.*" Even under Christianity, water, bread, wine, all objects of the senses, are used in worship—all emblematically; but they are not objects of worship; neither do they contain any *likeness* of any thing in heaven or in earth.

Thirdly, the worship of images may be said to be even repugnant to Scripture. It seems indeed as if the sacred writers could not possibly have the precise case of Popish images before them; and therefore we can only reason and infer from Scriptures intended for cases of like nature; but Deut. xxvii. 15, and Psalm xcvi. 7, should not be of less force under Christianity than under Judaism. They do indeed speak of the idols of heathens, immediately; but whether Romish worship of images be idolatry or not, the progress 141 of the mind from worshipping the invisible object, to worshipping the visible image, is so much the same, whatever be the resemblance, or its original, that every prohibition of worshipping images, should be considered as reaching every case in which a resemblance has anything to do with religious worship. If this be just, worship of images is, at

¹ Trent. sess. 25. See also Rhem. Test. on Acts xvii. 29.

² Art. vii. sect. 13. end. Exod. xxv. 18.

⁴ Parkhurst, Hebr. Lex. כְּרֻבִים, may make the cherubims to be thought emblems, even by those who do not come into every idea of his.

IV. least, discouraged, by a great number of passages in the Old Testament.

In Deut. iv. 12, 15, particularly ver. 16, Jehovah seems to let us into the *grounds* of his prohibitions; and they must be always of force. Those who make a likeness of anything, are said, ver. 16, to *corrupt themselves*.

And with regard to the *New Testament*, St. Paul's reasoning with the *Athenians*⁵ seems to imply that Christians ought not, now that times of ignorance are past, to make use of any sensible *media* in worship, though to an invisible or "*unknown God*;"—that using such is not doing all we can to worship God in Spirit. We may also observe, that whatever only tends to make us change "the glory of the incorruptible God into an image," or worship "the creature more than the Creator"⁶, is carefully to be avoided, even on scriptural authority; nay, on the authority of the New Testament.

19. The next subject is that of worshipping *relics*. In the degree in which it prevails its futility is palpable, and its tendency to promote infidelity has been mentioned⁷. Whatever associates Christianity with contempt has some effect in making Christianity contemptible. It seems *Calvin*⁸ proposed that an *inventory* should be published of Popish relics. No proposal can be more fair. Such inventory would be all the proof we could want that "the Romish Doctrine" "is a fond thing."

The Romish Doctrine about relics is not warranted by Scripture. One text alleged is Matt. ix. 22; but the woman cured did not *adore* the hem of our Saviour's garment: she thought nothing about it; nor was she cured by virtue of any relic; her *faith* made her whole.

Another text is Acts xix. 12. There is a great eagerness described to get handkerchiefs, &c. from St. Paul. It shewed faith, or an high opinion of his supernatural power. It might be weak, though natural; it might succeed, on account of the disposition which it implied; and yet such a flight might not be meant as the ground of a perpetual observance. To *copy* such things is silly and childish. That Paul should perform miracles on those who were at a distance from him rather surprises us at first; but if God thought fit that it should be so,

⁵ Acts xvii.

⁶ Rom. i. 23, 25.

⁷ Sect. 5.

⁸ See Fulke on Rhem. Test. Acts xix.

12, folio 221, from "Calvin's admonition concerning reliques."

distance probably would occasion no additional difficulty; and IV. we can conceive that such distance would strengthen the evidence in some respects. And then it seems probable, from a comparison with our Saviour's mode of performing miraculous cures, that the cure would be connected with the person who performed it, by some visible tokens¹. At present *we* believe that miracles have ceased.—Another text is Heb. ix. 4; but the things laid up in that case were *records*. Reason and divine authority conspired in dictating that they should be preserved. And the genuineness of the relics is indisputable. 143 I do not suppose that the *Jews* pretend to any relics *now*. If they did, and worshipped them, the case would be a case in point. The care shewn in Scripture to give decent *burial* to our Lord, St. Stephen, &c. will not, I trust, convert any one to the Romish doctrine of relics.

As to its being repugnant to Scripture, I will content myself with saying, that the texts brought to prove the doctrine of *images* so, may be applied in such a manner as to be sufficient for any one's conviction. Saint Paul would probably have said of this error as he does of some others, had he been witness of it, "refuse profane and old wives' fables," and exercise "thyself rather unto godliness²."

20. The last part of our proof relates to invocation of *saints*. That it is foolish, in the degree in which we speak of it, (according to what was said in the historical part and explanation,) appears from the endeavours of the Romanists to explain it away³.

Saints cannot hear all who invoke them; this has been observed before. As to the notion that the angels⁴ employ themselves in *informing* the saints of what good Catholics address to them, I dare say you will excuse me if I do not attempt to disprove it: it proves to me that the doctrine of the invocation of saints wants support⁵.

Experience, I think, will shew, that the lower the objects 144 of our religious addresses are, the lower will be the turn of our

¹ Mark vii. 33.

² 1 Tim. iv. 7.

³ Compare Midd. Preface, p. 50, with p. 156 of his Letter, and many other parts. And see *Bossuet*, quoted by Bishop Hurd, Proph. p. 386.

⁴ End of sect. 6. from Forbes, VII. i. 21.

⁵ I think Epiphanius's reasoning about

the *Virgin* is well worth mentioning: *Εἰ γὰρ Ἀγγέλους προσκύνεισθαι οὐ θέλει (θεὸς), πόσω μᾶλλον τὴν ἀπὸ Ἄννης γεγενημένην; Hær. 79. (Collyridians) sect. v. In sect. vii. he says, Τὴν Μαρτὶὰν μηδεὶς προσκυνεῖτω: and near the end of the Hær. ἡ Μαρία ἐν τιμῇ, ὁ Κύριος προσκυνεῖσθω.*

IV. religious sentiments; and the less will they be directed to the all-perfect Being. We may say of the invocation of saints, as of purgatory, that its being admitted, can be accounted for, without supposing it to be well founded.

In the next place, the doctrine of the invocation of saints is not warranted by Scripture. Origen thought it possible, that "some will be redeemed by the blood of martyrs⁶." This does not certainly imply the invocation of them; but it is contrary to an observation of our own in a preceding Article⁷. The texts in favour of our present doctrine are much of the same stamp with those for that of purgatory; and I shall beg leave to use the same method with them all⁸, except those which direct men to intercede for each other, as 1 Thess. v. 25; 1 Tim. ii. 1; and James v. 16. Now it being allowed, from these, and others, that man ought to intercede for men, and that one man may desire or call upon another to do so, is it not to be believed that saints in heaven intercede for men, and that men may invoke them in order to beg their intercession? Bishop Hurd has thought this objection worthy of a very attentive consideration, and he has answered it at length in his eleventh
 145 Sermon on Prophecy⁹. Bishop Porteus has answered it briefly¹⁰, according to his plan. I would wish you to read these answers; and therefore I will only say, if we may conclude, that saints are incapable of hearing our invocations, the whole business is at an end. If that be not allowed, I then reason thus: our not being told that we are to promote intercession among saints in heaven, when we are repeatedly told that we are to promote it on earth¹¹, seems a strong argument that no such thing is expected of us, or proper for us. Still if men are determined to persist, and say that they can reason by analogy from earth to heaven, the proper analogy seems to me to be this: as Christians are required to intercede for each other on earth, so it is probable that saints and angels intercede for each other in heaven; and this notion is confirmed by reasons of utility. It is certainly very useful, in a moral light, that men should intercede for each other¹²: it improves the mind of each inter-

⁶ Lardner's Works, vol. II. p. 462.

⁷ Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 4.

⁸ A specimen collected from Rhem. Test. Luke xvi. 9. Acts v. 15; vii. 60. 2 Cor. i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 15. 1 John ii. 1. Apoc. v. 8; vi. 10.

⁹ Hurd on Prophecy, p. 386, &c.

¹⁰ Bishop Porteus's Brief Confutation, p. 23.

¹¹ Consider Matt. xviii. 19, in this view.

¹² Dr. Ogden on Prayer and Intercession treats this subject.

cessor; it promotes mutually beneficent principles, which effect IV. the general good; besides, that placing our benevolence before God, viewing it in the light of his countenance, must needs make it of a right sort. But the intercession of one rank for another has not the same effects; nor can frail ignorant men on earth give their attention to creatures in heaven, in a state quite out of the reach of their knowledge, without great danger of a romantic and superstitious religion.

I will now proceed to the last thing in our proof: to shew, that the Romish doctrine of the Invocation of Saints is even repugnant, in some degree, to the Scripture. It does not seem 146 that the sacred writers had, or could have, the doctrine immediately in their view, and therefore there may be no direct prohibition of it made in so many words; but the silence being on both sides, is much in our favour; if nothing be said, there is nothing to be done;—especially when we are told that we may ourselves use importunity with our heavenly Lord¹. The heavenly creatures are called our fellow-servants, Rev. xix. 10, and xxii. 9, and elsewhere.

The Romanists have indeed said, that *dulia* is nevertheless due to them, from Gal. v. 13; but the *δουλεία* there mentioned is clearly mutual; and indeed means only mutual kind offices—*διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης*.

Bishop Hurd considers², after Mede, the Romanists as guilty of the dæmon-worship mentioned 1 Tim. iv. 1. And Bishop Hallifax³, after Mr. Mede and Bishop Newton, applies to them Dan. xi. 38, according to the marginal reading; Mahuzzim (𐤌𐤓𐤕) being interpreted Protectors, or tutelary Deities, and considered as including saints and angels. The texts of the New Testament would have an immediate reference to the oriental philosophy, and the spiritual beings which it supposed, as was shewn at the end of the first Book; but from those texts we may form a tolerable judgment what the Apostles would have said about the popish saints. This seems the proper idea with which we should read Col. ii. 18. 23; 1 Tim. i. 4, and iv. 1, &c⁵. I conclude with 1 Tim. ii. 5: 147
“There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ.”

¹ Matt. vii. 7. Luke xi. 8, 9.

² On Prophecy, p. 386.

³ On Prophecy, p. 352.

⁴ From 𐤓, or 𐤓: Parkhurst's account is under 𐤓. In Walton's Polyglott the

word is not interpreted. Lowth, on the place, prefers Mede's translation.

⁵ Col. ii. 23, will occur again under Art. xxxii. Indeed, it has already occurred.

IV. 21. If we say anything in the way of *application*, it shall be concerning the *mutual concessions* which might be conceived to take place, supposing the contending parties were perfectly candid: indeed, from mutual concessions must of course arise *improvements*. I always wish, whilst I am engaged in controversy, that some respectable adversary were present; in order that personal respect might prevent anything illiberal from being thrown out.

It has not been sufficiently observed in the controversies on this Article, that he who refuses to admit a doctrine does not of course deny it. It may be wrong, in some cases, either to adopt or reject a notion⁶. A man says, you will allow that the planets are inhabited; the proper answer is, I neither allow it nor deny it. It seems probable from analogy that they may be; and I should think any man narrow-minded who made himself sure that they were not; but the moment you build anything upon such a supposition, I declare your building to be without foundation. We say indeed that purgatory, &c. are repugnant to Scripture; but we do not mean to any express declaration belonging immediately to the doctrine. This might possibly have some effect in reconciling. Would *Dupin* have been content with saying, it *may* be needful for our souls to be purified after death? and would our Church say the same? Might it be said, the saints in heaven may
148 possibly know something of our actions? this would have effect. What else do we say of particular judgments of God? How do I know but this event may be a judgment? Such a question is enough to make us think, and to learn righteousness: more would be presumption and superstition.

It seems, at first, a strange thing to have the rituals, canons, councils⁷, of a church, so different from "the private writings of her divines," as we find them in the Church of Rome: but this may perhaps be nothing more than that some Romanists are more improved than others; that the ignorant people go on in the old tract, which was first made in times of darkness and superstition; and that the enlightened, though they dare not disturb the minds of the lower people, endeavour, in their own persons, to make the old doctrines as little absurd as possible; and endeavour to dwell on what is right, and soften what is wrong.

⁶ Art. xviii. sect. 9.

⁷ Hurd on Prophecy, p. 348.

In our Church many a parish-clerk has readings and customs IV. which we cannot justify, though we let him go on; and the common people have superstitions which are not the doctrine of our Church. Our Church was formed by the best and ablest of men at the revival of learning, and consisted of reformatations of abuses, as far as it differed from all others; and all its members who are tolerably educated must be upon much the same footing.

Now if this be the case, many popish errors will disappear as the people improve; and the fire of purgatory will gradually go out. Even councils, canons and rituals, may grow obsolete, and at last “vanish away¹.” We may hope to see this improvement take place first in our countrymen of the Romish persuasion. 149

A change might, in case of improvement, take place particularly in what is called *adoration*. The ceremonies of bowing, kissing things animate and inanimate, and even of kneeling², are arbitrary, in a great degree. At this time, or at any other, I suppose English Papists might not use all the same gestures with Italians, though equally superstitious, before images and pictures.

It has been said that no reconciliation need be attempted between Papists and Protestants in those doctrines which are the occasions of accumulating wealth³; but the clergy are by no means so corrupt as they used to be; and the Pope raises much less from his followers than formerly. I do not think that the God of this world has so blinded the minds (2 Cor. iv. 4.) of Englishmen, Protestants or Catholics, as to make them persist long in errors merely because they are lucrative.

As Bishop Fisher confirms, in an artless way, several things which we have had occasion to observe, I will transcribe a passage from his refutation of Luther⁴:—

“Multos fortasse movet *indulgentiis* istis non usque adeò fidere quòd eorum usus in Ecclesià videatur *recentior*, et admodum serò apud Christianos repertus: quibus ego respondeo, non certò constare a quo primùm tradi cœperint: fuit tamen *nonnullus* earum usus, ut aiunt, apud Romanos vetustissimus, quod ex stationibus⁵ intelligi potest:” And he adds, 150

¹ Heb. viii. 13.

² One of the canons of the Council of Nice forbids, I think, kneeling at prayer.

³ Art. xiv. sect. 7.

⁴ Art. xviii. (p. 496) in Forbes xii. viii. 31.

⁵ There is something about *stations* in Bingham, xiii. ix. 2; & Forbes, xii. viii. 14.

IV. “Nemo certè dubitat orthodoxus an *purgatorium* sit, de quo tamen *apud priscos nulla, vel quàm rarissima, fiebat mentio* : sed et *Græcis* ad hunc usque Diem non est creditum *esse* : quamdiù enim nulla fuerat de *purgatorio* cura, nemo quæsivit *indulgentias* ; nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum existimatio : *si tollas purgatorium quorsùm indulgentiis opus erit?* cæperunt igitur indulgentiæ postquam ad *purgatorii* cruciatus aliquamdiù *trepidatum* est.”

Bishop Fisher was Chancellor of this University, preceptor to Henry VIII., a principal writer against Luther, a cardinal, and Bishop of Rochester : he chose rather to suffer death than to permit any one but the Pope to make him Archbishop of Canterbury.

ARTICLE XXIII.

OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

1. It seems needful, even for the purpose of offering our historical reflections, to consider first, in what “ministering” consists. In “preaching,” baptizing, presiding at the Lord's supper. These are all the particulars mentioned in our Article ; but yet we usually include reading prayers, or praying, marrying, and burying. So that to mention any of these occasionally, will not be thought beyond our purpose. Indeed the sacraments are treated of in the following Articles ; therefore we must endeavour to say nothing of them here, which may with more propriety be introduced hereafter.

Our subject is, the obligation which Christians are under to take *Orders* before they perform any public act of an ecclesiastical minister ; or, as it is somewhere expressed, not to do any such act “*self-ordered*.”

In reviewing *historical* facts, we must pass over the conduct of the Apostles and other inspired men; because that will make part of our *proof*. 152

2. The *Apostolic Fathers* speak constantly as if those who ministered had received a regular commission to minister. *Clement* of Rome, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, a work always held genuine, is what I should call copious on the subject of ministers; not proving anything formally about their commission, but taking it for granted. One sees from this work that the Corinthian church had *ejected* some ministers; for which he blames them.—*Polycarp* speaks of the *qualifications* of good ministers: he mentions also Valens's having been dismissed from the presbytery. He writes to the *Philippians*.—*Ignatius*, writing to the church at *Ephesus*, speaks of that church as very *well governed*; and says a good deal on the subject of *episcopal* authority. And to the church of *Smyrna* he says, (sect. 8):

Ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἠγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὐσα, ἣ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ.

To which we may add, that the distinction between Clergy and *Laity* (Κληρὸς and Λαϊκοί) was known in the time of Clemens Romanus¹, and expressed in the same words in which it has been expressed ever since.

The *continuance* of a regularly appointed clergy appears undeniably from the *Roman Laws* concerning them. Concerning their *revenues*, arising from various successions, contributions, &c.—their peculiar *punishments*, and the modes of life and *employments* which were permitted them;—of all these *Bingham* gives an account, in the fifth, sixth, and seventeenth Books of his *Antiquities*.

3. Things seem to have gone on in much the same train, with some exceptions which need not be mentioned, till the *twelfth century*. Then the corruptions prevailing in the Church began to set some men of good minds and simple manners upon separating from the main body of their Christian brethren. These were called *Waldenses*. They lived in the mountainous country of Piedmont, bordering upon France, in the *Vaudois*²; and seem to have had chiefly in view to bring 153

¹ Bingham's *Antiquities*. Clem. ad Cor. i. 5, end of sect. 40, ὁ λαϊκὸς ἀνθρώπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται.

² See Maclaine's Note on Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist. Cent. xii. 11. v. 11, 12.*

These valleys were called Vaudois, on account of the Waldenses, or Vaudois, coming to inhabit them. Their head, Petrus Waldus, or *Vaud*: Cave says, Petrus Waldius, that is, of Waldi. Mo-

IV back the Church of Christ to its *primitive simplicity*. In order to do that, they would have a great deal of church power to prune away; and so it is said that they held that any man might, in some degree, exhort and expound. Yet it is also said that they had something in the way of our three ranks—I mean, of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. In truth, the age in which they lived, and their own obscurity, though they were very numerous, have left many doubts concerning them. Their descendants still remain in the same country; and Protestants have been called upon, not many years ago, to relieve them when under persecution.

154 4. At the time of the *Reformation*, the usual appointments of ministers continued in the Church of Rome, and in the Church of England; but in some countries abroad, on bishops³ refusing to ordain those who were separating from the Romish Church, they had recourse to ordination by *elders*, or presbyters; which kind of ordination has continued ever since in those countries, and was transferred from thence into *Scotland* by John *Knox*⁴.

In the Church of Rome, *Ordo* being made a sacrament, it will occur under the twenty-fifth Article. The Romanists boast of a regular succession of bishops, from St. Peter down to the present time; but some Protestants have conceived themselves able to prove⁵ that they had full as good a claim to such an honour. The subject is much too complicated for us to meddle with; and may belong to the thirty-sixth Article rather than this; or perhaps not be at all necessary.

sheim says, we must *distinguish* carefully between Waldenses and Vaudois; but Maclaine opposes this.

The Waldenses are sometimes called *Albigenses*, but Mosheim makes *Albigenses* to mean some *Paulicians*, or *Manicheans*, in the 11th Century, from *Albigia*, or *Alby* in France. See Mosh. Cent. xi. Part II. Chap. v. sect. 2, 3. with the Notes of Maclaine, who differs from Mosheim. When differences arise, relative to matters not essential, between persons of character, who have studied those matters, we generally content ourselves with stating briefly the different opinions maintained.

³ Heylin's Tracts, p. 228.

⁴ Baxter pleads for the legality of or-

dination by presbyters; but, in strictness, he does not seem to bring an instance of it, except in cases of necessity. On Councils, p. 485. Bishop *Horne* declares against ordination by presbyters, and maintains the necessity of a *succession* of ordaining ministers. Charge 1791, p. 23.

⁵ Baxter on Councils, p. 471, sect. viii. and p. 484, Prop. vi. Burnet on the Validity of English Ordinations. Neal, i. p. 502, bottom, quarto. Heylin's History of Episcopacy. Archbishop *Bramhall* has a work on this subject, which may be good; see the account in his *Life*, Biogr. Britan. note (u); or his *works* in folio.

5. *Socinus* found a difficulty arising from the Reformation. IV. Some of his friends urged¹, that by that event the Church (considered externally as a visible society) was *collapsed*, or fallen to ruins; and that no less power could rebuild it than had built it originally;—that is, a supernatural *miraculous*² 155 power must again be displayed on earth, otherwise no man could ever have the satisfaction of thinking that he was a member of the true Church of Christ.

This was not a notion to be borne by one who was just establishing a new religion, or sect; *Socinus* therefore combats it strenuously. Any assembly, he holds, may form themselves into a *church*; as to succession, and election after any particular mode, they are nothing. Even in the time of the Apostles, men not admitted into Christianity, and no way commissioned, might preach the word of their own accord³; much more may a Christian expound now, when Christianity is established. General consent is all that is wanted.

As to the *Lord's Supper*, any set of Christians may meet and *break bread* together; and *Baptism* may be changed into any other mode of admitting one's name into the list of Christians; or even being *brought up* by Christian parents is sufficient of itself. But *Socinus* does not inform his friend *Radecius* how all this is to be carried into *execution* with decency and order;—how competition and confusion are to be avoided, or presumptuous folly prevented from stopping the mouth of modest sense. The same defect is observable in the *Racovian Catechism*. There, innocence of life, and fitness to teach, are mentioned as qualifications⁴, but it is not said who is to be judge whether any particular man possesses them.

6. The Popish yoke removed, men found more liberty 156 than they used to any good purpose. *Fanatic* teachers sprung up, and assumed a variety of strange forms. It is not worth while to mention every short-lived freak; but, taking all the time between the Reformation and the beginning of this eighteenth century, there seem to be three leading ideas, besides our own, with regard to the ministerial office:—

One, that the authority to execute it was to come immediately from heaven. Another, that it was to be given by a

¹ *Socinus's* third Epistle to *Matt. Radecius*: Works, vol. i. fol. p. 380, &c. (or *Fratres Poloni*) pp. 383, 384.

² One objection to ministers which *Baxter* answers, is "You work no mi-

racles." On Councils, p. 472.

³ *Socinus* refers here to Acts viii. 4, and xi. 19, &c.

⁴ *De Ecclesiâ Christi*, cap. ii. p. 241.

IV. senate, or council of *elders*, or *presbyters*: both these allowed it to extend to *several* congregations. But the third idea was, that church authority was of a confined nature, and belonged only to one *single congregation*, the members of which conferred it by *election*. The first was the idea of all sorts of *Mystics*;—of the Familists, or Family of Love⁵, in Queen Elizabeth's time; and afterwards of those mystics who were called *Seekers*⁶, and of the *Quakers* in the time of Oliver Cromwell. The second was the idea of the *Presbyterians*, before briefly mentioned⁷; the third was the idea of the *Independents*, who looked upon each separate congregation as a separate church. The *Brownists*⁸, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, did not make a church more extensive⁹; but those
 157 commonly called Independents made no figure till the time of our civil wars in the seventeenth century¹⁰. We are told that they do not insist upon ordination, except for administering the Sacraments¹¹. *Imposition of hands* seems to have been used by most or all sects of Christians who practised ordination¹². The presbyterians have two *lay-elders* for each preaching minister, in the imposition of hands, and in synods; the Lutherans have *superintendents* (not unlike bishops) who perform that office¹³.

Sometimes fanaticism may confound or suspend the observance of rules. In the armies of Cromwell, both general and soldiers, prayed and preached¹⁴; but in every thing like a regular society, I apprehend there is at bottom some *commission* for performing every ministerial office. Wherever I see order, I ascribe it to *rule*; and order in a society, to *authority*. If this be right, those who pretend to have no rule must have some way of deceiving themselves¹⁵; in common civilities

⁵ See Art. vii. sect. 3; but the *Reformatio Legum de Hæresibus*, cap. xvi. should here be read. Some held, that any who had a smattering of the Scriptures, ("qui sacris literis utcunque sunt aspersi,") and said they had the *Spirit*, might teach *any* where, and give sacraments, and govern the Church; no ministers being settled in any fixed places; might minister without any vocation, imposition of hands, or any act of the *Church*.

⁶ Baxter on Councils, p. 471, sect. 10. Also p. 460.

⁷ Sect. 4.

⁸ Art. vii. sect. 6.

⁹ Neal, vol. i. p. 253.

¹⁰ Veneer, p. 523, &c.

¹¹ Dr. Priestley, Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 64.

¹² See Dr. Zach. Grey's Preface to *Hudibras*. Originally the Independents do not seem to have ordained; after their uniting with the Presbyterians they sometimes did, and then they used imposition of hands.

¹³ Heylin's Preface, sect. 23.

¹⁴ Neal II. p. 252.

¹⁵ The *Quakers* are mentioned Mo-sheim, Cent. xvii. sect. 2. Part I. chap. iv. end, (or 8vo, vol. v. p. 44,) and their

people do things by rule, which they can fancy are from the IV. mere choice of the moment.

The Methodists, I am told, reckon no ordination valid except that of our Bishops. Those amongst them who have not been ordained, and yet sometimes harangue, are said only to give a "word of exhortation¹:" yet they seem to be distinguished in some way, and appearances are as if they were maintained. 158

7. The reason why *uninterrupted succession* is so much valued is, because the incapacity of any one person who ordains might be supposed, in strictness, to invalidate or vitiate all subsequent ordinations. On this principle some *American* bishops have been consecrated in England, and their consecration regulated by an act of parliament.

8. Dr. *Priestley*, in his address to the Methodists, lately published², prefixed to Mr. Wesley's Letters, advises the Methodists to form separate societies with whatever rules they think proper; and adds, "Let any person whom you think qualified teach and exhort others, whether he be in *holy orders*, as it is called, or not; and if they³ be qualified to teach they are certainly qualified to administer all the ordinances of the Gospel, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. I know of no exclusive right that any men, or body of men, have to this privilege⁴."

9. It seems worth while, before we close our history, to observe, that in events which have relation to the doctrine of our present Article, there have happened many cases of *necessity*. When people have been sick, or out of the reach of a place of Christian worship, or under persecution, or without tolerably good laws; in such cases things could not take their regular course—practice could not correspond to theory. All that could be aimed at must have been to come as *near* the theory as possible. This kind of irregularity has happened sometimes with respect to *preaching*, sometimes with respect to *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*; it has also affected *Ordination*, and *marriages*. 159

silent meetings accounted for. See also Book III. chap. xiv. sect. 12, of this work.

¹ Acts xiii. 15. Heb. xiii. 22.

² This was written in 1791.

³ The word "*they*" seems to mean the same as "*any person*;" sometimes per-

haps *they* is used concerning a *single* person when the *sex* is not specified. Whether Dr. Priestley meant, by *plural* following singular, to include, or not exclude, *female* ministers, I will not take upon me to say. The word "*he*" occurs just before "*they*." ⁴ P. xxix.

IV. Of a case of necessity in *preaching* we have a remarkable instance in the conversion of *Iberia* to Christianity⁵. A female captive converted the king and queen, who preached to their people, and converted them: but then they sent to Constantine for a bishop and clergy as soon as they were able. Or, not to go so far for an instance, I have known chapels in the diocese of Chester, served by persons not ordained: sometimes, I think, serving them before ordination was a condition of possessing them afterwards.

Origen, while a layman, taught divinity in the catechetical chair of Alexandria⁶, even in the presence of his bishop. The thing was blamed, but not the preacher.

10. The cases of necessity in regard to Baptism may best come under the twenty-seventh Article;—such as Baptism by women, clinic baptism, &c.

And those relating to the Lord's Supper, under the twenty-eighth; as sacrament without the usual elements, family-sacraments, &c.

11. We have already mentioned⁷, that at the Reformation 160 foreign divines not being able to get ordained by bishops, applied to presbyteries. It happened, that some English divines were abroad at the time, and were obliged to have recourse to the same expedient. Their ordinations were allowed as valid⁸ in King Edward's time; but in the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign legal disputes arose whether they could claim *tithes*, &c.; and in the reign of James the First the validity of such ordinations was denied⁹. In 1644, when the bishops declined ordaining any but those who were well inclined to King Charles the First, the Assembly of Divines¹⁰ took several steps to have ordination performed without their assistance; but it was only *pro tempore*¹¹; there were then no presbyteries in England.

12. Bingham says¹², that *marriages* were solemnized by the Christian clergy for 300 years; but that the mixture of heathens and Christians made many extraordinary cases. The sacerdotal benediction got evaded when the laws became Christian, because they contained no injunctions to support it; possibly Chris-

⁵ Socrates, Hist. Eccles. Theodoret, l. 24, &c. Forbes, xvi. vi. 21. Burnet on the Article, p. 322, 8vo.

⁶ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 6. 13. Forbes. xvi. vi. 22. Heylin's Tracts, p. 294.

⁷ Sect. 4.

⁸ Neal i. 55.

⁹ Ibid, 503, top.

¹⁰ See an account of this, Grey's Pref. to Hudibras, p. xxviii.

¹¹ Neal, vol. II. Index, Ordination.

¹² Antiquities 22. 4. 2, 3.

tians, before that time, wished rather, of themselves, to have IV. Christian than heathen marriage. But in the eighth and ninth centuries the original Christian marriages by the priest were revived. Sir William Blackstone observes¹, that the intervention of the priest in the marriage-contract “is merely *juris positivi*, and not *juris naturalis aut divini*.” “In the times of the grand rebellion all marriages were performed by the *justices of the peace*; and these marriages were declared 161 *valid*” by act of parliament after the Restoration.

Our Church is against² re-baptizing and re-ordaining. At *Lausanne* a person who appears to be a layman reads the ten commandments in the pulpit, as appears from the letter of a friend of mine written at *Lausanne*. Laymen have usually read *Lessons* in cathedrals, and other places of worship.

13. Let us now proceed to our *explanation*³.

The *title* of this twenty-third Article differs something from that of the corresponding one in 1552: ours is, “Of ministering in the Congregation;” that of 1552 is, “No man may minister in the Congregation except he be *called*.” The word “*called*” does occur in the body of our Article, but it seems best not to have a *proposition* in a *title*, when it can be easily avoided.

What is to be understood by “ministering,” we were obliged to mention before we entered upon our history.

“*In the Congregation*.”—Of the word *congregation* we spoke under the nineteenth Article⁴. Here it may perhaps 162 only have its most usual sense, of an *assembly*; or it may be thus interpreted, an *whole Church*; that is, as large a society of Christians as, in any situation, act together by a common understanding—or a separate *assembly*, considered as *part* of an whole church. But if *congregation* be taken in the same sense with *ἐκκλησία*, that sense was also mentioned. *Ἐκκλησία*

¹ Vol. I. see Index, *Marriage*. Marriage in *Scotland* is said to be a *civil* contract.

² Puller's Moderation of the Church of England, page 307. At *Islington*, I am told, a popish priest, turned Protestant, does duty without any re-ordination. Consult *Biogr. Britan.* Life of *Bramhall*, note (R), for an instance of re-ordination.—In my parish, a woman, who had been baptized as a dissenter, wanted me to re-baptize her in the church, as an adult: I declined.

³ I should have thought it would have

been better if the 22d Art. had come after this, rather than before it. The order of the subjects would then have been:—19. A Church. 20. Its Authority. 21. A number of Churches acting together. 22. Who has a right to minister in a Church. 23. Of Popish Doctrines. 24. Continuation of Popish doctrines; of having public devotions in a language not known to the unlearned. There was probably some good reason for the present order, though it does not occur to me.

⁴ Art. xix. sect. 5.

IV. does indeed, in Scripture, though it several times stands for the *whole* church of Christ, sometimes mean merely an assembly—sometimes a small one, such as would be contained in the *house* of a new convert⁵. Perhaps this use of the word *ἐκκλησία* might give rise to the congregational churches of the *Independents*.

At the Hampton-Court conference before King James the First, in 1603, the Puritans desired that these words “*in the Congregation*,” might be omitted in this Article, “as implying a liberty for men to preach *out* of the congregation without a lawful call⁶.”

14. “*Public*” (“preaching,” &c.)—This must be opposed to *private* (preaching, &c.)—such as reading a sermon to a family, or presiding in family devotions. (Mal. iii. 16.) I apprehend that teaching would be private in any assembly not under ecclesiastical authority; though there might be good reasons for not encouraging religious harangues to numerous companies who were not under such authority. What is usually called *private Baptism*, as opposed to that which is performed in churches publicly, is, properly, administered in a *congregation*⁷; as is also the communion of the sick, according to Matt. xviii. 20, and Tertullian’s maxim, “*Ubi tres, Ecclesia est*”⁸.

15. “*Called*”—“*sent*”—“*chosen and called*.”

“*Called*.”—This is a word frequently used in Scripture: it seems to be the old English for *invited*; and it is used chiefly of men’s being invited into the Christian religion. Such invitation, or calling, is often said to come from God; but the meaning only is, that so important an event as a man’s being made a Christian ought to be *referred* to Divine Providence, though we cannot refer it with distinct ideas of the divine agency. Of this referring events to God, we speak largely under the tenth and seventeenth Articles. One *called*, is sometimes only a name for a Christian, as 1 Cor. vii. 17—21; and in the parable (or parables) of the marriage-supper, the invitation denotes men’s becoming Christians, when referred to the Divine government of the world. God may call by man, or by

⁵ 1 Cor. xiv. 24. Rom. xvi. 5. Col. iv. 15.—Vener mentions the Athenian *Ἐκκλησίαι*, p. 526.

⁶ Neal’s Hist. Puritans, vol. i. 4to, p. 415.

⁷ “Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation.” The

prayer containing these words must, I should think, be one of the Collects used at Private Baptism, as sanctifying the water.

⁸ Quoted by Vener, p. 527, “from Tertullian’s Exhortation to Chastity,” p. 457.

human authority. Here, called means, more particularly, IV. invited into the *ministry*; and in this sense it is used by St. Paul at the beginning of his Epistle to the Romans, and of his first to the Corinthians.

“*Sent*”—is generally appropriated to *ministers*. Our Saviour is not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel: (our Saviour’s being sent, occurs a great number of times). The *Apostles* take the name of their office from being *sent*; and other ministers are distinguished by their being said to have a *mission*. See Matt. x. 16; xxiii. 37. Luke iv. 26; 164 xxii. 35. John xx. 21. Acts xiii. 4. Rom. x. 15. 1 Cor. i. 17. Some notice also should be taken of the passages which compare ministers to *labourers*, Matt. ix. 38, and xxi. 34. These passages were all in the minds of our reformers when they used the word “*sent*.”

“*Chosen and called*”—when spoken of together, in Scripture, usually seem to mean different *steps* in admission to Christianity. Calling is the first proposal; and choosing, the final appointment. Some begin the negotiation, but do not complete it; or, more begin it than complete it; or, in the Scripture style of comparison, “*many* are called, but *few* are chosen.”

The word *chosen*, as well as *called*, is sometimes used with relation to the ministry: see Acts i. 24; ix. 15; xxii. 14. 2 Tim. ii. 4. But there is a variety of expressions for the same thing—*ordained*, *appointed*, *separated*, &c.: it might be useful to see the marginal references, Acts ix. 15. When *chosen* relates to the *ministry*, it seems to be something *prior* to *called*, but more commonly *posterior*: one old edition of the Articles has *sent*, *called*, *chosen*. (See Bennet’s Collation, page 87.)

From this interpretation of the expressions of Scripture it appears, that being called to the ministry does not imply anything of such immediate communication with heaven that we must be sensible of it at the time—does not imply any such thing as the inspiration of the Mystics, who seem to mistake the meaning of such expressions.

16. I can see one difficulty: it may perhaps be asked, how those who propose *themselves* for orders can be said to be *called*? When a man proposes himself he only declares, that if he is appointed he will *accept* the appointment; and the 165 nature of human affairs makes this mode necessary. Though it might be the most perfect method, if persons in authority

¹ Called, Art. xvii. sect. 44. Chosen, Art. xvii. sect. 40.

IV. did keep so exact an account of the characters of all men, that they could actually *invite* to the ministry all those who were likely to do the most good in it; yet if we speak with relation to the present imperfect state of things, we must say, that no ecclesiastical magistrate can know of all who would accept the office of minister; and this method is as inconsistent with self-ordering, as any other².

Calling means inviting. Now inviting one's self, to the house of a friend, does not destroy the essence of his invitation; though the form may be a little changed. But, what is most to the purpose, those of whom it is said in Scripture that they were called, did generally, no doubt, propose *themselves* for Baptism. At least, any one who had proposed himself, and had been baptized, would have been spoken of, on looking back
166 upon the whole of the transaction, as *called*; that is, called by the Providence of God, using what means seemed best to his infinite wisdom.

Baxter, at the end of his History of Councils, enumerates some particular acts of the Government of God in calling ministers.

17. "*By men*"—that is, by men *immediately*; the call may be *referred* to God, as has been seen. A minister is lawfully appointed, though without *supernatural* powers—without being *inspired*, so that he can be immediately sensible of the inspiration—without having a power of working *miracles*;—and yet so *called*, he may be called of *God*³.

I suppose the ministers of our Church have had it objected to them, that they are not true ministers, because they have not the Spirit, and because they work no miracles.

² The Puritans, in synods, determined, that no one should offer himself for orders; every one should be really *called* by some congregation.

Neal, i. p. 231. See also Latimer's Sermon on St. Andrew, vol. i. p. 160, 8vo, where there are some good things on *patrons* calling proper ministers; but his advice to men not to become ministers except they be called, might perplex a modest man, or encourage an enthusiast. Yet he does not seem to mean more than that no one should take orders from views of mere worldly advantage, or from pride, vanity, &c.; for he speaks of that as a man's *vocation* to which he has been regularly "*brought up*." If therefore a

young man were to fix upon the ministry as his profession, and go through a course of education suited to make him fit for it, or were to be invited into the Church by a pious *patron*, he would, I should imagine, come under Bishop Latimer's notion of one *called*.—*Korah*, &c., Numb. xvi. were uncalled, or impious intruders.

³ Not seeing this has occasioned a wrong notion of the whole affair of church-authority amongst the Presbyterians. See that notion described by Dr. Balguy, Ser. vii. pp. 114 and 116, referring to p. 13, bottom. See also before, Art. xx. end of sect. 2. And Baxter on Councils, pp. 471, 472. Objection 10 and 12.

18. “*Who have public authority given unto them in the IV. Congregation.*”—This seems to leave the *manner*, of giving the power of ordaining, quite free. It seems as if any religious society might, consistently with this Article, appoint officers, with power of ordination, by election, representation, or lot;—as if, therefore, the right to ordain did not depend upon any uninterrupted *succession*¹.

19. “*The Lord’s vineyard.*”—This expression does not seem to be used merely for ornament; but because the Church of God is so frequently called the Lord’s vineyard in Scripture; indeed, the similitude is so much dwelt upon, that there seems ground for *reasoning* from it, and even deriving *rules* for practice. The *Jews* were once the Church of God, and Christians are so now². Consult Psalm LXXX. 8—16; Cant. viii. 12; Isai. v. 1—7; Matt. xx. 1—16; Matt. xxi. 33—41. The Psalm may relate properly to the Jewish Church; the prophecy to the Jewish Church primarily, or perhaps to the Church of God in general; Matt. xx. to both Jewish and Christian; Matt. xxi. to Christian only. 167

20. This Article is not to be supposed to make any rules or laws, or any provision for cases of *necessity*. They make provision for themselves. Necessity has no law.

21. We now come to our *proof*. I do not see that there need be more than one proposition.

22. ‘It is not right to minister in any religious society, without an appointment from that society³.’

This must be proved from Scripture, though really Scripture only speaks, as it were, incidentally; taking for granted that religious society cannot be carried on, in any rational or effectual way, without an appointment of ministers.

With regard to the Old Testament, there can be no doubt but priests and Levites and prophets were distinguished from other men; and severe punishment inflicted when this distinction was invaded: see Numb. xvi.—Punishments were of course supernatural where the government was so. I will therefore 168

¹ See Forbes, xvi. vi. Bishop Horne as before, sect. 4.

² Taylor on Romans, Key, No. 52. also 133.

³ There might be another proposition, affirming that ordination may be valid without the intervention (as far as we can discern) of any thing *supernatural*. But

as ideas of supernatural powers being given to ministers have arisen from a wrong interpretation of those texts which speak of the agency of God, and of referring events to his agency, and as the meaning of those passages has been explained, a second proposition seems needless.

IV. only bring passages from the New Testament, and that in the order in which they now stand.

The tenth chapter of St. Matthew should be read entire, and studied by every one who either proposes to be a minister, or is called upon to appoint others.

See next, Matt. xxiv. 45; xxviii. 18, &c.

John iii. 27; x. 16; xxi. 15, &c.

Acts i. 22; viii. 17; x. 3—5. But Acts xiii. 2, the solemn⁴ separation of St. Paul, must strike as something extraordinary, after his miraculous conversion before related, namely, in chap. ix. Any one properly attentive, fixing his thoughts on this, would naturally exclaim, 'It was not enough, then, to authorize Paul to go and preach the word, that he had been struck blind by the immediate and supernatural power of God! that the general design of divine Providence, in teaching men a new religion, had been expressly communicated to him by a voice from Heaven! that Ananias had been sent to him, as to a chosen vessel unto God, to bear his "name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Israel," to deliver him from a blindness of three days!—this chosen vessel must still be consecrated "*by men*;" men must fast and pray over him, and lay their hands upon him, before he could be a legitimate preacher of the holy Gospel!—nay, that very person must be thus commissioned by the instrumentality of men, who could say of himself with more propriety than any other minister of the Gospel, that he was "an Apostle not of men, neither by man."'
169 (Gal. i. 1.) We should also consult Acts xiv. 23, and xx. 28, 29, where those measures must be supposed to be enjoined, which are necessary to defend the flock from *wolves*—an end not to be answered without authority.

Rom. x. 13, &c. has been mentioned in the explanation; as have several texts which are to our present purpose.

1 Cor. iv. 1, 2. *Stewards* are not self-appointed.

Chap. xii. 16, 19, 27, 29, 30. Chap. xiv. in general, but the last verse seems of itself sufficient.

2 Cor. v. 20. Eph. vi. 20, ("*in bonds*")—*ambassadors* are not self-appointed.

Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Titus i. 5; Heb. v. 4, 5, &c. and 12; Heb. xiii. 17, compare with ver. 7.

⁴ How inconsistent is all this with Socinus's notion and Dr. Priestley's that any man may minister! This inconsist-

ency should be marked now and then, in going through these texts.

One might also venture to bring as proof some considerations IV. from the nature of cultivating a *vineyard*. All cannot preside, and direct; all cannot do the nicer parts of the work; some must dig, and do the more ordinary offices, and follow the instructions of others. This must be the case even if the Lord was present; but when he is away, he must necessarily have officers to represent him, and enforce his authority¹.

With regard to *reasoning* on this subject, Dr. Balguy's two Consecration Sermons are so perfect, without any superfluity, that I need only recommend them to your perusal. If you choose a specimen, I will take one from the latter sermon². Certainly, if ministers be self-ordained, modest merit will never be called forth; presumptuous vanity will be ever ready to obtrude itself; noisy ignorance will overpower diffident wisdom; and what will hinder vicious men from rising into power, especially if any considerable emoluments are annexed to the ministry? Nay, what can hinder doctrines opposite to each other from being taught, to the utter extirpation of all religious principle? What can hinder different men from officiating in such different ways as to produce disturbance and confusion, and put to flight all religious affection? And how can it be brought about, that certain appearances, modes of dress and behaviour, shall be so associated with piety and virtue, as instantly to produce good feelings³ in the mind? Besides, the learning requisite, to make a man a good minister of religion, requires that the ministry should be made a separate *profession*. How much the opinions of that profession should weigh with the *people*, has been shewn in the *second Book*. 170

23. I will here rest my direct proof: some little *indirect* seems proper under this Article.

24. *Socinus*⁴ produces Acts viii. 4, and xi. 19, as proofs that men could preach in the time of the Apostles without being ordained; nay, preach with success. But those who, in those passages, are mentioned as being dispersed by persecution, and as going into foreign countries, might be only on the footing of the captive in *Iberia*⁵, or of the Israelitish maid, that attended⁶ on the wife of *Naaman*. They being themselves members of revealed religion, could not but recount, in

¹ Matt. xxiv. 45.

² Dr. Balguy, Ser. vii. p. 122, "On the other hand," &c.

³ No stage-players used to be allowed

to become ministers. Bingham, iv. iv. 7.

⁴ Opera, vol. i. p. 383. See sect. 5 of this Art.

⁵ Sect. 5. ⁶ 2 Kings v. 2.

IV. *conversation*, (λαλοῦντες⁷, Acts xi. 19,) the wonders belonging
171 to it; and might very well be supposed to make converts. Not but some of the dispersed might have received a regular *commission* to preach; the passages contain nothing to the contrary. At all times there have been many converts made by private conference; sometimes by ministers, sometimes by private persons. This case of spreading the tidings of Christianity during dispersion, occasioned by persecution, does not seem to come up to that of *public* preaching in a *regular* Christian congregation.

25. A second objection may be this:—

Many of the texts quoted in the proof just now given, relate to the appointments of the *first teachers* of the Gospel, who had *miraculous powers* committed to them. Such teachers must be limited, as to their number, and commission.

I should answer, that no texts of Scripture are proofs, but after some kind of parity of reasoning; as was mentioned several times under the twenty-second Article, and proved in the eleventh chapter of the first Book: difference of circumstances must be attended to. Let then the texts be read over with this view. Let a reasonable man see how many things there are in them not peculiar to teachers endued with miraculous powers;—how many things which would have been said had it pleased God to trust the reception of Christianity to reasoning only, or to prophecies, and such proofs as we now possess.

Baxter (on Councils, page 465) speaks of *two sorts* of ministers—1. to teach men *new* doctrine, and 2. *standing* doctrine: but there are as many texts as seem natural, circumstances considered, implying a succession of ministers having no miraculous powers. 1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. i. 5; 1 Pet. v. 2; Heb. xiii. as before: nor can we conceive Matt. xxviii. 18, or John xxi. 15, &c. to be temporary; or Acts xx. 28. Paul's separation, Acts xiii. 2, seems a precedent for after times; his miraculous powers, and immediate revelation might have sufficed for him. John x. 16, looks to after times; Rom. x. 13, &c. is not restrained in its sense by times; nor is 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

⁷ The word Acts viii. 4, and Acts xi. 20, is εὐαγγελίζω, to tell the good news of; εὐαγγελίζεω ἐλευθερίαν, νίκην, &c. to tell the good news of liberty, victory, &c. (see Parkhurst's Lexicon). Hence an *evangelist* (2 Tim. iv. 5) may be any

person, bishop, deacon, or layman, employed to act as a *missionary*, where Christianity was yet *unknown*;—εὐαγγελίζεω λόγον, or Χριστόν, to tell the good news, of the *Word*, or of Christ: any one might do that.

The *Fathers* reasoned on Scripture thus. See Heylin, page 242, IV. sect. 13.

26. I will next take some notice of what has been quoted from *Dr. Priestley*. To me it seems confused, and inconsistent with itself. *Confused*, as not shewing in what character the Methodists are addressed. Are they addressed as dissenters or as members of the established Church? If as dissenters, and they will acknowledge themselves to be such, I see no great difficulty. Let them follow his advice; let them appoint persons to preach and give the Sacraments, in the way they think best; and may success attend them! may virtue and piety be the result! They do nothing inconsistent with our Article: such persons are not self-ordered. Who knows too but in appointing they may use *prayer* and imposition of hands? But if they insist that they are members of the Established Church of England, then they perhaps may be addressed as such by *Dr. Priestley*; and can members of any society be rightly persuaded to violate the *laws* of that society? 173 for the "legal designation of particular persons to these offices" (the sacred offices of religion) "cannot but mean, if it means anything, that all who are not appointed, are excluded¹."

Perhaps the main purport of *Dr. Priestley's* advice may be to induce the Methodists to carry the matter of *exhortation* farther than they do; or shall those who exhort administer *Sacraments*? This might occasion a greater distinction or distance between the Methodists and the Church of England than at present subsists; but that end we must not suppose to be the end particularly desired; and I see no good purpose which it could answer to religion in general. The Methodists in England do not seem to be any way restrained in their exhorting; and they are not, that I ever heard, in want of a greater number of ministers than they already possess, for the administration of the Sacraments.

The passage before us appears to me not only to be exceptionable on account of its confounding situations, but on account of the *inconsistency* of its different parts; as I understand them. *Dr. Priestley* first says, "let any person whom you think qualified teach, exhort, and administer Sacraments:" and afterwards declares (as I understand, for the expression is not totally free from ambiguity,) that no set of men have an "exclusive right" to teach, exhort, and administer Sacrament:

¹ *Dr. Balguy*, p. 122.

IV. but if certain men were appointed by the Methodists, in preference to others, to perform these offices, would not they have an exclusive right to perform them? Surely it cannot be said that Dr. Priestley does not advise the Methodists to appoint. The word appoint is not used, but some persons are spoken of
 174 as "*qualified*," in such a manner as to imply that others are *disqualified*; and who are qualified or disqualified, the Methodists are to determine. Is not this, in substance, appointing? Nor will it, I hope, be urged, that ministers so appointed have no exclusive right to preach, &c., because they cannot exclude other ministers: they exclude all those from whom they are distinguished and separated; which is all that can be meant. No Papist would say that ordination, even in his Church, gives such an exclusive right of ministering, that no one can lawfully minister in a Turkish mosque. But enough.

27. I here put an end to our proof, direct and indirect; and proceed to the *application*.

It may not perhaps be amiss here to take a short form of assent.

'It is contrary to Scripture and to reason, that any man should act as a minister in an ecclesiastical society, merely from his own choice: he ought to be appointed. And though it may become him *devoutly* to refer his appointment to the Providence of God, he is to act upon it as an ordinance of man; and to consider himself as receiving it *immediately* from those who are vested with *authority* for conferring it, by the religious society to which he belongs.'

28. There seems also room for a few words on the subject of mutual *concessions*.

Though what has been laid down about the appointment of ministers is very *true*, yet it has not an *invariable* force in all cases. Let us take two *extremes*. In a large *monarchy*, with various ranks of men, if there be a church established, self-ordering, in such a church, would be greatly inconvenient and hurtful; for the church would be a large body as well as the state, and every large body requires a great number of subordinations to reduce it to unity in action; and when there
 175 are many ranks of citizens, nice rules are wanted in order that each rank may feel the influence of religion, by means of the ministry. Ambition and interest too, in the case supposed, offer strong temptations to worldly men to push themselves into the sacred orders.

But take the other extreme, and much fewer rules and IV. appointments are wanted. As in small select companies, and societies, you sometimes see every one know his place, the most accomplished take the lead, and things rightly conducted, by a mere feeling of propriety; so can one almost conceive it possible for a small religious society to proceed, if composed of men unaffectedly pious, and aiming at the general good. Perhaps a state of persecution is most likely to occasion such a society; especially if the people persecuted, are, like the *Waldenses*, of great simplicity of manners. Yet this, I fear, is rather too Utopian. Religious affections want much regulation, and that is not always suspected; so that men are run away with before they are aware. The pride of teaching religion sets some men upon teaching it before they are duly qualified; while the habitually modest want drawing out, and compelling to shew themselves, by a judgment superior to their own. Ordinarily then, in practice, no religious society ought perhaps to be left without some regulations determining who shall teach and preside in it; but yet the nearer any society approaches to this extreme, the fewer rules it needs be restrained by. In all intermediate cases more rules would be necessary than in this extreme, and fewer than in the other; and as you approach to the other, before-mentioned, regulations such as are really wanted will continually be found more numerous and complicated.

As to those who insist upon it, that all teaching ought to 176 be guided by immediate and sensible inspiration, we can only leave them to their own¹ feelings, if what has been said is ineffectual.

29. If we conclude with any hint respecting *improvement*, we may say, that a right agreement, and a ready perception about the nature of *cases of necessity*, and the duties arising from them, might be of considerable use, in a subject where they so often occur. When men act irregularly through necessity, we excuse the past, but expect regularity in future: the return to regularity is to be with as little delay as possible; and restitution and compensation are to be made as far as ability reaches.

It would also be very useful for men to know habitually, and feel familiarly, as it were, how institutions may be ascribed to the Providence of God, without their being less considered as the ordinances of man on that account.

¹ See Dr. Balguy, p. 116, referred to before, Art. xv. near the end.

IV.
177

ARTICLE XXIV.

OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE
AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.

IT is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.

1. The principal part of the *history* of this Article comes into a small compass. The Church of Christ became divided, as to the part which we are most concerned with, into *Eastern* and *Western*, or into *Greek* and *Latin*. *Constantinople*, being the capital of the Eastern Empire, became the capital of the Greek Church; and so *Rome* of the Latin Church. *Liturgies* must, of course, be made in Greek for one country, and in Latin for the other. In both parts of the world such Liturgies would spread; they would also become venerated and sacred: on that account they would be continued, and persisted in, even when they became unintelligible to the common people. To change them would have been to alter “the universal order of God’s Church².” The ignorance of the people, and their superstition, made barbarous devotions
178 not unacceptable to them; the abuse was carried on till it was checked, in the western church, by the Reformation³.

This is the chief part of our history; but it may be proper to mention a few more facts which have some relation to the subject of forms of devotion in words not commonly understood.

There seem to have been mystical *carmina* in many ages. *Magicum carmen—Magorum Carmina*. Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 1, mentions some heathens “who thought those prayers most effectual which were uttered in a barbarous language.” (Comber’s Advice, pp. 82, 83.)

One *Elxai*, a leader of a Christian sect in early times, is said to have ordered his followers to use an unintelligible

² Rhemists on 1 Cor. xiv.

³ By what degrees the Latin ceased to be a vulgar tongue in Italy, Gaul, &c.—how far by incursions of barbarous nations, how far by other causes—is a diffi-

cult subject. Something upon it may be found in *Brerewood’s Enquiry*, chap. ii. 4. 5. And in *Usher*, cap. iv. And Wharton’s addition, cap. iv.

prayer. We have the words in Epiphanius's nineteenth Heresy. IV. As Epiphanius did not understand them, we may conceive it possible that they were not understood by those who used them¹.

The *Jews* spoke Syriac and Greek, in common conversation, when they used pure Hebrew in their synagogues². It has been thought that the earliest Christian Liturgies were in Hebrew. (See Brerewood, chap. xxvi. p. 185.)

The *Copts*, or Christians in Egypt, have service in the old Egyptian, or *Coptic*, though even the priests themselves understand very imperfectly what they pronounce. *Arabic* is, as I have been informed, the language commonly used in Egypt, since the sixteenth century³. 179

Many Greek Christians do not pray in the Greek which they commonly talk, but in pure Greek⁴; and this, in all their monasteries, though in Africa. The *Romanists* allow the propriety of pure Greek when used⁵; and they do not object to Hebrew.

The *Russians* are said to use the *Slavonian*, (which is spoken of as an extensive or general language) in their places of worship⁶; and the Mohammedans Arabic, where it is not the vernacular tongue.

Notwithstanding these instances, it does not appear that in the Christian Church there was any notion of prayers in an unknown tongue, as a thing settled and defended, for 600 or 800, or perhaps 900 years. Bingham says 1000⁷; but must not Latin, &c. have ceased to be vernacular in less than 1000 years?

There is a famous passage in Origen's work against Celsus⁸, in which he replies to an objection made to the Christians, as 180

¹ See Lardner's Works, vol. ix. p. 514.

² See Locke's Note on 1 Cor. xiv. 4, p. 129, quarto.

³ Book I. chap. ix. sect. 5. But Brerewood thinks, that the Coptic prayers are in Syriac, or in a second sort of Chaldee.

⁴ So, I think, Ricaut says. See Veneer, p. 634, and Brerewood, p. 196, bottom.

⁵ Fulke on Rhem. Test. fol. 294.

⁶ The English chaplain at St. Petersburg informed a friend of mine in 1790, that the common people understand this Slavonian but imperfectly.

Brerewood speaks of Russian, as a dia-

lect of Slavonian, p. 200: he says, too, that Slavonian is the vulgar tongue of more than one third of Europe—that sixty nations speak it.

⁷ See Fulke on 1 Cor. xiv. in Rhem. Test. sect. 8 and 15. Brerewood, chap. xxvi. p. 185; and Bingham, Book XIII. chap. iv. sect. 1.

⁸ Orig. Contra Cel. Lib. viii. 13. The God of all languages hears men pray in all languages, as with one voice. Bennet on this Article has this passage (that is, in his *Directions*, &c.) For Valentini-ans, see Appendix to the first Book, sect. 18.

IV. if they addressed *angels* by barbarous names, and thought their prayers would have no effect if they did not. This might be true of Valentinians, &c.; but in clearing Christians in general, he says, ‘ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει.’

Here I will read a passage from our Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments. (pp. 279, 280, octavo.)

In *Jerom's*⁹ works we have an account of the funeral of his disciple *Paula*, a Roman matron. Multitudes from the cities of Palestine attended it. In order that every one might have a clear understanding of some part at least of the service, Psalms were sung in four different languages—Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, Latin¹⁰. Dr. Fulke gives a pretty translation of a passage in the *Epitaphium Nepotiani*, ending with, “the savage nature of the *Besses*¹¹—“have now broken their harsh language into the sweet song of Christ.”

It appears that Latin was spoken by ordinary people in *Africa* in the time of *Augustin*. He says, that he learnt it by hearing his nurses talk it¹²; and that he sometimes used expressions, as did other persons, which were rather vulgar, in order to suit himself to the more ordinary people¹³. These expressions must be in Latin.

181 Pope Leo III. however, as also Pope Benedict¹⁴, ordered that the Nicene Creed should be used in Greek, even in the Latin Church, during public worship, lest τὸ στενὸν τῆς διαλέκτου should give occasion to some *blasphemy*. Τὸ στενὸν, &c. is translated (by Usher¹⁵, I suppose,) “*idiomatis angustia*.” The Greek account of this matter is from a fragment of

⁹ T. IV. Ed. Ben. *Epitaphium, ad Eustochium*. Eustochium was the daughter of Paula: see Fulke on Rhem. Test. 1 Cor. xiv. sect. 8. The Roman Paula, of noble birth, had left Rome, and travelled into Palestine, &c. where she had founded monasteries, &c. There she died.

¹⁰ The word *Hebrew* is not in all the MSS.

¹¹ *Ad Heliodorum*, tom. iv. Edit. Bened.—Heliodorus was the uncle, I think, of Nepotianus. *Bessi*, in Thrace to the south of the most southern part of the Danube.

¹² Confess. I. 14, mentioned by Fulke on 1 Cor. xiv. sect. 14. Rhem. Test.

¹³ Aug. in Psal. 123. 128. *Et de Doct. Christ.* 2. 13. Fulke *ibidem*. Here might be mentioned *Justinian*, placed by Cave A. D. 527, (but the *Novellæ Constitutiones* after 535,) who ordered priests to speak so as to be heard and understood. Novell. 137, cap. vi, (p. 682 of Corpus, 8vo, tom. II.) This mentioned by Fox, p. 9, Martyrology (or Acts and Monuments); and in our Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments; and in Bingham.

¹⁴ Benedict the *Third*, I suppose; though there were several short-lived popes between Leo and him.

¹⁵ See Usher, *de Symbolis*, p. 25.

Photius. At all times, probably, one great reason for not IV. using the vulgar tongue has been the fear of *profanation*.

Cave¹ mentions that Pope John VIII. whom he places in 872, did, in the year 880, when the *Moravians* were converted, allow them “*sacra peragere linguâ vernaculâ* ;” that is, in the *Slavonian*.

Innocent III. (the deposer of King John of England) held a council of *Lateran*, (that is, in a Church dedicated to St. John at Rome, and called Lateran, from the palace on whose site it stands²) in 1215. A part of chap. ninth of the acts of this council is translated by Dr. Fulke³, in which it is 182 ordered, that in those places where men of different nations mix, proper persons should be provided to celebrate divine service in their different *languages*, and according to their different ceremonies⁴. Yet this same pope opposed the people of Metz (Metenses) about their having the *Scriptures* in their vulgar tongue; but not in any council. In this council of Lateran, Cave says there were many orators from foreign courts.

It seems as if the *schoolmen* might be reckoned amongst the *adversaries* to prayers in an unknown tongue. Archbishop Usher (*de Scrip. et Sacris vernaculis*, p. 235,) has something to the purpose. Thomas Aquinas owns that prayers were in the vulgar tongue in the time of Christ. I see also, he says, that though Christ *could* have spoken different languages, he spoke only one; because he spoke only to one nation. Dr. Comber tells us that Gabriel Biel pleads strongly for having prayers in a known tongue. (Advice, &c. p. 84.)

The authors of the Rhemish Testament shew no reserve in defending the use of prayers, &c. in Latin; I mean, by those who do not understand it. They use many arguments in favour of their opinion; such of those arguments as seem to have any weight may be examined by and by. We have in the margin, “The Peoples⁵ devotion nothing the lesse for

¹ Hist. Lit. t. II. p. 61, or Index, Joannes VIII. Papa. But Dr. Fulke gives this to Pope Nicholas I. (him Cave places in 858). Rhem. Test. on 1 Cor. xiv. sect. 8.—He does not say *Moravians*, but *Slavonians*. Burnet also mentions the fact.

² Chambers says, in his Dictionary, *Lateran* was first the name of a man,

then of the *palace* where he lived, then of the *church*, &c. built from that palace.

³ On Rhem. Test. on 1 Cor. xiv. sect. 8.

⁴ Brerewood mentions this, p. 189.

⁵ On 1 Cor. xiv: Fulke's sect. 13 and 14.

IV. praying in Latine." And, "It is not necessarie to understand our prayers⁶."

The Council of Trent is more guarded: it orders frequent *explanations*⁷ to be made by the pastors of what is said at
183 mass. These are to be made on Sundays and Holidays;—and that, lest the *sheep* of Christ should be hungry, and the *babes* want bread. Yet those are anathematized who say that mass ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue.

Dupin "allows that divine service may be performed in the vulgar tongue, where that is customary⁸;" yet he "excuses the Latin and Greek Churches for preserving their ancient language;"—and "alleges, that great care has been taken that every thing be understood by *translations*."

We may lastly mention collectively some eminent Romanists who favoured our opinion:

Cardinal Cajetan, who died 1534, and Nicholas of Lyra, who died 1340, go so far as to prefer prayers in the vulgar tongue, as Comber mentions⁹. Gabriel Biel was spoken of just now as being of the same way of thinking. More may be seen in Usher *de Scripturis et Sacris vernaculis*, cap. x¹⁰.

Brerewood also would furnish more instances of different languages amongst Christians; but these may be sufficient;—so here I close my history.

2. The *explanation* need not be long.

184 The difference between our present Article and the corresponding one of 1552 is so distinctly marked out by Bishop Burnet, that I refer to him.

The word "speaking," in the *title*, is explained in the body of the Article, to mean praying and administering Sacraments. *Preaching* is not mentioned, because, I suppose, sermons are every where in the vernacular language: they are so in *France*; and, I doubt not, the case is the same in other catholic countries¹¹.

⁶ Here one might read Sir Edwin Sandys's *Speculum Europæ*, p. 7.

⁷ Sess. 22, cap. 8. Also canon 9.

⁸ Mosheim, Appendix, as before.

⁹ Comber's Advice, p. 84. See also Veneer, p. 635, who mentions Mercer the famous Hebraist. In the present age the celebrated financier Neckar wishes his church would give up the use of unknown tongues in public devotions.

¹⁰ By Wharton, 1690, 4to. This seems

to contain a great deal of learning, but more about the people's reading the Scriptures, than about *Sacra* being *vernacula*, in ancient times. Cap. viii. sect. 4. p. 235, is the passage lately referred to. Bingham, 13. 4, gives the title of this book more fully; *Historia Dogmatica*, &c. He has also, I perceive, several of the same instances which have been here made use of.

¹¹ Sir Edw. Sandys, speaking of the Roman

“*Public prayer*”—so that here is nothing of *private* IV. prayer. This however is spoken of as being sometimes in an unknown tongue, (unknown to him who prays) as well as public;—by the Rhemists¹, and in our Homily², “Of common-prayer and sacraments.” Private prayer, in any tongue understood by him who prays, is allowed in the second Preface to our Prayer-books.

Topics of reason and utility are omitted in our Article, but they are used in our Homily—and rightly; especially as Scripture could not treat the precise question before us.

“*A tongue not understood of the people*”—includes, in the reason of the thing, a voice that is not *audible*. I believe it is common in the Roman service for the priests to perform masses in such a voice: these may be what are called private masses. The French Dictionary of the Academy calls this sort “*basse messe*”³.

I know not whether the meaning of the words “*primitive Church*,” is quite agreed upon. Bennet, in his directions, gives the above-mentioned passage of Origen as a proof that the primitive Church allowed the use of different languages: but, literally and properly, the primitive church should mean the *first* church, or the Church of Christ in the *Apostolic age*. Indeed, Bennet might reason, as Wall does⁴, thus:

Origen was born about 80 years after St. John died⁵: consider when his grandfather might live. He might know from his grandfather if the practice of the primitive Church, strictly so called, favoured such a scheme as worshipping in languages not understood. Thus the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries afford good probable proofs of customs in the Apostolic age. But yet the Church of England, at the Reformation, was jealous about allowing any authority but scriptural; therefore the best explanation of “the custom of the primitive Church,” seems to be, the *customs* mentioned in *Scripture*. And consequently, “the word of

Roman religion in general, opposes the sermons to the service, when he calls the latter “*a lampe put out*,” &c. p. 8, *Speculum Europæ*. And it is implied in the directions to pastors given by the Council of Trent, just now mentioned, that the explanations which they are to give must be in the vulgar tongue.

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. sect. 13. (Fulke).

² P. 277, 8vo.

³ In the 9th canon, lately mentioned, of the 22d session of the Council of Trent, those are anathematized who condemn the rite of the Romish Church, “*quo summissâ voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur*.”

⁴ On Infant-Baptism, Preface.

⁵ Origen is placed by Lardner in 230; he was born in 185.

IV. God *and* the custom of the primitive church," together, should mean, the directions and practices recorded in the Scriptures.

But those who wish to go farther down may consult Bingham's *Antiquities*, Book XIII. chap. iv. And Usher's *Historia Dogmatica controversiæ intra Orthodoxos et Pontificios de Scripturis et Sacris vernaculis*;—especially the fourth and fifth sections of his eighth chapter. The title of the fourth section is, *In Ecclesiâ Primitivâ, commune officium vulgari linguâ celebratum fuit*. But his authorities are only the
 186 Apostolic Constitutions; which, though ancient, are not now esteemed genuine: and a Liturgy called St. James's, but probably not to be depended upon as composed by an apostle. These seem to be his only authorities that pretend to belong to the Apostolic age: he quotes from Jerom, Clemens Alexandrinus, Augustin and others; and uses the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom; but if these give us the custom of the primitive Church, strictly so called, we can only believe that they do so on such probable grounds as have been lately explained.

3. We now proceed to *proof*.

According to what was last explained, we need but make one proposition: 'It is contrary to directions recorded in Scripture to have Liturgies in any language which is not generally intelligible where they are used.'

This matter could not be directly discussed in Scripture, as has been observed of several others⁶; but the fault mentioned 1 Cor. xiv. of using the gift of tongues through ostentation, when it would perplex instead of informing, is open to the same arguments and expostulations with that of which we are speaking, having Liturgies in unknown languages⁷. We may therefore apply, almost immediately, the passages of that chapter to our present purpose. The whole chapter might be read, but we may distinguish some verses as particularly apposite: 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 26, 31. From these and
 187 several other passages, it is very clear, that those who had authority in conducting religious assemblies were to adapt their rules and laws to the moral and religious *improvement* of the generality, as also to their *comfort*.

⁶ Art. xxii.

⁷ See Warburton on the Spirit, p. 21. See also Locke on the 4th verse, where he mentions, that Lightfoot looks upon the *unknown* tongue to mean *Hebrew*.

Now if any Jew, turned Christian, used Hebrew in Christian assemblies because it was a *sacred* language, that case comes nearer our present one than speaking with tongues, in general.

The *unlearned* are mentioned repeatedly; and all are IV. enjoined to act like men of *mature understanding*. One can scarcely read this chapter to any purpose, or even attend to its meaning uninterruptedly, without some idea of what was meant by the gift of *prophesying*. Mr. Locke¹ understands it to include three things: predicting some events, singing inspired hymns, and interpreting mystical and difficult parts of Scripture by inspiration. This interpreting is distinguishable from interpreting what was said in an assembly by those who had the gift of *tongues*. Prophesying was carried on in the *vulgar* tongue; St. Paul magnifies its worth, in *comparison* of speaking with tongues; but then he meant in assemblies where no foreigners required information.

That the Scriptures look upon the lower ranks of men as important, appears from many places both of the Old and New Testament. The parable of Lazarus might be mentioned in particular. Connect that with John xxi. 15, &c., and with Acts xx. 28, 29, and neglect in edifying the poor and unlearned will seem no trifling matter. And if St. Paul insists so strongly on our attending to principles of utility, it may be considered as a scriptural argument to urge, that the better prayers are understood the more good they do; especially if well composed, so as to comprehend brief and plain expressions of the most important doctrines; and that it is in vain to compose them well, if, at last, they are unintelligible.

But we should say a word or two of scriptural *practice*. Christ spoke no unknown tongue: St. Paul avoided it; and 188 only permitted it², as it were, at home. The office of interpreter was appointed in order to prevent anything from being finally unintelligible. The Church of Christ sometimes prayed collectively, as related in Acts iv. 24, and elsewhere. We may add, that no Liturgy was ever originally composed in any language not familiar to the people by whom it was to be used.

4. So much for direct proof. Some arguments of our adversaries may seem perhaps to require an answer or proof of the indirect sort. Their arguments in favour of their opinion are so many objections to ours.

1. It has been urged, that the chapter on which we build does not relate to public worship³, but only to private *confer-*

¹ Locke on 1 Cor. xii. 10.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 1, (with Locke's note) and 39.

³ 1 Cor. xiv.

IV. *ences.* But it seems to me to relate to *any* meetings *whatsoever*, which could tempt men to display their powers by way of gaining admiration;—"when ye come together," wheresoever it may be, to sing, pray, give thanks, prophesy, hear revealed interpretations of Scripture—where the people may be required, or induced, to say *Amen*.

The word *church* occurs five times in the chapter, and is opposed to "*home*." The larger the assembly, the greater the absurdity of puzzling them: the Romish argument seems to suppose the contrary.

2. It has been said, that a general language is most convenient for *strangers*. The number of learned strangers is very small in comparison of that of unlearned natives: besides, as each stranger is at home sometimes, he receives most benefit upon the whole from the rule of having Liturgies in the vulgar tongue. I should have thought it a great pity, when I was at church in Holland, that a Dutch congregation should lose the edification of a Dutch Liturgy, for any good I should have got from their using a Latin one.

3. The Romanists are ready to say, that their Latin Liturgy is made intelligible by translations, *explanations*, ceremonies⁴: but translations are not used in church; I mean, by the ministers. The mind does not go with the words by means of a translation only published, not publickly read. Those who cannot read are as much at a loss in that case as without translation. Explanations may give a general idea; but that is very imperfect work: ceremonies make but little impression on those who do not understand the words which accompany them. An unconnected word may be explained, such as *Amen*, *Hallelujah*, *Hosanna*; or such short sayings as *Κύριε ἐλέησον*, *Dominus vobiscum*; but a sentence is quite a different thing;—what must a series of sentences be!

4. We are told that we might submit to unintelligible prayers, because in any vulgar tongue many things occur which are not understood;—in the Psalms, for instance, and Prophecies. It may be so. Our knowledge is imperfect, and so are our understandings: we must labour to improve ourselves; but that is not to be done by purposely making things obscure, where obscurity can be avoided.

To impose ignorance by choice, in matters of revealed religion, is to counteract revelation; which must be a good;

⁴ Dupin as above. Rhem. Test. &c.

however men may have it in their power to pervert or mis- IV. present it. The faculty of speech is a good, though the im-
 perfections in language are great. No one would be willing
 to lose the faculty on that account; yet to pray in an unknown 190
 tongue is to deprive many human beings of one important use
 of it. But when Psalms, Prophecies, &c. are the most diffi-
 cult, all people receive *some* benefit from them; some religious
 ideas, some pious feelings.

5. Sometimes dispute has been carried so far, that it has
 been said, there is *good* in the common people's not under-
 standing Liturgies. If Christ had thought so he would have
 only given us the Lord's Prayer in Phœnician, or in Hebrew;
 and would have forbidden its being used in any other language.
 The people may doubtless want instruction; and, deprived of
 it, may attach wrong ideas to religious expressions; but every
 day's teaching may lessen this evil, and, at the same time,
 mend the *heart*, as well as the understanding, of both those
 who receive instruction and those who give it.

6. Lastly, it has been held, that men are more devout for
 being ignorant; or, according to the proverbial expression,
 'Ignorance is the *mother of devotion*.' That ignorance may
 occasion some kind of rude, barbarous emotions in the mind,
 when attending to superior beings, will scarcely be denied;
 but what kind of devotion is that! The savage trembles at
 an eclipse, the ignorant attributes the effects of electric fire to
 the immediate agency of Satan¹; but this is very different
 from the devotion arising from religious "truth and sober-
 ness²." Fanatical terrors have very little effect in giving the
 mind steady and rational principles of action. Ignorance
 may be the mother of superstition or enthusiasm; it may even
 conceive and bring forth hypocrisy; but it will never give 191
 birth to that *love* of God and man, which, the better informed
 it is, has the greater tendency to make the Christian uniformly
 and effectually virtuous;—"stedfast, unmoveable, always
 abounding in the work of the Lord."

I will mention no more arguments, or objections: you may
 think I have already mentioned too many, in so plain a case;
 but it has sometimes seemed that objections might lead to
 profitable observations, when they are not formidable to any
 important truth.

¹ Art. x. sect. 50. where is a paragraph from Doomsday-book of St. Julian's
 Shrewsbury.

² Acts xxvi. 25.

IV. 5. What little I shall say, in the way of *application*, may be placed either to the head of mutual conciliation, or to that of improvements: in the present case, what conciliates improves.

An ancient dead language, it must be confessed, has, by being fixed, some advantages for religious worship. It is venerable, free from vulgarity; nay, it is sometimes, as we find from our Latin Articles, even more perspicuous than an obsolete vernacular tongue. If such language be *general*, it has still more advantages; as Latin is amongst learned Europeans, French amongst the polite; and the *lingua Franca* amongst the mercantile that have any connection with any shore of the Mediterranean. The Hellenistic Greek used to be very general in our Saviour's time³. If there could be such a thing as a *sacred* language, that would have strong effects—in the same manner as a sacred edifice, set apart entirely for purposes of religion. And if such sacred language could be *fixed* and *general*, it might be worth while to have *Liturgies* composed in it, for the use of the more improved in all different nations of the globe. The intercourse of nations with each other increases
192 daily, and will increase as the world improves⁴. I do not see any impropriety in using Latin prayers in universities. Dr. Heylin speaks of their being used at Christ Church, Oxford, at early service, when only members of the University are supposed to be present; and he says, he does not understand that, at the Reformation, it was “meant but that the morning and evening service might be used, in colleges and halls of either university, in the Latine tongue, where all may be supposed to understand it.” Private prayers are expressly allowed to be “in any language that they themselves” (the persons who pray) “do understand⁵.” Whatever may be permitted or contrived, of this sort, should be calculated, not to promote pedantry or ostentation, but spiritual improvement. “Let all things be done unto *edifying*⁶.” This must be the universal principle; and, in any state of which we can have the least conception, it cannot fail to lead us to provide, in every nation, a Liturgy in the vernacular tongue. However, it is one thing to say, that a thing ought to be done, and another to say, that people have always been unpardonable for not doing it. There

³ Book I. chap. vi. p. 77.

⁴ Isai. xi. 9. Hab. ii. 14.

⁵ “Concerning the service of the Church:” prefixed to Prayer-books, in

Sparrow's collection, p. 201. Q. Elizabeth mentions, that the colleges had petitioned for leave to use Latin Prayers.

⁶ 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

have been times of such gross darkness, that, when we look back IV.
upon them; we feel almost in a state of indifference about the
language in which the people prayed. It occurs to us, at the
moment, that they might have been improved; but then again
we recollect that the clergy were little more enlightened than
the people; and we apply to the church the words of our
Saviour, "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness,
how great is that darkness!" Now, however, better prospects
begin to dawn upon us: though some Popish countries may be 193
slow and sluggish in advancing towards civilization, yet that
which is nearest to us, has, of late, taken ample strides; and
it is firmly to be expected, that, if the rage of *philosophizing*
leaves any substance of revealed religion, any Christian church
of magnitude and importance, there will not, ere long, be any
objection to making the forms of public worship intelligible to
the people¹.

ARTICLE XXV.

194

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

SACRAMENTS ordained of Christ be not only badges or
tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain
sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's will
towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and
doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our
Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in
the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the
Lord.

Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say,
Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme
Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel,
being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of
the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures;
but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and
the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or
ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed
upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use

¹ 1797, I leave this as it was written at the end of 1791, to take its chance of seem-
ing groundless and chimerical.

IV. them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

195 1. We have now before us seven Articles upon the subject of Sacraments. This twenty-fifth treats of Sacraments in general, and of those which we reject. It is always difficult to make general observations before those particular ones of which they consist. In the analytical method, the particulars would come first; but it is most usual to give reasonings to the world in a synthetic form. The consequence, however, of treating first of Sacraments in general will be, that several parts of our present Article may be passed over, without either history, explanation, or proof; I mean those which, though expressed in general terms, relate only to Baptism, or the Lord's Supper.

2. Our *history*, according to this, needs only be of the *seven* Romish Sacraments, collectively, and of the *five*, taken separately, which we reject.

I seem to have a general idea of the manner in which the seven Romish Sacraments might acquire and lose their celebrity. Men of religious characters begin with obeying the injunctions of Christ, and following the example of his Apostles and their immediate successors; a sacred regard for every observance grows stronger and stronger; new particulars shew themselves, in which zeal may be manifested and exerted; one pious man tries to go a step beyond another; a third is determined to surpass them both; ordinances, at first simple, come to be clogged with a multitude of ceremonies, and adorned with splendour and magnificence². Reason makes no opposition, or when it makes any is disregarded, or contemned; and thus, what was originally rational and plain, runs into excess and folly. Some at length see this with the eyes of common sense, and labour to impose restraints and contrive regulations; others encourage themselves in disgust and love of novelty, and either through passion or affectation, throw the whole aside.

But to be more *particular*.

We are told, that Justin Martyr and Tertullian speak of no more sacraments than two³. The same is said of Ambrose⁴,

² Something of this sort is described in Mosheim, Cent. xiii. Part II. chap. iv. sect. 1. p. 107, 8vo. vol. III.

³ Vener on the Article, p. 641.

⁴ By Bp. Bramhall, quoted by Puller, p. 274.

who wrote concerning sacraments. Theodoret speaks of some IV. Christians who were called *Euchitæ*¹, because they were for prayer without sacraments; and of some, who conceived so highly of the *spiritual* nature of Christianity, that they would allow of no *matter* or element whatsoever. They had the name of *Ascodrutæ*, Ἀσκόδρουται—and they are the more worthy of our notice, as their notion seems to be the same with that of our modern *Quakers*; though the *Quakers* are said, by Mosheim, to have had their rise about the middle of the seventeenth century. The etymology of *Ascodrutæ* is not well understood. Even Theodoret (*Hæret. Fab. Lib. I. cap. x.*) seems at a loss about them; and I have consulted a 179 number of books about the name, without obtaining any satisfaction. They seem to have made this their fundamental principle, that *invisible* things are not to be completed by *visible*. Of course they *baptized* not; but moreover they had no θεῖα μυστήρια—no divine *mysteries*. This I understood as a general expression, though the sacrament of the Lord's Supper has sometimes the name of *the mysteries*. Theodoret next speaks of some called *Archontici*, Ἀρχοντικοί, with whom a knowledge of God, of the mystic sort, seems to have been all in all. These went so far as to *anathematize* τὸ λουτρὸν, καὶ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων μετάληψιν—*Baptism*, and the receiving of the holy *mysteries*. The word ἀπολύτρωσις, which is translated *redemptio*, means only a mode of *baptizing*; and so Wall seems to have understood it. On Infant-Baptism, II. v. 1.

Augustin is said, by the Rhemists on Gal. iv. 3, to have spoken of the *seven* sacraments which are held by the Romanists; and passages are quoted from different parts of his works in order to shew this; but Fulke seems to me to answer the Rhemists completely. The opening for dispute, in this matter,

¹ See Rogers on the Art. He refers to no part of Theodoret's works. *Euchitæ* (Εὐχίται) occur *Hæret. Fab. Lib. IV. cap. ii.* They were sometimes called Messaliani, Μεσσαλιάνοι, and sometimes Ἐνθουσιάστοι. They said that *baptism* was no more useful than a *rasor*; it *cut off* sin, but did not *extirpate* it: sin grew again; so they were for *prayer*. I see nothing about the *Eucharist*, in the account of them; they were great *enthusiasts*. They were tried, and, I think,

banished, by *Flavian*, Bishop of Antioch; and written against chiefly, by *Amphilochius*. One *Helvetic* Confession, chap. xix. refers to these *Messaliani*, under sacraments in general: and we see from that passage that the ideas of our *Quakers* were in being at the time of the Reformation. Syntagma, p. 67, of Part I. The Reformers seem to have liked to refer recent errors to old times. See Synt. Part II. page 13, *Donatists*.

IV. is, that we find *sacramentum* used in different senses. It seems to be used for any *emblematical* action of a sacred import; or, according to the expression of our Homily², for “anything whereby an holy thing is signified.” *Washing of feet* has been accounted a sacrament; and in the Greek Church there was a festival called Νικτήρ³ (and probably is at this day), in which the patriarch, or abbot, or whoever was the head person at the place, personated our Saviour, and washed the feet of twelve poor persons, who personated the twelve Apostles. In monasteries these were poor monks; and the steward, or bursar, took the part of St. Peter, and acted his reluctance; and the porter was Judas Iscariot, and underwent much ridicule and many insults.

198

In ancient times, there was also a sacrament of Catechumens⁴; in which *salt* was given them as an emblem of purity and incorruption, with reference, probably, to Matt. v. 13, and Mark ix. 50. In this extended sense, all the typical acts of the *Jews* were sacraments; and accordingly, *circumcision*, eating the *paschal lamb*, &c., have been called Sacraments of the *old Law*. In this extended sense of the word sacrament, it has been disputed, amongst Christians, whether there were not *thirteen* sacraments⁵; and, as *images*, of Christ, Virgin Mary, &c., mean something beyond the visible figure, it has been asked whether they might not be considered as sacraments⁶.

I will give you the passage of Augustin's Letter to Januarius⁷, as it is made the beginning of King Edward's Article. It is translated in our Homily, and in Fulke's answer to the Rhemists on Gal. iv. 3.

199 Archbishop Bramhall says⁸, concisely, “Our Church receives not the septenary number of sacraments, being never

² On Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 276, 8vo.

³ See Cave's Lit. Diss. Νικτήρ.

⁴ Bingham, x. ii. 16.

⁵ Forbes, ix. iii. 2.

⁶ See Forbes, ix. i. 26. The Trent Catechism, Part II. sect. 10. proves that such a question has been asked, by answering it in the negative.

⁷ Ep. 54, or, in a different way of reckoning, Ep. 118. “Primò itaque tenere te volo, quod est hujus disputationis caput, Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum, sicut ipse in Evangelio loquitur, leni jugo

suo nos subdidisse, et sarcinæ levi: unde sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione præstantissimis, societatem *novi* populi colligavit, sicuti est *Baptismus* Trinitatis nomine consecratus, communicatio corporis et sanguinis ipsius, et si quid aliud in scripturis canonicis commendatur, &c.”

⁸ Quoted by Fuller, p. 275. A counsellor to the French King, Mr. de la *Militiere*, wrote to Charles II. king of England, before the Restoration, inviting him to profess popery, as a likely means to get restored: Bramhall answers him, in

so much as mentioned in any scripture, or council, or creed, or IV. father, or ancient author; first devised by Peter Lombard in 1439; first decreed by Eugenius the Fourth 1528; first confirmed in the Provincial Council of Senes 1457; and after in the Council of Trent." Here the number mentioning the time of Peter Lombard must be wrongly printed; Cave places him in 1141. I suppose the number belonging to Eugenius is put to Peter Lombard¹; and so on.

*Forbes*² says, that Hugo de Sancto Victore, (Hugh of St. Victor,) whom he places in 1130, and Cave in 1120, seems to him to have first mentioned seven sacraments, though Peter Lombard agrees with him. The abbot of St. Victor at Paris probably knew Peter Lombard, who lived there, though not as Bishop of Paris till after Hugo's death. However, it is still more probable that Peter knew the person and writings of Hugo. At the Council of *Florence*, in 1438–9, it seems to have been debated between the Greek and Latin Churches, whether the seven sacraments were to be observed "*secundùm³ usitatam in Ecclesiâ Romanâ formam.*" Whoever first fixed on the number seven was probably an happy man—so powerful 200 and mystical a number⁴ as it is! The Trent Catechism dwells upon it⁵.

The number *seven* was not one of the things first changed at the *Reformation*; indeed, the five ordinances which the Romanists call sacraments and we do not, are fairly to be *distinguished* from all others which have been called sacraments in the extended sense, in respect of their importance, if we take extreme unction for visitation of the sick. *Wickliffe* did not reject them; but then his definition of a sacrament was only "a visible token of something invisible⁶." In the *Necessary Doctrine*, &c. which bears so hard upon some Romish abuses, seven sacraments are explained, calmly and practically, not in any way of controversy⁷. In the time of Edward VI., "If sick persons desired to be *anointed*, there was a provision for

in the Address from which this passage is taken. Bramhall was then abroad, I think, as well as King Charles; but see his life, the life of Archbishop Bramhall, in the *Biographia Britannica*.

¹ This conjecture is right: in Bramhall's Letter the three years are put in the margin, all together.

² Forbes, ix. iii. 1.

³ Cave Hist. Lit. tom. 11. p. 233.

⁴ See Cruden's Concordance, under the word *seven*.

⁵ Part II. sect. 13. about Sacraments in general, p. 137.

⁶ *Wickliffe's* doctrines may be found in Collier's Eccles. Hist.; but I am not sure where I saw this definition.

⁷ Yet many things in these explanations differ from the Romish doctrine.

IV. compliance in some degree⁸." *Heylin* tells us⁹, that four of the five sacraments which we now reject were "retained under the name of *Sacramentals* in our publick Liturgie;" extreme unction being changed into visitation of the sick. But not rejecting the five, might, with our Reformers, amount to little more than not making a separate class of our *two*.

The *Romanists* are very tenacious of the number seven. In the seventh session of the Council of Trent, canon the first, we are anathematized if we make either more or fewer than seven. We must not make thirteen any more, nor take in the 201 *μπτῆρ* of the Greeks, or some which the Fathers took in, when they used the word sacrament in its large sense; neither must we say, that the five are sacraments in some *lower sense* than the other two; they are all seven to be allowed "*verè et propriè sacramenta*." We must not say, that sacraments are only constituted to "confirm our faith¹⁰:" this may aim at our Article. We must not deny that sacraments *give* grace "*ex opere¹¹ operato*:" translated in the Articles of 1552, "*of the work wrought*." John Fox blames the Romanists for saying, that sacraments "*give* grace,"—and not only do *signifie*, but also "*containe* and exhibite that which they signifie, to wit, grace and salvation¹²." The Trent Catechism says, "they have in them an admirable and *sure* virtue to cure our souls¹³."

The Romanists say, that three sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, impress a *mark* or *character* (*χαρακτήρ*) upon the *soul*, and also give an *outward* distinction; that this mark or impression, or sealing, external and internal, is *indelible*; and therefore these sacraments cannot be *reiterated*. (See Trent Catech. Part II. on Sacraments in general, sect. 29, &c.)

This seems only to mean that a person *once* baptized, confirmed, ordained, is *always* baptized, confirmed, ordained;—which is against *re-baptizing*, *re-confirming*, and *re-ordaining*; that is, supposing a man *really* once baptized, &c. But re- 202 baptizing, &c. have always proceeded on the supposition that a man's first baptism, &c. were improperly called such. (Like our divorces *a vinculo matrimonii*.)

⁸ Neal, i. p. 37, in 1548.

⁹ Life of Laud, Introd. sect. 12.

¹⁰ Canon 5. John Fox says, sacraments are "*to excite our faith*:" vol. i. p. 36. *Excitare* is the word of our Article.

¹¹ Canon 8. This will be mentioned

under Art. xxix.

¹² Vol. i. p. 36. Acts and Monuments, or Martyrologie.

¹³ P. 145, or last sect. 32, of Part II. on Sacraments in general. Sect. 10 is mentioned in the ninth section of this Article.

If priesthood be indelible, a church can never withdraw its IV. commission from a priest—can never degrade him.

The Rhemists soften nothing¹, but maintain the seven sacraments in the fullest and strictest manner. I have already referred to Gal. iv. 3, where, I think, the arguments on both sides are sufficiently displayed, by them and their answerer Dr. Fulke; but other places may easily be found.

Even Dr. Dupin² “insists that the *five* Romish sacraments be acknowledged as such, whether instituted immediately by *Christ*, or not.” In the Acts of the Council of Trent, canon first of sess. 7, we are told that it is wrong to say, “non fuisse *omnia à Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta.*”

The author of “Principles and Practices of Methodists”³ mentions as a popish doctrine, “that the use of sacraments, accompanied only with an imperfect sorrow, so finishes and completes these religious acts, that they will be sufficient to justify us.” *Sacramental justification* is the term used by divines. The Trent Catechism mentions this⁴.

Those whom we call the *sectaries* have several of them run into an opposite extreme to that of the Romanists. The *Reformatio Legum*, in the part *de Hæresibus*, speaks against the same persons with our Article, who would have the sacraments to be taken “*pro nudis signis, et externis tantùm indiciis,*”—
203
“*quibus, tanquam notis, hominum Christianorum religio possit a cæteris internosci.*” But in a separate *title, de Sacramentis*, we have first a definition of sacraments, and an account of their efficacy; then the marks of a sacrament, and a declaration, that those marks are only found in Baptism and the Eucharist. After an account of these two, we have something concerning ordination, matrimony, confirmation, and visiting the sick. In other titles, we have something concerning ecclesiastical punishments, and excommunication. But I see no names of any *sects* mentioned.

Abroad, the followers of *Swenkfeldt* are said to have set

¹ This question about the efficacy of sacraments was much agitated between the Romanists and the Reformers. Limborch calls it *acris quæstio*, Theol. 5. 66, 21 and 22, p. 604.

² Mosheim's Appendix, p. 131, 8vo, vol. VI.

³ First Letter from Academicus, to Mr. Berridge, p. 73. This author is supposed to have been Bishop Green, Regius

Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.

⁴ Page 142, or sect. 16, Part II. on Sacraments in general.

⁵ *Reform. Leg. de Hæresibus*, cap. xvii. See also in *Syntagma Confessionum*, the Confessions, or Articles, of Augsburg, and Scotland, and Switzerland, pp. 61, 96, 153. And in the second Part, p. 15.

IV. aside all external ordinances, in favour⁶ of internal revelations; which is like what the *Quakers* have done since the time of Oliver Cromwell⁷. The pretext used was, that sacraments are *Judaical*.

Mr. Gloster Ridley, in his *Life of Bishop Ridley*⁸, tells us something of the sects alluded to. The *Anabaptists* and others, through abhorrence of the Romish worship of the *Hostia*, and the Lutheran high notions of the sacrament, ran so far into the opposite extreme, as to use low and scurrilous expressions concerning it; and to fix up bills or papers, against the door of St. Paul's cathedral, containing such expressions.

204 We have, in Strype's⁹ *Life of Archbishop Whitgift*, a paper signed by one Anthony *Randall*, minister of Lydford, of the *Family of Love*, dated May 31, 1581, containing the assertion for which he was deprived by the Bishop of Exeter. Amongst other things it is said, "He never thought the Lord's Supper and Baptism to be sacraments, because he had not read the word sacrament in the Holy Scripture. He alloweth the administration of sacraments because the magistrate hath established it."

I will conclude this history of sacraments in general with mentioning that the *Socinians* allow¹⁰ but *one* ceremonial *præceptum* of Christ—to break bread. How this is to be obeyed, will best appear hereafter.

3. Having finished our history of the sacraments taken collectively, we come to make some historical remarks on those *five*, taken separately, which we reject. These five still remain interesting to us, though we reject them as sacraments, because they are changed into *offices* which we esteem to be of great importance: *Confirmation*, *Absolution*, *Ordination*, *Matrimony*, and *Visitation of the Sick*. A right knowledge of these has a great tendency to make the *pastoral* duties useful to the public, as well as comfortable, or pleasing, to the pastor himself.

First of *confirmation*. In the primitive age of Christianity it appeared to the generality of thinking Christians, that Baptism included ideas both of *water* and the *Holy Spirit*¹¹. John iii. 5; Titus iii. 5; of which more hereafter. Persons of

⁶ See Rogers on the Article, p. 153.

⁷ Mosheim, Index, *Quakers*. Bennet's Confutation of Quakerism. Barclay's Apology, Prop. ii. sect. 2.

⁸ *Life of Bishop Ridley*, p. 216.

⁹ Strype's *Whitgift*, Appendix, p. 93.

¹⁰ Racov. Catechism, p. 143.

¹¹ Cave's *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 131, 2. Anon. *de Baptismo non iterando*, A. D. 253.

inferior rank in the ministry were competent to baptize with IV. *water*, but it was observable that those of the *highest*¹ rank 205 made use of *prayer* and *imposition* of hands for the obtaining of the *Holy Ghost*; and it was granted to their petitions. It shewed itself at first in some *supernatural* effects, otherwise the grant might have been incredible; but the *Comforter* was to be sent to Christians in all ages—to guide them into all truth, to reprove² and inspire them, to work in them both to will and to do³; yet he was to be asked⁴ for. What more natural *mode* of calling down the Holy Spirit could be adopted, when his gifts became *ordinary*, than one which was some *imitation* of the mode used by authority when they were *extraordinary*⁵? It suits this account, when *Jerom* calls what has now the name of *confirmation*, by the terms *imprecatio*, and *invocatio spiritûs sancti*. “Non abnuo hanc esse Ecclesiarum consuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longè in minoribus urbibus per presbyteros et *Diaconos baptizati* sunt, *Episcopus*, ad *invocationem* sancti Spiritûs manum impositurus, excurrat.” *Dial. contra Lucifer*. cap iv. And a little after, “Alioquin, si *Episcopi tantùm imprecatione*, Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lugendi sunt qui in villulis, aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis, per presbyteros aut *diaconos baptizati*, ante dormierunt quam ab *episcopis* inviserentur.” 206 The latter passage refers to cases of *necessity*⁶.

When churches increased, a *ceremony* would be wanted. *Unction* would readily occur, as suited to notions of Jews⁷, and Gentiles, and to many climates where Christianity was professed. How soon it was used in what we call *confirmation*, is not agreed: some learned men think very soon; but Bingham⁸ does not allow any proof of it before the time of Tertullian. However, we may look upon this ceremony as arbitrary, arising from particular circumstances; and therefore as one which may be *omitted*, though enjoined by the Council of Laodicea, in the year 367.

¹ The authorities seem well collected in *Wheatly* on Common Prayer, Confirmation, beginning, pp. 397, 398. In *Cornelius's* case, Acts x. 47, the Holy Ghost *precedes* baptism, and is the *cause* of baptizing.

² John xvi. 8, 13.

³ Phil. ii. 13.

⁴ Luke xi. 13. See also 2 Cor. i. 21, and parallels. And 1 John ii. 27, might be considered.

⁵ Whatever is in *Scripture* must be in

an age of *miracles*; but according to our reasoning about the difference between a first *ministry* and an established one, we might conclude with regard to any particular ordinance. See Art. xxiii. sect. 25.

⁶ These passages are quoted by Bingham, xii. i. 1.

⁷ Exod. xxx. 22. Psalm cxxxiii. 2. 1 John ii. 20. 27. See also Pearson on Creed, Art. ii. beginning, &c. pp. 80, 93. And for Gentiles, p. 99, folio.

⁸ Bingham's Antiquities, xii. iii. 2.

IV. Some scholastic writers own that confirmation as a sacrament was not instituted by Christ, or used by the Apostles; but that it was made a sacrament at the *Concilium Meldense*⁹. Cave mentions two, one in 845, the other in 1201; but he says nothing of confirmation in his account of either.

One of the scholastic writers was the famous Alexander Hales, the Doctor Irrefragabilis of our own country—called in Latin Alexander *Aleensis*¹⁰. The *matter* and *form* were distinctly expressed by Pope Eugenius IV. in the Council of Florence, in the year 1438.

It would seem very doubtful how soon confirmation should
207 follow *Baptism*. In the Baptism of adults the sooner the better; delay would only be owing to the necessary avocations of those superior ministers who were to confirm, that is, of Bishops¹¹. In case of Infant-baptism there would be more difficulty. Those who thought that the Eucharist should be administered to infants, would be for having confirmation follow Baptism immediately; but others would wish to have confirmation deferred till any one was fit to have been baptized as an adult. This distinction between adults and infants is not marked out so plainly as might be wished¹². In cases of Infant-baptism it is probable that the necessity of confirmation must have appeared particularly strong, as obviating objections incident to a contract, in which a contracting party had not perfect understanding¹³.

The *name* of confirmation was not common in ancient times. Cyprian¹⁴ uses *consummation*, or the verb *consummate*, but not as a technical term. The Greeks had different names; but I will speak of the Greeks separately.

The Greek Christians use unction in confirming: the ointment was made by the patriarch or bishop alone, on the Thursday in Passion-week, of precious ingredients, and with a sacred apparatus; it is used for some other purposes, but chiefly for confirmation; which always, in the Greek Church, follows Baptism immediately. It has the names of *χρίσμα*, unction; *χειροθεσία*, imposition of hands; and *σφραγίς*, the

⁹ *Consilium Meldense* was the Council of *Meaux*. See Bingham's Index of Councils, Ant. vol. II. p. 519.

¹⁰ Forbes, IX. iv. 4; and Cave calls him Alexander *de Hales*.

¹¹ See authorities from the Ancients, Bingham, XII. i. 1.

¹² However, see Bingham, XII. i. 2.

¹³ This is confirmed by Limborch, v. LXXvii. 3.

¹⁴ Cave's Dissertation under *μύρον* says, that Cyprian uses the word *consummation non semel*.

sign or seal of the Lord. In the *Ἐυχολόγιον*, or Greek ritual, IV. there is an office, called the Office of the Holy ointment, or *ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου*, where are the ceremonies and 208 prayers, and the mode of preparation. The vessel in which this ointment is contained has the name of *ἄγιον τοῦ μεγάλου μύρου*. But the Greeks do not call confirmation a *sacrament* ordained by Christ¹.

The *Romish* notion of confirmation is easily collected from the acts of the Council of Trent, and the Catechism composed by order of that Council. In the seventh session of the Council, there seem only to be three canons on the subject, without any argumentation. The first declares confirmation to be a proper sacrament, and not a mere ceremony, or catechetical examination; the second condemns those who allow no virtue to the chrism; the third says, that not every priest, but only a bishop, can confirm, ordinarily. In addition, we find in the Catechism the form of words made use of: "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, and confirm thee with the *chrism* of salvation. In the name of," &c. It is also affirmed, contrary to the schoolmen here mentioned, that Christ was "the *author*" of this sacrament, and "appointed the rite of *chrism*, and the *words* which the Holy Church uses", &c. The authority for this assertion is not *Scripture*, but the second Epistle of S. *Fabian*², Bishop of Rome; which is sufficient to those that believe confirmation to be a sacrament, because all sacraments are mysteries, "above the reach of human nature, nor can they be instituted by any but by God himself;"—as curious an instance of reasoning in a circle as you shall meet with. This Catechism proceeds to inform us, that the *matter* of this sacrament is *chrism*; the *form* was given before; that one confirmed ought 209 to have a *godfather*, as a "*monitor*," a "*captain*," a "*fencing-master*;" for he has now put on the whole armour of God; but that there must be no *marriage* with this fencing-master: that confirmation is not to be given till young persons have "the use of *reason*," and *therefore* it must be deferred till they are *eleven* years old, or however till they are *six*³: that confirmation gives spiritual *strength*, as appeared from the conduct

¹ This is chiefly from Cave's Dissertation, under *Μύρον*: see also Bingham, XII. i. 1.

² Cave mentions no such Eccles. writer. Ladvoeat places him in 236.

³ The Bishop of Lincoln, at his Visi-

tation, 1791, desired that none might be brought to be confirmed under fourteen years of age; which, I think, agrees with Archbishop Secker. See his Sermon at the end of his Lectures on the Catechism.

IV. of St. Peter, who deserted his cause *before* the descent of the Holy Ghost on the great day of Pentecost, but *after* it suffered with constancy.

The Catechism lays down, that confirmation is one of those sacraments which imprint a *χαρακτήρ*, as before-mentioned, and *concludes* with explaining the parts of the Romish ceremony;—the unction why on the forehead, the sign of the Cross, the *blow* struck by the bishop on the breast⁴, the giving of the *pax*⁵. The taking of *Whitsuntide* for a festival or season of confirmation, may be understood from what was just now said of St. Peter.

I should imagine that *Presbyterians* have no confirmation, (though they have penance, ordination, matrimony, and visitation of the sick) as I see nothing relating to it in their 210 *directory*, or in their form of Church-government⁶, and as it is rejected in the Helvetic confession;—yet the objections made by the Puritans, as described by Neal⁷, do not seem sufficient to justify a total abolition; being only, that children *might* come too young to the Eucharist, and that an expression in our bishop's prayer has an appearance of ascribing a *sacramental* effect to the institution. Yet Puritans used infant-baptism.

Those who set aside confirmation must conceive both water and spirit to have their full effect in *Baptism*. The Helvetic confession says, "*confirmatio et extrema unctio inventa sunt hominum, quibus nullo cum damno carere potest Ecclesia. Neque illa nos in nostris Ecclesiis habemus; nam habent illa quædam quæ minimè probare possumus.*"

The Church of *England* retains the office of confirmation, and confines it to the *bishop*; it closely imitates the Apostles in using no chrism—only prayer and imposition of hands. It defers the ordinance till young persons are arrived at years of discretion, that they may themselves ratify their baptismal covenants. It does not consider confirmation as a sacrament: the reason will best come into our proof. In *theory* it uses a *Godfather*, as a *witness*, but not in *practice*.

⁴ Wheatly says, on the *cheek*, p. 410. Limborch calls it *alapa*.

⁵ A paten which serves for the top of a chalice, which is given by the administering priest to the assistant priest to kiss,

just before the offering. So I understand the French Dictionary of the Academy.

⁶ Published in Append. to Neal's History of Puritans.

⁷ Vol. i. p. 159, quarto.

The *Baptists* are said to be much divided on the use of IV. confirmation¹;—insomuch that those who have held confirmation to be a necessary qualification for the Lord's Supper, have separated themselves, in celebrating that ordinance, from those 211 who have held the opposite opinion.

An incident, mentioned in the accounts of the Hampton-Court conference, may lead us to what may, in fact, have been the principal difficulty relating to Confirmation. That difficulty might be thus expressed: 'If confirmation be necessary, is not *Baptism imperfect*?' King James the First, who might be prejudiced, as a Scotchman, in favour of the Scotch Church, expressed a scruple of this sort; but Archbishop Bancroft, "on his knees replied, that the Church did not hold Baptism imperfect without confirmation;" that "it was of apostolical institution, Heb. vi. 2, where it is called the doctrine of the *laying on* of hands²." Indeed in that place (taking in the preceding verse) it seems described as one of the fundamental *principles* of Christianity, and as following Baptism. With regard to the difficulty, it is of a sort which often occurs amidst the imperfections of human transactions. King James might have recollected, that the accession of a king is completed by *coronation*. I suppose that if a king purposely neglected or refused to take the coronation-oaths, his neglect might shake his title to the crown; but if, without any culpable neglect, it happened that he was not crowned till he had begotten a son, and was to die, such posthumous son would probably inherit as if the accession was complete.

Baptism then may be complete without confirmation, if confirmation is not to be had; and yet confirmation may be requisite when it can be had. This seems to agree with the two sentences lately quoted from Jerom.

4. But we must now proceed to the second Romish sacra- 212 ment which we reject, viz. *penance*. A good deal was said on the efficacy of repentance under the sixteenth Article³. I will endeavour not to run into repetition. It seems as if we could not stir a step without distinguishing *private* repentance from penance considered as a part of ecclesiastical *discipline*; though the Latin word *pœnitentia* may stand for both. Peter

¹ Wheatly speaks on this subject; see his work on the Common Prayer, p. 406. Also Wall on Infant-Baptism, p. 447, quarto; or 2. 8. 6. 15. I do not perceive

that the Confession of Augsburg declares anything concerning it.

² Neal, vol. i. quarto, p. 412.

³ Art. xvi. sect. 1.—3, 18, 32, 33.

IV. Lombard speaks, as do others, of *pœnitentia exterior* as opposed to *interior*⁴. His idea might be the same with ours. Private repentance is visible only to God; whereas penance is visible to the Church, and may be considered as some evil undergone in order to avoid *excommunication*; yet though these two ought to be kept distinct in the mind, they sometimes run into one another. A private man may be guided in his repentance by a minister of the Church, as it might, without some regulation, be too light or too desperate; and a person under ecclesiastical censure, or penance, may inwardly repent, and his penance may be, and is meant to be, the occasion of his repentance. Also a private penitent may impose penance upon *himself*, or even apply to the Church to impose it upon him, independent of any restitution or compensation which he may think it right to make.

Whatever relates to penance, properly so called, should be deferred till we treat of the thirty-third Article. The Romish *sacrament* seems to me to relate to private repentance, as conducted and regulated by a minister of the Church. But let us proceed in order.

213 Before we come to the Romish Church, let us just take notice of the Greek *μετάνοια*. It was a part of the *εὐχολόγιον* before mentioned, and itself consisted of many parts; amongst others we find the following mentioned in Cave⁵:—

1. *Εὐχή ἐπὶ μετανοούντων*, a prayer over the penitents.

2. *Ἀκολουθία τῶν ἐξομολογουμένων*, an office for those who confess.

3. *Εὐχή ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιτιμιῶν λυομένων*, a prayer over those who are absolved from penance.

4. *Ἀκολουθία εἰς λύσιν ἀφορισμοῦ ἱερέως*, a service for dissolving the excommunication of the priest; containing, as I understand, many prayers.

From the Greek Church we are told⁶, that the first penitentiary formularies were brought into the Latin, by one of the name of *Theodorus*, who was of *Tarsus*, a monk, and afterwards, in the year 668, an inhabitant of England, and Archbishop of Canterbury.

That the Romish sacrament of penance is most properly an authoritative regulation of *private* repentance, will appear from dividing it into its constituent parts. These are *contrition*, *confession*, *satisfaction*, *absolution*. But the whole is

⁴ See Forbes, IX. v. 19.

⁵ Hist. Lit. Dissert. p. 31.

⁶ Cave, I. 593.

sometimes called by the name of a part. Our Homily¹, on IV. Common Prayer and Sacraments, seems to mean the whole by the word *absolution*; and that word is used in the same sense in the Necessary Doctrine², and in the works of Duns Scotus³. And the *form* of the *sacrament* is, according to the Trent Catechism, “*I absolve thee* ;”—though indeed the *matter* is said to be contrition and confession and satisfaction⁴.

“*Contrition* is the grief of the soul, and a detestation of 214 sin committed, with a purpose to sin no more for the time to come⁵.” Its place is sometimes supplied by what is called *attrition*, which is sometimes defined imperfect contrition. The difference seems to be, that contrition is grief for sin *as sin*, or *moral* sorrow and abhorrence; attrition is grief for sin as producing bad *consequences*—one might call it *prudential* sorrow and abhorrence. However, if this latter turns the *will* from sin, it is deemed efficacious.

Attrition is called by its *name* in the fourteenth session of the council of Trent, chap. 4; but the naming of it seems sometimes to be *avoided*. It is well and artfully *described* in the fifth canon of the same session, but not named; neither do I see it named in the Trent Catechism, though it is described in sect. 37.

The next part of the Romish sacrament of penance is *confession*. The word *auricular* is generally added to confession, in order to distinguish it from public and general confession, such as we open our service with (after a short sentence or two and an exhortation to confess); and because it is made in the *ear* of an invisible priest⁶.

Bishop Porteus says⁷, as to “private confession in all 215 cases, it was never thought of as a command of God for 900

¹ Homilies, 8vo, p. 276.

² Nec. Doctr. is not paged: near the begin. of Penance.

³ See Forbes, ix. v. 26.

⁴ Trent Catech. on Penance, sect. 17, 19, page 245, Engl.

⁵ Ibid. sect. 30, or p. 250.

⁶ The French Dictionary of the Academy says, the confessional is commonly *shut*, and that two penitents kneel at one time on different sides. These penitents cannot be supposed to communicate with each other; and I have understood that

the priest is not seen during confession; or not always. To confess, in French, often means to confess a *penitent*, that is, to receive his confession; consequently the priest, who confesses penitents, is a confessor; but in English, to confess always means to confess *sins*: so that the penitent would be the confessor in English, keeping up the analogy. But we rightly comply with Popish expressions in Popish business.

⁷ Brief Confutation, p. 47. See also Comber's Advice, p. 16.

IV. years after Christ, nor determined to be such till after 1200;” whereas the Council of Trent say⁸, “a sanctissimis et *anti-quissimis* Patribus, magno *unaninique* consensu, secreta confessio sacramentalis, qua *ab initio* Ecclesia sancta usa est, et modò etiam utitur, [fuerit] *semper* commendata.”

The opposition here seems strong; yet Bingham does a good deal towards reconciling the contending parties⁹, by observing, that though there were, in ancient times, several sorts of confession in some sense private, and though there was such an office as that of penitentiary priest, yet private negotiations had always relation to public discipline, and made a part of it; notwithstanding some things might be occasionally concealed, for fear of scandalizing weak brethren.

I have already observed, that the private penitent might be desirous to submit his offence to the Church, in order that he should be properly punished in this life—neither too slightly nor too severely; and this seems no unwise plan to gain satisfaction and peace of mind. Now this was the very business in which penitentiary priests were employed. And we may see that such a plan would make private penitence and church-discipline coincide; or at least would form an intimate connection between them. In the whole affair of penitence the great difference between ancient and modern times seems
216 to lie in this; that in ancient times private repentance was more intimately connected with church-discipline than in modern.

The *ἑξομολόγησις* of the ancients (taken from James v. 16,) Bingham shews to mean the whole of public confession and penance, considered as ecclesiastical discipline.

Daillé has written a very good book on auricular confession, the contents of which may be found in Bingham, xviii. iii. 4; which are well worth reading. But I would wish any one not by any means to excuse himself, if he is seriously studying the subject of confession, from reading the conclusion of the third chapter of Bingham’s eighteenth book.

In the Romish church, *young* persons are called upon to confess. The Trent Catechism mentions this, and describes the very humble posture in which confession is made¹⁰. It also mentions that confession must be *unreserved*—of evil thoughts,

⁸ Sess. 14. cap. 5.

⁹ Bingham, xviii. iii. 11. See also Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 459.

¹⁰ Page 261, sect. 56. See also Dict. Acad. *Confessional*.

words, and actions; or of offences against the *tenth* command-IV. ment, as well as against the other nine. It sets forth the provisions which are made for the security of the penitent who opens his heart¹; yet *Comber* shews that some cases have dispensation for divulging secrets²; as when a fault concerns the Church. This must give great latitude.

It seems strange that so much stress should be laid upon confession, and yet that it should be insisted on by the Church only *once a year*³. Could any one make a confession of all the sins, in thought, word, and deed, which he had committed during a whole year?

Whatever good some kinds of private confession might do, 217 yet the Romish is said to have been in fact productive of much evil. This is described by Sir Edwin Sandys⁴. *Comber*⁵ and *Benson*⁶ speak of the evil resulting from the clergy knowing the thoughts of men's hearts. Indeed, if we consider that among such a numerous body as the clergy some may be expected to be vicious and corrupt, we shall be shocked at the thoughts of their being intrusted with secrets capable of being turned to bad purposes. Yet the Romanists seem still to value private confession as much as any part of their religion⁷.

To me it seems that private confession, under ecclesiastical laws, is bad even in *theory*; that is, mischievous not through mere *abuse*—at least, not through any abuse but such as must be expected. Why not confess to God himself? To lean on inferior confidences, to be tried by narrow-minded judges, must tend to lower and debase the religious sentiments, as was said of worshipping saints and angels; and must hinder a man from looking up to his heavenly Judge. And what can be expected from reducing indeterminate duties to determinate laws, but a mechanical religion, coldness and evasion? What man pays with generous fervour what he is obliged to pay by law? What can be expected from requiring towards strangers, or persons of bad character, that confidence, those effusions of sincerity and contrition, which every delicate mind

¹ Sect. 64, and 74.

² Advice, p. 37.

³ Trent Catechism, sect. 59. French Prayer-book, page 16, "Les Commandemens de l'Eglise."

⁴ *Speculum Europæ*, p. 10.

⁵ Advice, p. 37.

⁶ On James v. 16.

⁷ I collect this from what I heard an eminent English lawyer of the Romish Church say, when he was soliciting an act of parliament for those who have since been called *protesting Catholics*.

IV. reserves for a few intimate friends, but hypocrisy or self-deceit?
 218 But our present business is *history*.

The Church of *England* may seem, from some things, to approach towards Romish confession. "Repentance," says Bishop *Sparrow*⁸, "consists of three parts, as the Church teaches in the Communion; 1. *Contrition*, or lamenting of our sinful lives; 2. Acknowledging or *confessing* our sins; 3. An endeavour to bring forth fruits worthy of penance, which the ancients call *satisfaction*." Thus Bishop Sparrow. And of the fourth thing, *absolution*, the Church of England affords several instances.

Confession, in some sort private, is often commended by our divines⁹, and even in our Liturgy: we may instance in the first exhortation to the Communion, and in the Visitation of the Sick¹⁰. But, in the first place, let me observe, that I look upon it as always a mark of good sense, when men are avoiding anything, not to do it rashly, and through mere disgust; but to take every good they can find, though mixed with evil which they disapprove: in avoiding one extreme, it shews rational moderation not to run precipitately into another. And with regard to particular regulations, there is a great difference between requiring a constant, *ordinary* confession of *all* sins, and recommending it to an unhappy man, who wants much to unburthen his mind, in one or two extraordinary situations, and to have his difficulties solved, to apply to one, who must, of course, be better informed than himself, and may be supposed free from religious melancholy. The ordinary language of our Church is, "confess yourselves to Almighty God," and it is found even in our first exhortation to the Communion; but when the mind is tormented with scruples, or debilitated by sickness, advice is wanted; and the weak should be "*moved*" to get over their reserve, and solicit spiritual "comfort or counsel."

219

The real purpose of our Church, in quitting the laws of auricular confession, and at the same time recommending some confidential intercourse between a minister and those troubled in conscience, was, probably, to throw off a yoke hard to be borne; to give liberty where the sensible and delicate mind most longs for it; to substitute affectionate exhortation in the room of penal laws, and mechanical observances; and thereby

⁸ Rationale, p. 17.

⁹ Bingham, xviii. iii. Bishop Porteus, p. 46.

¹⁰ See Wheatly, p. 460.

prevent hypocrisy and evasion, without dissolving the pastoral IV. connection and relation, or weakening the mutual confidence and mutual kindness between minister and people.

The next part of the Romish sacrament of penance, after confession, is *satisfaction*. The Church of Rome seems desirous to have the penitent suffer something in consequence of his offences; seeing, probably, that some suffering would be good for him, and might be made profitable to the Church. But how to manage, is the difficulty; for the system gives complete forgiveness to the penitent, even of mortal sins, without such suffering. It is therefore said, that God is sometimes spoken of as forgiving sins, when those who are forgiven have some partial, temporary *punishment continued*; and that, in a Christian, even after penance and absolution, there are some *embers*, as it were, of sin, some remains of vicious *habits*, from which *danger* is to be apprehended. Both, then, for the continuance of some punishment, and for the counteracting of these remains of evil in the mind, it is judged proper to set some kind of *tasks* to the penitent, to be performed after his absolution. To this it is added, that when the Church has been witness to a man's offending, it should be able, for its satisfaction, to see some sufferings submitted to as marks of amendment; and that such marks will serve as a warning to others, and make them cautious of offending. Lastly, it is laid down, that such actions as are prescribed as satisfactions ought never to be intermitted. The satisfactions enjoined by the confessors are to be *prayer*, *alms*, and *fasting*; these having a respect to God, our neighbour, and ourselves. But it is also held, that if *God* is pleased to inflict punishment himself, those will be the same in effect as satisfactions enjoined by the priest. The *quantum* of alms, &c., is to depend on circumstances; as on the fortune of the offender, &c. like *damages* given by a jury. This is trusting a good deal to confessors. 220

It is held also, that "one can satisfy for another,"—on account of the *communion of saints*; with some *limitation*, which I do not understand¹. Indeed, the whole of this satisfying by proxy is to me obscure. It answers some purpose, no doubt; indeed, one can see that it tends to promote a circulation of wealth in the Church; but the *moral* good of it

¹ It means, I believe, that if a person | usually to the *mind* of the penitent is
satisfies for another, the benefit arising | lost.

IV. does not strike me at present. Acts of mortification and self-denial, undertaken in order to break and extirpate vicious habits, are right and reasonable; but here they appear to disadvantage by being cramped up in a bad system.

The last part of the Romish sacrament of penance is *absolution*. In order to have an idea even of the historical part of the subject, one must attend to the distinction between
 221 *ministerial* and *judicial*. A person gives *ministerial absolution*, when he acts as a *minister* or *agent*, under God as a principal; *judicial*, when he acts in the capacity of a *judge*, from whom lies no appeal. Nor can we proceed rightly without remarking here, that all judicial absolution must consist in releasing offenders from punishments inflicted by religious society amongst *men*, or from Church censures; and that all anticipation of the day of judgment, in absolving, must be ministerial—its end, to warn and comfort;—though every decision of a minister or agent will undoubtedly be ratified, if the agent acts in his proper character², and is rightly informed; which he cannot be, except the repentance, in any case before him, be sincere: and as he can only pronounce absolution on supposition of sincerity in his penitent, his absolution must be, in some sort, *conditional*. This premised, we proceed with our *history*.

All absolution given in the Christian Church to Christians as individuals was at first ministerial³: there was not for many centuries any mention of the Church claiming to forgive as God. Though, in cases of judicial absolution from Church censures, prayers were offered that God would forgive the offender, as the Church had done. The forms of absolution which have been in use are four: the *precatory*, the *optative*, the *indicative*, and the *declarative*. They differ as do the following expressions:—‘O God forgive this penitent;’—‘*may* God pardon and deliver you from all your sins;’—‘I absolve thee from all thy sins;’—‘God pardoneth all them that truly repent; wherefore, as I presume, your repentance
 222 is sincere, I advise you to be of good comfort, and not to distrust the divine mercy.’ The most ancient of these forms was, I believe, the precatory; the optative is precatory as to its meaning. The indicative was not used till about the middle of the twelfth century⁴. Within a century after that,

² Art. xxii. sect. 17.

³ See Bingham, XIX. i. 1. &c.; and

Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 465,

&c.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 467.

the priest's indicative absolution was looked upon as equivalent IV. to the forgiveness of God.

There is one exception to ancient forms being precatory, which comes so near the case of our absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, that it seems worth mentioning. Even in the primitive Church, we are told that the *clinical* absolution¹, or absolution given to persons on a *sick bed*, was in the indicative form;—only certain religious exercises were enjoined in case of recovery, which, when the absolution was given, it was taken for granted would be faithfully performed. Perhaps it might be thought, that as persons on a sick bed are apt to be dejected, and their dejection is apt to increase their disorder, that form suited them best which was calculated to inspire the greatest confidence².

The Romish notions of absolution are to be found, as before, in the acts of the Council of Trent, and in the Trent Catechism. The Rhemish Testament might carry us into too great length. It was in the fourteenth session that the subject was treated: we find it mentioned in the sixth chapter and the ninth canon. The wish of the Council seems to be, to declare even private absolution judicial; but the difficulties are so striking, that they are obliged to soften the expressions. 223 However, in the canon the matter stands thus: any one is to be anathematized if he says, “*absolutionem sacramentalem sacerdotis, non esse actum judicialem, sed nudum ministerium pronuntiandi et declarandi remissa esse peccata,*” &c. Where I can conceive some *evasion* to be derivable from the word *sacramentalem*; for any man who believes there is such a thing as *sacramental* absolution, will believe it to be *judicial*; and what is affirmed is affirmed of no other. But in the chapter we have still greater caution; the absolution of the priest is owned to be “*alieni beneficii dispensatio;*” it is called “*ad instar actus judicialis.*” In the *Catechism*³, made for the instruction of the *people*, we find, that when the priest uses the words, *Ego te absolvo*, he pronounces that the sinner *has* obtained from *God* the pardon of his sins. Nay this is said of a penitent who has not confessed, but only has had the *wish* of confession; though by the ninth canon any one is anathema-

¹ See Dr. Marshall's Penitential Discipline, p. 104, quoted by Wheatly, p. 468.

² On this subject we find recommended,

Archbishop Usher's Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, and Dr. Marshall's Penitential Discipline.

³ On Penance, sect. xix. p. 246.

IV.

tized who shall say, “non *requiri* confessionem pœnitentis, ut sacerdos eum absolvere possit.” In some cases, still farther relaxation is allowed; for the priest is directed to absolve his penitents if he only finds that diligence in reckoning up sins, and grief in detesting them, have not been “altogether wanting.”

We come, in the last place, to absolution as it is practised in the Church of *England*. Our Church uses three of the four forms already mentioned; the declaratory near the beginning of the service; the optative, which is in sense precatory, in the Communion; and the indicative in the Visitation of the Sick. But Bishop Sparrow rightly observes⁴, that “these several forms, in sense and virtue are the same;” and illustrates his observation by the instance of a Prince commissioning an officer to set at liberty all well-disposed prisoners: it seems immaterial which form of words he uses. The indicative form was once, by the rubric in the office of Visiting the Sick, directed to be used in all private confessions when men had scruples of conscience⁵; but now, in the first exhortation to the Communion, though absolution is promised to the scrupulous, the form of it seems to be left to the priest, only it is shewn to be ministerial; and to be built, not so much on private judgment, as on “God’s holy word.”

I will close this account of absolution with observing, that though our expression in absolving the sick, “I absolve thee from all thy sins,” sounds as if the absolution were purely indicative; yet, if we take all the expressions of the form at once into our minds, we must perceive that the absolution is expressly called ministerial, and that it is also declarative and optative; and therefore, that the concluding expression cannot be rightly understood but as consistent with those forms to which no member of the Church of England objects.

Having now gone through the four parts, we may conclude by taking notice, that in the Romish sacrament of penance the *matter* is, the part of the *penitent*, (contrition, confession, satisfaction); the *form* is, the part of the *priest*, “Ego te absolvo.”

In the *Directory* of the Presbyterians, I do not see absolution mentioned; but the minister is to *comfort* the sick, to *declare* God’s mercy to penitents, to hinder the indisposed

⁴ Rationale, page 19.

⁵ See King Edward’s first Liturgy,

rubric in the Visitation of the Sick. Or Wheatly on Common Prayer, p. 469.

from being too much cast down, &c.; and, in case of *scruple*, IV. “instructions and *resolutions* shall be given to satisfy and settle him.”

5. The next Romish sacrament, after penance, which we reject, is *orders*: but on this we need not dwell very long. Indeed, our principal concern is with the Romish Church, as we have already, under the twenty-third Article, given some account of church-ministers in general; and as we shall have occasion to speak of the English ordinations in particular, under the thirty-sixth Article. However, if any particulars occur, which have not been mentioned before, and which throw any light upon the Romish orders, they may be admitted.

Bingham¹ gives an account of several sorts of ministers in ancient churches, which in our Church are not used;—as *deaconesses*, that is, elderly widows, attending on Baptism and other offices relating to *females*; *subdeacons*, *ὑπηρέται*, assistants to deacons, &c. in the ceremonies of the church—a sort of agents or messengers, and at the same time pupils, to the bishops; *acolythists*, (or acolyths, or acolytes) attendants for lighting candles, and providing wine for the Eucharist; *exorcists*, whose business it was to attend the *ἐνεργούμενοι*, or demoniacs, or possessed, and pray with them. This office of exorcists seems strange to us; nor do I perfectly know the nature of the disorders under which the *energumens* laboured, or were conceived to labour. Religious fervours have frequently disordered the intellects, especially in a new religion, when opposed by friends who could raise the affections, and occasion great agitation in the mind. In the plans of ancient churches, we see that two sides of the cloisters of the outward court were occupied by these *energumens*². As to the exorcist's driving away the unclean spirit at *Baptism*, that might be partly emblematical, and partly owing to the notions of men, not free from superstitious weakness, concerning the nature and end of that institution. 226

There were also, in the ancient churches *readers*, who read the Scriptures aloud in some elevated place or reading desk. All these were probably in training for higher offices. Even the *ostiarii*, or door-keepers, had a kind of ordination from the

¹ Bingham, III. iii.

² Frontispiece to Wheatly on the Common Prayer. I have been concerned with several persons who would have occupied

a place in one of these cloisters. While the Gospel was spreading, most, or many mad people would take a religious turn.

IV. Bishop, as far as that name could be applied to a ceremony of solemnly delivering to them the *keys* of all the sacred things with which they were to be entrusted³. Besides these there were *catechists*, and several inferior clerical officers; but I need not describe any more. Indeed, there is no end of the different modes in which men may worship God; and scarcely any, of the different officers who may be employed in very large religious assemblies, where the ceremonies are complicated and conducted with a magnificence calculated to strike the eye and warm the imagination.

Cave, in the alphabetical Dissertation before mentioned, has an article *χειροτομία*, or office for *ordaining* different clerical ministers. He informs us, that the *ostiarium*, *exorcist*⁴, and *acolythist*, are not now held clerical in the Greek Church; but that there are rituals in the Euchologion for ordaining bishop, priest, deacon, subdeacon, reader, &c. He mentions *Morinus* as a learned writer on such subjects.

The Romish church try to keep up a connection between the ideas of priesthood and *sacrifice*, with a view to their mass. They have five orders below that of deacons, which are enumerated in the twenty-third session of the Council⁵ of Trent; subdeacons, acolythists, exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers. These are the same *names* which we have found in ancient churches; but we are informed, even by Cardinal Bona, that, in reality, the ancient offices had ceased in his time; and that the persons called by these names, were chiefly *boys*, and men *hired*, but initiated by no kind of *ordination*⁶.

In the acts of the same Council, *order* is declared to be a proper *sacrament*, instituted by *Christ*; but the *unction*, though declared requisite, does not seem to be expressly called the matter of the sacrament. Imposition of hands is mentioned, and the grace of God; but only from the Epistle to Timothy; and no scriptural form of words is produced. *Order* is said to be one of those sacraments⁷ which impress an indelible *χαρακτήρ*.

In the Trent *Catechism* the proof that *order* is a proper sacrament, seems⁸ very lame. It informs us, however, that by

³ The *ostiarium* were not considered as laymen.

⁴ When the disordered in mind were not supposed to want *prayer*, &c. one who had the care of them would only be like a keeper of a mad-house: he need

not have any spiritual or clerical character.

⁵ Cap. ii.

⁶ I. xxv. 18. Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* Quoted by Bingham, III. iii. end.

⁷ Sect. 11.

⁸ Sect. 20.

the *shaving* of the crown an entrance is opened into the IV. sacrament of order, and that the shaven *circle grows* with 228 ecclesiastical dignity. It also sets forth “the dignity of door-keepers¹ ;” gives us the usual forms by which they and other inferior clerks are ordained, or appointed ; and mentions, that *bastards* and persons *deformed* are disqualified for ordination.

It seems reasonable that there should be a number of ecclesiastical officers in any place, proportioned to the greatness of the congregations in that place, and to the number and grandeur of the ceremonies. In our cathedrals we have precentors, &c., which we have not in our inferior churches ; not to mention vergers.

6. We now come to the Romish sacrament of *matrimony* ; but of this some history has already been given² under the twenty-third Article : we need only speak of Romish matrimony and our own.

The Council of Trent declares³ matrimony to be a sacrament instituted by Christ himself, but mentions neither *matter* nor *form* ; nor uses any argument, that I should call such, besides that passage⁴ of the Vulgate, “erunt duo in carne unâ. *Sacramentum* hoc magnum est.” It seems⁵ there have been great disputes amongst the Romanists whether *all* marriages could come under the notion of a sacrament. The Church of Rome is not only against *polygamy* but *divorces*. As matrimony is with them a sacrament, it is *indissoluble* ; not that it is one of those which stamp a χαρακτήρ, because, though indissoluble for life, it may be dissolved by death. Nor is it inconsistent with *separation, a mensâ et toro* ; but only with 229 divorces strictly so called, *a vinculo matrimonii*. Yet any marriage not consummated is dissoluble by one of the parties going into a convent or monastery, or entering into any religious order. The prohibitions and disqualifications from consanguinity, &c. are numerous, more so than those in Leviticus ; and the Romish Church claims a power of adding ; but ease is to be procured by means of *dispensations*. Now the greater strictness there is, the more frequently must dispensations be sued for. I will only observe farther, on Romish matrimony, a seeming singularity—I mean, that an institution should be deemed a sacrament only by those who most commend abstain-

¹ Sect. 31, margin.

² Art. xxiii. sect. 12.

³ Session 24.

⁴ Eph. v. 31, 32. See sect. 2 of this Article, about *sacramentum*.

⁵ See Limborch's Theol. v. LXXvii, end.

IV. ing from it!—to commend abstinence from a *sacrament* would appear to us somewhat strange.

It is natural here to take some notice of *our own* customs concerning the institution of matrimony.

We seem to go on this principle, that a society, formed in order to bring up youth in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, ought to be formed with some solemnities of a religious sort. And whatever inspires religious sentiments will refine the sexual appetites, and hinder them from degenerating into gross brutality—will tend to meliorate love by a mixture with friendship; and sensual desire, by esteem of moral perfections.

It is of course that we reject unlimited intercourse of the sexes; but, moreover, we reject *concubinage*, not only in the modern sense of the word, but that kind of unequal marriage between master and slave, or servant, which used to be called concubinage in very ancient times. We place the husband and wife in *one rank*, and make their reciprocal claims on each other's person and property to be equal. We reject also *polygamy* entirely.

We adopt the prohibitions and impediments, in respect of consanguinity, &c. which are mentioned in the Mosaic law; but, it may be, they are such as would result from the *moral* principles of incest, applied to the prevailing customs of the part of the world which we inhabit⁶.

We look upon adultery⁷ as dissolving the marriage contract, and therefore, on proof of it, allow of *divorce*; but we take all methods to encourage honouring the wife as the weaker vessel. And we inculcate not only gentleness and courtesy, but patience; of which our *homily* is a respectable proof—the composition of some one who well knew, not only Scripture, but human life.

In our service, the union between Christ and his Church is set in the right light; and becomes, instead of a foolish argu-

⁶ See Wheatly, p. 425. Lev. xviii. The table was drawn up by Archbishop Parker, who infers from one sex to the other. The Romanists had too many impediments from consanguinity, &c.: we wanted to lessen their number; what way more unexceptionable, or less likely to be excepted to, than for us to take the *Levitical* impediments? Extending them to both sexes made them seem more numerous, and therefore nearer to the

Popish; but the Jews must have extended them in like manner, by parity of reasoning.

⁷ This does not mean the law of England, as it stands; that allows *no* divorce, (see Blackstone, Index, *Divorce*); we mean those principles on which a new law may at any time be made, and on which new statutes are framed occasionally.

ment for a *sacrament*, a rational and affecting inducement both IV. to Christian piety and conjugal love.

One objection to this account, with respect to the equality of husband and wife, is striking; the wife contracts to *obey*, which the husband does not. And it is true that no *society* can be carried on without *authority* lodged somewhere; but such authority as is lodged with the husband is only for the 231 sake of *unity*, in order that education, &c. may not absolutely stop. Conjugal authority would be *abused*, according to our principles of marriage, if it gave any honour, privileges, accommodations, to the husband above the wife. The wife of a duke is a *duchess*, of a peer a *peeress*, and so on; though in ancient times some sorts of wives were little better than slaves, having little or no claim on the person or property of the husband.

It may be said, why could not conjugal authority be *divided*, and given to the husband in some things, to the wife in others? It seems probable, that if that had been done the wife would not have had an influence so great, or so suited to her powers, as she now has. The conjugal society is formed so much upon sentiment, that the exercise of its authority may be left more indeterminate than that of other societies. The magistrate ought indeed to have a power of protecting a wife from personal danger, or from what, in her rank, would be called indigence; but to make general laws that the wife in all families (and only general laws could be made) should have so much conjugal authority, and no more, might be probably, in effect, preventing the husband and wife from governing tacitly according to their respective powers of governing to good purpose.

The *American* Liturgy omits our expression, “*with my body I thee worship.*” The omission makes the form appear to me very blank. *Worship* is an old word for honour¹ or respect; and by the formulary used in our Liturgy upon putting on the ring, the husband engages to treat his wife as an *equal*, in *person* and *property*; that is, not as a *concubine*, 232 such as *Hagar* was to *Abraham*. Now to change a form which does this, so as to make it only engage for respectful and honourable treatment in regard to *property*, is surely to cut off a material part; especially if we consider what *St. Paul* says, 1 Cor. vii. 4. I do not say that *American* husbands do not treat their wives with personal respect—I speak only of the

¹ Art. xxii. sect. 9.

IV. propriety of a verbal *form*. Yet I think the English Liturgy was formed by a wisdom superior to that which dictated the American.

The *Presbyterians* seem only to *simplify* the rite of marriage; whether with good effect, I should much doubt. The account of the marriage-ceremony ordained in the *Directory*, as given in the preface to Grey's *Hudibras*, might not be too long for me to read to you.

7. We come, lastly, to the history of the Romish sacrament of *extreme unction*.

The primitive anointing of the sick has been generally accounted the gift of *healing*; though Papists must maintain also a sacramental unction. In the seventh century, we are told, Christians practised unction with a view of curing their bodily diseases. This was not merely a medicinal application of oil; it was religious, or rather superstitious. Superstitious people, in different ages and countries, have run into a kind of religious quackery². But in the twelfth century the bodily cures failed so often, that it was thought best to hold the anointing to be beneficial to the *soul*, rather than the body; and to the body, only when bodily health would do the *soul no*
233 *harm*. When this came to be the notion, those parts of the body were anointed which are considered as instruments of *sin*³.

Cave gives us an account of an office or ritual used in the Greek Church⁴, and called *Εὐχέλαιον* or prayers for the ceremony of extreme unction; it is part of the *Euchologion*, and is entitled more fully, The Service of the Holy Oil, to be sung by *seven* priests, collected in the *church* or *house*: that is, the sick man was to be brought to *church* to be anointed if he was strong enough to bear it; but if he was very weak indeed, “*graviter afflictus et prostratus*,” the *seven* priests were then to sing this service at his house. Many mystical reasons are given why the number should be seven, and therefore we may suppose that it was never less. Extreme unction, though practised in the Greek Church, is not there reckoned a *sacrament*; nor was it of old, by Chrysostom, nor indeed in the Latin Church, by the venerable Bede⁵.

² See injunctions of King Edward VI. in Sparrow's Collection, p. 9. Fulke on the Rhemists, fol. 433, mentions a custom of carrying home water, after it had been used for baptizing, in order to apply

it to bodily sores.

³ This from Wheatly, p. 475, &c.

⁴ *Hist. Lit. Diss.* p. 28.

⁵ See Fulke against the Rhemists on James v.

In the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent, we find IV. three chapters and four canons upon extreme unction. It is called, in the chapters, a proper *sacrament*, intimated (*insinuatium* ¹) by Christ in St. Mark's Gospel, and recommended and published by St. James. From a *tradition* concerning the passage of St. James, chap. v. 14, &c., the Church has learnt what that Apostle teaches; namely, that the *matter* of this sacrament is *oil*; the *form*, these words, "*Per istam unctionem*," &c.; the *effect*, to *wipe off sins*, and to promote the health of the *body*, when that is expedient for the *soul*. The *elders* mentioned by St. James mean *priests*. This sacrament is to be administered to persons who seem to be "*in exitu vitæ*;"—from which it is sometimes called "*sacramentum exeuntium*." The *canons* are not content with saying that this sacrament was "*insinuatium*" *a Christo*; they say it was *a Christo Domino nostro* "*institutum*." In other things they only repeat what was said in the chapters, annexing anathemas. 234

The Trent Catechism tells us moreover at length what is the *form* of this sacrament: "God indulge" (or pardon) "thee by this holy unction, whatever offence thou hast done through the fault of thy *eyes*, or *nostrils*, or *touch*;"—and says, that the institution "*came from Christ*," and afterwards was *published* by St. James: it was *rather* to heal the *soul* than the *body*. This sacrament is to be administered to such as are "*grievously sick*;" but before they lose their senses. Besides the parts of the body mentioned in the form, some others are to be anointed—the *ears*, the *mouth*, the *hand*, the *feet*, and lastly the *reins*, (only in men, not in *women* ²), "*being the seat, as it were, of pleasure and lust*." And the sacraments of penance and the eucharist are to be received as a *preparation* for that of extreme unction. This sacrament is said to require great *trust*; and to be sometimes less effectual than it might be, through want of *faith* in him who receives it.

The *Necessary Doctrine* says, that extreme unction (which it calls a *sacrament*) is to be ministered to such as *require* it; that it is called extreme, or *last*, because it comes after *other* 235

¹ This word *insinuatium* was a *correction* in the council. A thing *might* be intimated in one place, and instituted in another; but, in that case, the institution would be the thing mentioned.

² I do not see this distinction in the Catechism, but it is mentioned in *Limborch*, v. LXXVII. 21, where the account of the Romish notions is concise, and seems accurate.

IV. *unctions*. It may be administered more than *once*, and ought to be “in the *entrie* of sickness;” and the Eucharist ought to be received *after* it.

King Edward VI. retained³ the custom of anointing for some time, as a *temporary* indulgence to the *prejudices* of those who had been brought up in Popery; but in his *second*⁴ Liturgy it was omitted. Wheatly gives us the form, out of King Edward’s first Liturgy; in which the priest addressed the sick person, when he anointed him, “upon the *forehead* and *breast* only.” He also observes, that this unction might be considered as the remains, not of the primitive, but partly of the ancient, and partly of the popish unction.

In our Liturgy, as it has stood ever since the publication of the second Book of Edward VI. we have no unction; but we have a Visitation of the Sick. Of this I may be expected to say something; but my observations have been anticipated, either under the subject of *Confession*, or under that of *Absolution*. I seem now only to have to read to you the sixty-seventh Canon; which leaves the whole *method* of instructing and comforting the sick to the *discretion* of the minister, if he be a *licensed preacher*; if he be not one, he is then “to *instruct and comfort*” the sick “in their distress, according to the order of the *Communion-book*”⁵.

236 P. S. In Wall’s Infant-baptism, it is said⁶, that the English *Baptists* use extreme unction, though rarely, and in hopes of recovery.

8. At length we have finished the *history* of this twenty-fifth Article; and we come now, in course, to the *explanation*.

Our present Article has that for the first paragraph which was the last in the Article of 1552; and has that for the last which was the first, after a sentence from an Epistle of Augustin to Januarius⁷. In the middle it has a rejection of five popish sacraments, which in King Edward’s Article were not mentioned. It has omitted one sentence of the former Article, concerning the effect of the sacraments being “*ex opere operato*”—in the English, “*of the work wrought* ;” retaining the

³ Mentioned sect. 2.

⁴ See Neal, p. 37, vol. 1. 4to; and Wheatly on Common Prayer, pp. 471, 477.

⁵ See the Canons of 1603; and Wheatly, Introd. to Visit. Sick. He says, it may

be questioned whether, “by the Act for *Uniformity* of publick prayers, we be not restrained from *private forms*.”

⁶ Part II. chap. viii. sect. 2, page 446, quarto.

⁷ Sect. 2.

sense, in the rest, but dropping the *phrase*, with the remark IV. upon it.

The first paragraph of our Article contains a definition of a sacrament ; which it is no very easy matter to give. We have one in our short Catechism ; to those who find one of these intelligible, the other will be so too. It seems to me a good way to get at the meaning of our Church, to consider what opinions she wishes to *avoid*. With regard to the nature of a sacrament, she wishes first to avoid the notion, that it is a mere *badge*, by which Christians are distinguished from heathens ; and next, the notion that it acts *mechanically* upon the soul, as a powerful *medicine* does upon the body. If the inquirer finds any space between these two notions, the Church of England seems willing that he should range in it freely. We must suppose some outward *sign*, and some inward meaning ; this meaning must imply some *good* affecting our *minds*,²³⁷ and the *future* happiness of our souls, and *appropriated* to ourselves by our own voluntary acts ; and then other particulars, if any there be, may be left unascertained. My own idea of a sacrament is, a ceremony, which expresses by *visible words* (as Augustin¹ calls them), some great *benefit* bestowed by God on man ; which may be some beneficial *state* or condition, leading to great good—a ceremony immediately enjoined by divine authority. It is called an outward “sign of an inward and *spiritual grace*,” or *favour* ; but *inward* is only opposed to *outward* ; and means, the *benefit* shadowed out by the ceremony : and any benefit (or grace, or favour) may be called *spiritual* which relates to the future happiness of our soul or spirit, or to the improvement of the *mind*. *Spiritual* is opposed to the *material* sign ; and its sense best got by taking it so. If it appears to any Christian that God’s Holy Spirit must be concerned in a sacrament, he may satisfy himself thus. When we come to consider attentively how great and wonderful a thing it is that *God* should institute a ceremony for *us*, and how grateful we ought to be for the benefit which it shadows out, and how diligent we ought to be in securing and rightly applying that benefit, we must feel very great moral *improvement*² ; and all such improvement it is our duty to *refer* to the assistance of the *Holy Spirit*. The

¹ *Contra Faustum*, XIX. 16, cited by Forbes, ix. i. 32.

² P. S. I think our Reformers had

much the same idea : see *Reform. Legum, de Hæresibus*, cap. xvii.

IV. nature and manner of such reference belongs to the tenth Article. This moral improvement, this dispelling of our weaknesses, this warming of our sentiments, and confirming of our good principles, is called, with respect to the Lord's Supper, 238 "the *strengthening* and *refreshing* of our souls." I should think that this might serve as an explanation of the first paragraph: to me it makes that paragraph intelligible.

The second paragraph needs no explanation.

In the third, some expressions may be noticed.

"Those five *commonly* called sacraments."—We should not express ourselves so *now*, but the *five* were very commonly called sacraments when the Articles were made. "Sacraments of the *Gospel*:"—this is opposed to *sacramenta* in the *large* sense, as meaning any *emblematical* actions of a sacred nature.

In the remaining part of the Article, we have several instances of the *plural* number being used when only *one* single thing is meant. The *Puritans*³ objected to this, at the Hampton-Court Conference; making confirmation to be included in both expressions "corrupt following," and "allowed;"—at least that is the best sense that I can make of the objection. Corrupt imitation⁴ of the Apostles may relate to confirmation, orders, and extreme unction, or it may mean only the last; but "*states* of life allowed in the Scriptures," seems to mean matrimony alone: our *Homily*⁵ says, "*godly states* of life," meaning the same thing. Afterwards, "Sacraments" are not "to be *gazed upon*," &c. is applicable to the Lord's Supper only. "Duly *use them*" may indeed include Baptism, because consecrated water used to be carried home and given 239 to the *diseased*⁶. But St. Paul's passage⁷ about unworthy receiving relates to no sacrament but the Lord's Supper.

In excuse for this using plural where only one thing is meant⁸, we may say, let any one try to use the singular number, and yet keep to the subject of sacraments in general. Several other little things may be said. "*They*" is sometimes used, when the meaning only is to keep the expression general, and not determine whether *he* or *she* or *several* be meant. "*They* whom I shall employ in this business will

³ See Neal, vol. i. quarto, p. 415.

⁴ Art. ix. "*following of Adam*." Sect. 17.

⁵ P. 277, octavo.

⁶ Fulke on Rhemists, fol. 433, top: as in sect. 7.

⁷ 1 Cor. xi. 29. Yet Augustin treats of the efficacy of Baptism as depending on the worthiness of the receiver. Forbes, x. i. 20; x. ii. 14.

⁸ Archbishop Usher keeps this mode of expression in his Irish Articles.

do it well, you may depend upon it:’ a person who said this IV. might employ *one* man, or one *woman*, as well as several. We affirm concerning anything in the plural, when we are speaking of it, as being some *species* or *class*. Your *Voltaires* are dangerous people. Forbes says¹, “*Patres aliquando, de uno Sacramento loquentes, utuntur vocabulo numeri pluralis.*” And in the Epistle to the Hebrews we find something which seems to be of the same nature²; “subdued kingdoms,” &c. &c. predicated of a few particular men—Gedeon, Barak, &c. every *one* of whom did not perform *all* the exploits there mentioned, though they were performed by the persons named.

We cannot well say more in the way of explanation, without encroaching on some of the subsequent Articles.

9. Our *proof* must be directed solely against the *five* popish sacraments which we reject; all the rest belongs to other places. In disputing whether different things can be called by the same name, we are apt to run into trifling propositions, by using that name in different senses; but here we seem secure from that snare; for the Romish Church defines 240 a sacrament much as ours does; and without that, it would be enough if we proved that the Romish five are not sacraments in the same sense with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

In the Trent Catechism³ a sacrament is defined, “a thing subject to *sense* which, by *God’s* appointment, has vertue both to *signifie* and to *work* holiness and righteousness.” “*God’s* appointment” cannot signify the course of *nature* or *providence*, for all sacraments are held by the Romanists⁴ to be appointed by *Christ*. In this definition there are *four* parts corresponding to the four parts of ours:—1. An external part; 2. An appointment of Christ; 3. A signifying, or sign, or pledge; 4. An invisible efficacy. This settled, we may briefly remark on the Romish *five*.

Confirmation seems sufficiently authorized as an holy ceremony, but it has no external rite appointed by Christ. Imposition of hands is not peculiar to it, and chrism is of human invention.

Penance, or penitence, public or private, is an important thing; but it has no tolerable pretensions to institution of Christ as a visible ceremony. The confession mentioned James v. 16, is, in some way, *mutual*. And the *effects* of

¹ Forbes, ix. v. 6.

² Heb. xi. 33.

³ P. 131, or sect. 10, of Sacraments in general.

⁴ Trent, sess. vii. canon 1.

IV. popish penance may be expected to prove such as are described, Ezek. xiii. 10.

Ordination, or *Orders*, is very well authorized; but *Christ* never ordained with any visible sign, nor ever instituted any for his Apostles. They used imposition of hands, but not for ordaining only.

Matrimony was not instituted by Christ, in any sense; he confirmed it as a contract, but not even as a *sacred* contract: nor did he appoint any *rite* for the execution of the contract. And it is one in which the Supreme Being is no *party*. As to Eph. v. 32, the marriage of Christ and his Church is certainly a *mystery* (*μυστήριον*), which in Latin is rendered *sacramentum*; but the meaning only is, that Christ is not *literally* married to his Church, but only *metaphorically*, or mystically. This is only an argument in one language: translate it, and it vanishes into nothing.

Extreme unction, if enjoined at all, was enjoined not by Christ, but after his death. Mark vi. 13, relates cures merely of a bodily sort; and even in bodily cures oil was not always used by Christ. James v. 14, &c., seems to me to mean nothing beyond the compass of ordinary practical piety and benevolence; as I will endeavour to shew more at large.

Our *Homily*⁵ on Common Prayer and Sacraments shews these *five* to be no sacraments in about one page.

How different are they from those two which we retain! instituted for the most important situations;—for a change of life on *entrance* into the Christian covenant; for a prospect of *eternal* happiness, to be attained by the Christian sacrifice: confined to no rank or order of Christians; instituted, both as to their external rites and their influence on the heart, with a plainness wholly incontrovertible⁶!

10. As the Romish sacrament of extreme unction is founded on one single passage of Scripture, James v. 14, 15, I think our end will be best answered if I give you my idea of that passage. I found I had not a satisfactory notion of it; and therefore I set myself to consider it without consulting commentators. It appeared to me to have the following meaning:—‘I am giving you (St. *James* is supposed to speak, or write) miscellaneous moral and religious directions, as is usual

⁵ Pp. 276, 277, octavo.

⁶ St. Paul seems to me to make quite a separate class of ordinances of our

two sacraments, in 1 Cor. xii. 13. See *Locke's Paraphrase*. The Rhemists take no notice of it.

at the close of an epistle; let me direct what is to be done in IV. cases of *sickness*. Is any one indisposed amongst you? he will of course take all *human*¹ means of recovery—that need not be advised; but let him not neglect *religion*. Sickness is favourable to piety; and should always be considered, though with due modesty and diffidence, as the *visitation* of God. And it is He who must give a *blessing* to the best judged *medicine*, before it can be effectual, (Psalm cxxvii.) Let then the sick man act as is most likely to promote piety in himself, and to draw down the blessing of Almighty God upon his endeavours. Man was not made to be *alone*—as little in sickness, and as little in religion, as in any thing else. Let the sick man then invite some grave elderly Christians, amongst whom will naturally be some of sacred characters, and let them form a little *domestic religious society*. As a society cannot proceed without some *ceremony*, let some one of these respectable persons, as by commission from them all, make some *application* of something usually esteemed *mild and lenient*, to the *body* of the indisposed. This is to be done *religiously*, or “in the name of the Lord;” and the ceremony will dispose the company properly for what is the *principal* thing, *domestic prayer*, and *intercession*. “O how amiable” must such devotion be! how improving to the minds of all! how likely to draw down the *blessing* of “the Lord!” *Surely* he will hear 243 the prayers of his *faithful* servants; surely there is ground for *confidence* that he will raise up the dejected. And as our *Lord* joined *forgiveness* of sins with bodily *healing*, the whole of one of his blessed cures will be accomplished! Perhaps the indisposed may be troubled in *mind*. O, let mutual confidence, in all such cases, open the *heart* to so venerable a fraternity! that must needs give new strength to intercession. Think not that I direct you thus without reason and example. I have just now mentioned the “patience of *Job*;” let me, in like manner, suggest to you the successful intercessions of *Elijah*.²

As this interpretation is not the same with that given by commentators, they generally taking St. James’s unction either for a sacrament, or for an exercise of the miraculous gift of healing², it may be proper to offer some reasons for my own opinion.

1. The word ἀσθενεῖ does not seem to denote any *grievous*

¹ See in Sparrow’s *Rationale*, p. 300, patients to send for divines. The same a decree that physicians shall direct their in Wheatly. ² 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30.

IV. or *dangerous*³ sickness—nothing which could give occasion to the name of *extreme* unction, or require the help of a *miracle*. The sick man is supposed well enough to *invite* the elders.

2. It seemed to me that *elders* might mean *elderly Christians*, whether in orders or not. The Apostles *ordain* elders; but that does not seem to prove that elderly *laymen*, or elderly men *as such*, were *never* called *πρεσβύτεροι*. In *Fulke's* answer to the Rhemists on James v. I since find that *Bede*⁴ rendered *πρεσβύτεροι* “the elder sort;” and I find other remarks in support of the interpretation. Dr. Powell says⁵,
244 that it is not known exactly what was the nature of the presbyters in the apostolic age.

3. The use of *oil* seems to prove nothing, as to any cure being *miraculous*. It is used Mark vi. 13, in miraculous cures; but it was only as the *clay* and *spittle* which Christ used in curing the blind. Sometimes imposition of hands was used, and sometimes all externals were omitted. Oil may be used in any emblematical ceremony, as well as imposition of hands in ordination; it was so used in early times of the Christian Church, as we saw under confirmation⁶.

4. It is not the oil, but the *prayer*, which is said to *save* (*σώζειν*) him who *labours* under infirmity (*κἀμνόντα*.)

5. The expression, “*shall save the sick*,” looks at first as if a *miraculous* cure was meant; but “*shall save*,” cannot be taken literally; because something is spoken of which is to be done to *all* sick Christians; and if “*shall save*” was to be taken literally, or the cure was *miraculous*, none would *die*. Why, in that case, should the example of *Elias* be brought as an argument, or as a persuasive? Besides, is prayer never unsuccessful? the instance could only prove that prayer *may* save.

6. The *Lord's* raising up the sick man implies nothing miraculous: in the language of piety the Lord raises up *every one* who *recovers*.

7. As to *forgiveness* of sin, it is in so many places joined with healing, some of which have nothing⁷ miraculous in them,

³ Lex. Steph. quotes Cyrop. Lib. viii.

⁴ A. D. 701 (Lardner).

⁵ P. 364. Thesis.

⁶ Sect. 3.

⁷ See Psalm ciii. 3, with Bishop Lowth's note on Isaiah xxxiii. 24. and Liii. 4.

See also Matt. ix. 5, (with proverb in Whitby's note) and its parallels, Mark ii. 9; Luke v. 23; Matt. viii. 17. Hammond cites more texts, and mentions the case of Hezekiah. In the old Italic version *ιαθῆτε* is even translated “*ut remittatur*”

that I look upon it as a kind of Jewish phrase to express a *cure*. IV. Under the tenth and seventeenth Articles, we mentioned, that 245 the phraseology of the Jews refers all sorts of events to God. And on a footing of natural religion we may say, that *all evil is punishment*; though God may in this life punish men *collectively*: *sufferings* may fall upon *mankind* for the faults or negligence of *mankind*. Were it easily admitted that all evil is punishment, it must follow that the removal of evil is forgiveness.

8. In order to have the example of *Elias*, we must see that the fifteenth and sixteenth verses are on the same subject. This appears sufficiently from the word *ιαθῆτε*; but in two¹ good MSS. the word *οὖν* shews also a connection. *ἀλλήλοις*, and *ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων*, may mean, *in turns*; that is, when any one is sick, let him open his mind, and let his pious friends intercede for him. If this was made a custom, each Christian, (in case of recovery) would be sometimes the visited, sometimes the comforter and intercessor. First it is said, if any one is sick, the elders should, if invited, pray by him. The inference is more extensive—‘open *then* your hearts to one *another*, when *by turns* you labour under sickness; and pray *mutually* for sick neighbours’

All these remarks occur in reading the passage itself: others arise from some extraneous circumstances.

1. There is no probability that a custom of miraculous healing, or a sacrament of perpetual obligation, should be instituted at the conclusion of an epistle, in the midst of moral 246 directions, with every thing ordinary and natural, with nothing similar before or after it. I should imagine there might not be found an instance of any thing but moral directions at the close of an epistle. Nor can we conceive that anything supernatural could be instituted in so *few words*, without any mention having been made of it *by Christ*, or by *St. Paul* when treating of miraculous gifts. Had *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* been founded on only one text each, I should think they rested on weak foundations.

2. Those who have attended to the conduct of *St. James* will not think it like his usual *prudence* to institute super-

tatur vobis.” (Michaelis, *Introductio Lect. quarto, sect. 62.*) Our Church, in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, speaks of sickness as certainly God's

visitation; and as what *may* be sent to correct and amend what is offensive to God.

¹ First New Coll. and first Steph.

IV. natural observances in the slight and sudden manner here supposed. I refer chiefly to what is called the Council² of Jerusalem. (Acts xv. 13.)

3. The *ceremony* supposed in my interpretation does not seem an *unlikely* one to take place, nor contrary to the customs of early Christians. Their throwing *ashes* on the head of a Christian on Ash-Wednesday, was of a similar nature³.

4. We must not be understood to say, that no elder, when St. James wrote, had that *gift of healing*, which is repeatedly mentioned by St. Paul. In the case before us, whatever might be the efficacy of the religious act, it should be ascribed to *prayer*.

5. Without determining the nature of St. James's injunction, we might inquire how far it admitted of *change* in after times. It seems as if the *oil*, on any supposition, might be changeable; for miraculous cures were not always performed with oil; and in mere ceremonies oil was accidental, depending upon local customs or the produce of the earth. Oil seems to have been an established⁴ mild remedy in surgery, as appears from the application of it by the good *Samaritan*; and therefore any other established mild remedy might be substituted for it⁵. Nor does the opinion, that St. James's unction was miraculous, make much difference; since a natural practice of an ordinary sort has been shewn, in several instances⁶, to follow a similar extraordinary supernatural one, without interruption.

11. Such is our direct proof: if we aimed at any indirect, we might answer the weak *objection* of *Anthony Randall*, that *sacrament* is not a *scriptural term*⁷. It is in the Latin, and in the Latin only; it could not be in the original. But it is not necessary that when Scripture institutes a *thing*, it should also give it an authentic *name*; and yet when Christians have occasion to speak frequently of that thing, they must give it *some name*, as they do to other things; and they are most strongly induced to do so when there are several observances which want a *common name*.

² Art. xxi. sect. 1. See also Art. vi. sect. 24.

³ Bp. Bramhall, cited by Puller, p. 275.

⁴ What say *Hippocrates* and *Galen* of oil?

⁵ The oil would be called a *tradition*,

in Art. xxxiv.

⁶ In Ordination, Art. xxiii. sect. 25; in Confirmation, sect. 3 of this Article.

⁷ The Quakers think this argument worth adopting: see Barclay's *Apology*, Prop. xii. sect. 2, beginning.

The word *μυστήριον* is more confined in its meaning than IV. *sacramentum*. Every emblematical action has an outward meaning and an inward one: *sacramentum* includes both; but *μυστήριον* expresses only the inward meaning. Hence *sacramentum* is not a good translation of *μυστήριον*; more especially as *μυστήριον* never¹, in Scripture, is used about external rites. 248
The *Church*, in time, called several things mysteries.

12. In the way of *application* much need not be said.

If Dr. *Dupin* would not give up the five as sacraments, would he (or his successors) agree to make two *classes* of sacraments; and let us use *sacramentum* for any sacred emblematical act, as the ancient Fathers did, without determining whether it was of *divine* or *human* appointment? The Romanists themselves make a difference between their sacraments in point of rank. Still extreme unction would remain unsettled. Might we adopt some ceremony, in the visitation of the sick, *analogous* to that mentioned by St. James, according to the idea of it here given²?

For my own part, I know not whether such an alteration would not seem to me an *improvement*. A fomentation, or something of that sort, might be substituted for unction: some tasks, penances, exercises, might be imposed in case of recovery, after the manner of the ancient clinic absolution³; any good resolutions, recorded in the presence of respectable witnesses⁴, would be the more likely to be kept on that account. Surely a meeting of pious, discreet, elderly neighbours, some clergy amongst them, forming a domestic religious assembly, praying together, under due regulation, in the house of a sick man, if it became generally customary, and was held at different houses interchangeably, might be the means of promoting mutual benevolence, and might in time produce a great *increase* of 249 *piety* and *virtue*⁵.

¹ Limborch, v. LXvi. 10. For mysteries in the *Church*, see Bingham, Index, mentioned beginning of sect. 2 of this Article.

² Sect. 10, beginning and end.

³ Wheatly, p. 468.

⁴ Wheatly seems to favour the idea of *witnesses*, p. 468.

⁵ For the reasons mentioned in former instances, I again mention, that those who took notes during the Lectures will not find every thing in their notes which they find here. Want of time obliged me to omit the tenth section entirely, and the greatest part of the eleventh.

IV.

250

ARTICLE XXVI.

OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS
NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS.

ALTHOUGH 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; yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such, as by faith, and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.

1. The *history* of this Article seems to lie chiefly in the age of the Reformation; when those who were heightening every evil of Popery, and painting it, to themselves and others, in the darkest colours, amongst other things, suggested and maintained that such wicked ministers as the popish priests were must shock every serious man by their preaching, instead of amending his heart, and must vitiate even the sacraments themselves. Our Church shewed its moderation and good sense in not running the length of such reformers, being soon aware of the difficulties to which their notion must lead. But before we refer to any authorities, let us look to *early* times, and see whether anything similar appears.

The *idea* that sacraments administered by priests of immoral character, debauched, drunken, "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God⁶," should be something different from what they ought to be, and were intended to be, seems not unnatural. A sacrament must appear to the mind an holy ordinance, administered to devout Christians, by a sacred officer

⁶ 2 Tim. iii. 4.

still more devout: whatever deranged this conception must seem, at first, to destroy the vital spirit of the whole ordinance. And though *reason* might suggest what is urged in our Article, yet the *feelings* and prejudices would scarce ever be reconciled to a sacrament given by a bad man; nay, difficulties would arise on all sides, and would continue to harass the mind. Is this (a communicant would always ask himself) the representative of God? of Christ? or even of the Church? No; they must all disclaim him! Can the wicked be attended to by Him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity? by Him who knew no sin? or can any man be considered as bearing the commission of that religious society whose sanctity he profanes? Such arguing, I say, is not unnatural: it has, in truth, occasioned the difficulties which have made it worth while to compose an Article on our present subject. But our immediate business is with the history of early times. 252

Cyprian, who is placed in 248, Bishop of Carthage, a man of an excellent character, fell into disputes with other Christian leaders about *re-baptizing* those who had been baptized in any *sect*, out of the main body of Christians, or, according to the language of the times, out of the communion of the *Catholic* Church. These disputes must be about the effect of sacraments being hindered by some imperfection or *unworthiness* in those who administered them; for there seems nothing peculiar to Baptism in the question. *Cyprian* was of opinion, that the sacraments, in this case, were *ineffectual*; or, in other words, he was for the re-baptizing of those who had been baptized by *heretics*. His chief opponent was *Stephen*, Bishop of Rome, whose opinion, in all its particulars, is not exactly known¹.

The *Donatists* are placed by Lardner in 312. Their separation from the Church was owing to no difference about doctrine, but at first to a contest about the appointment of a bishop of Carthage. This appointment was made by some *Africans* (the inhabitants of Africa Proconsularis²), without consulting the churches of Numidia: these latter, thinking themselves ill used, made all possible exceptions to the appointment, and then disputes arose about the reasonableness of such

¹ Lard. Cred. *Cyprian*; or Works, vol. 111. p. 137.

² In Africa there were six Roman provinces, one of which was *Africa Pro-*

consularis, another *Numidia*. Bingham, Ant. 1x. ii. 5. *Carthage* was the metropolis of Africa Proconsularis.

IV. exceptions. The Numidians, amongst whom were one or two
 253 leading men of the name of *Donatus*, excepted particularly to the new bishop (whose name was Cæcilianus) as a man of immoral character, in some respects; and they excepted to his consecration, as having been performed by a traitor, or *traditor*, that is, one who had through fear delivered up the Scriptures, in the times of persecution, to those who meant to destroy them. A church governed by such persons, they said, could be no true church; all its ordinances, even the sacraments themselves, must lose their proper effect under such administration. Nay, when heated with dispute, they went so far as to re-baptize those Africans who came over to their party, if not Europeans who had communicated with them; which was professing, in the most open manner, the invalidity of the sacramental forms when used by their adversaries. The Donatists were very numerous, so as to be governed by 400 bishops. (Mosheim.)

They had also a very formidable force amongst them; a large band of fanatics, called *Circumcelliones*; who used violence, and were guilty of extensive and numerous massacres. These were also so wild as to fancy that they suffered martyrdom if they destroyed themselves, or compelled others to destroy them.

The writings of Augustin and Optatus seem to have had great effect on the Donatists; which shews that they had some good principles.

This affair of the Donatists being similar to that in which Cyprian was engaged, and both happening in Africa (in the larger sense), the latter renewed the idea of the former; and the writers in the controversy with the Donatists become expositors of Cyprian and Stephen. The chief writers on the side
 254 of the Donatists were Parmenianus, Petilianus, Cresconius, &c. Their adversaries were Augustin and Optatus, whose writings must be studied by any one that wishes to be fully informed on the subject. He would find them rational and spirited, and agreeing with our Church³.

Now it does not appear to me that these two celebrated cases are exactly parallel to ours; because, in both, the ministers are supposed disqualified *ab initio*; whereas our ministers, in the present Article, are supposed to be regularly ordained. But yet these cases would produce arguments which would

³ Take a specimen in Forbes, x. i. 8, from Aug. *de Unico Baptismo contra Petilianum*.

affect the subject now before us; especially as Cæcilianus was IV. accused of immoralities, though perhaps unjustly. It would thence come to be argued generally, whether *vice* in a minister hinders the effect of his ministerial acts.

2. But not to detain you longer from the age of the *Reformation*. I have not the works of Wickliffe at hand; but I suspect, that, inveighing against the wickedness of the Romish priests, he used, as one topic, the notion that their profligacy must vitiate the sacraments; or he said something which his enemies might represent as meaning that. The Council of Constance made decrees against him, and determined to dig up his bones on account of certain propositions. One of them was, "If a bishop or priest live in mortal sin, he ordaineth not¹, baptizeth not, consecrateth not." Another proposition said to be taken out of Wickliffe, as to the *sum*², is, "The ill life of a prelate subtracteth the subjects' accepta- 255 tion of orders, and other sacraments;"—"and yet in case of necessity," &c. But the Council of Constance might misrepresent the sayings of the Reformers.

In the *Necessary Doctrine*, &c. we have a passage to our purpose, on the subject of the Romish sacrament of *orders*³, in which mention is made of the Donatists, and the opinions of some ancients introduced, as Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Gregory of Nazianzum. This work agrees with the doctrine of our Church.

The Anabaptists, at the time of the Reformation, ran into this error, that the vices of ministers must annul the force of sacraments; as might be expected from their unthinking severity and moroseness. Luther says of them⁴, (Anabaptistæ) "propter hominum vitia vel indignitatem ("unworthiness," the expression of our Article) damnant verum Baptisma." And *Forbes*⁵, in his tenth Book and second chapter, speaks of the old controversy, "de fide et probitate baptizantis," being renewed by the Anabaptists at the Reformation; whose fundamental principle I judge (from *Mosheim's* account of them) to be, that the visible church of Christ must be *perfect* in *fact* as well as in *theory*. In the *Reformatio Legum (de Hæresibus, cap. xv.)* the Anabaptists are charged with seceding from

¹ These are the words in Baxter's Hist. of Councils, p. 431. Those in p. 438 are there said to be "charged on John Huss," but in p. 439, "taken out of Wickliffe."

² P. 438; see also p. 439.

³ About three pages from the beginning of the subject.

⁴ Works, vol. II. fol. 503.

⁵ Forbes, x. ii. 1, and x. iv. 11.

IV. the Church, and *sacraments*; saying, that they are kept away, “vel *ministorum improbitate*, vel aliorum fratrum.”

The Council of Trent anathematizes those who say that a priest living in mortal sin cannot confer a sacrament. The Catechism is expressed not unlike our own Article⁶. Those who follow the confession of *Augsburg*, “damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere populo uti ministerio in Ecclesiâ, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse⁷.” The *Helvetic* says⁸, that the perfection of sacraments does not depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of those who give them. And the *Scotch*, that for the right *use* of sacraments it is requisite that their end and design should be rightly understood by minister and people. The Presbyterians do not seem to condemn the error heartily.

Heylin, in his introduction to his Life of Archbishop Laud⁹, says, that the Church of England joins with the Church of Rome in several points, in opposition to *sectaries* of various kinds; amongst other Articles, he mentions that “of hindering the effect of the sacraments by unworthy ministers.” And *Du Pin*, in his Commonitorium¹⁰, makes no objection to our twenty-sixth Article.

Barclay, in his Apology for the *Quakers*, treats the distinction used in our Article between the *man* and the *minister* as frivolous; and seemingly runs into the notion lately mentioned as held by the first Anabaptists, that because the Church of Christ is perfect in theory, it must be so in *fact*; that is, no imperfect church must be allowed to be a true church. One sees what the scope of the reasoning is;—to depreciate all sacraments, by heightening the defects to which they may be liable in some particular cases, in the present faulty state of things—in order to draw men from externals, and bring them to trust only to the internal *light*. The idea was not new in Barclay’s time. In the *Helvetic* confession are these words: “Neque eos probamus, qui propter *invisibilia*, aspernantur in sacramentis *visibilia*, &c. quales *Messaliani*¹¹ fuisse dicuntur.”

⁶ See also Catech. on the *Eucharist*: sect. 74, p. 232. Acts of the Council, session vii. canon 12; on Sacraments in general.

⁷ Syntagma, Aug. Conf. Art. viii. or p. 13 of second part.

⁸ The *Helvetic* churches were founded by *Zuinglius*; the *Dutch* have much of *Calvin*’s notions in their doctrine. The

French Protestants are called *Calvinists* in France. (*Voltaire*, Louis XIV. *Calvinisme*). *Calvin*, Inst. xvii. 16, agrees with us. See a passage in *Bingham*’s Works, vol. II. p. 565, from Archbishop *Whitgift*, expressing the opinion of *Calvin*.

⁹ P. 37. ¹⁰ Append. to *Mosheim*.

¹¹ For *Messaliani*, or *Euchitæ*, see Art.

3. But though we may agree with the Church of Rome IV. as to the perfection of sacraments administered by imperfect men, yet there is another thing, very nearly allied to this, in which we oppose them; that is, the effect of the *intention* of a priest when he administers sacraments.

Intention is not the same with *probity*; because a man of a general good character might not *intend* to give a sacrament, as such, on a particular occasion, or he might be absent in mind, &c.—and a bad man might intend it. But yet these are connected¹. Ordinarily, a good man will have the purest intention in all offices of religion. The Romanists mention worthiness and intention together². And they describe their meaning by saying, that a minister must intend, in order to have his acts effectual, what the *Church*³ intends;—the church, I suppose, from which he receives his commission: 258 but the Romanists conceive only one true church. This idea of what the minister is to intend, was delivered by Pope Eugenius⁴ in the Council of *Florence*, in the year 1438. And, though the Council of Trent adopted it, yet Caterini⁵ argued, in that council, as a Protestant would now argue⁶.

We must not, however, think that the question about the intention of the minister was first started even in the Council of Florence. So long ago as the time of *Athanasius* it was discussed. Athanasius, when a boy, at Alexandria, baptized⁷ some boys, in the way of boyish imitation;—by way of *playing*, as we should say, at christening. But Bishop Alexander, by the advice of his clergy, held the baptism to be *valid*—and would not have the boys re-baptized. Amongst the *schoolmen*, our countryman *Duns*⁸ speaks of a distinction between *actual*⁹ and *habitual* intention, as established; and proposes an intermediate sort, which he calls *virtual*. Cardinal *Bona*, in his book on the Mass¹⁰, says, of the priest's intention, "*habitualis sufficiens non est; actualis optima atque laudabilis; sed non necessaria: sufficit enim virtualis, illa nimirum quæ ab actuali*

xxv. sect. 2, where there is mention of the Quakers, and of this passage. For some half-converted Quakers, see the sixth section of this Article.

¹ Forbes, x. i. 18.

² See Council of Trent, sess. 7, can. 11, 12. And Catechism, Part II. sect. 23, of Sacraments in general.

³ Council and Catechism, *ibid.*

⁴ Forbes, x. i. 14. ⁵ *Ibid.*, x. i. 27.

⁶ See Trent, sess. 14, chap. vi. about a *confessor* not having a due intention.

⁷ Forbes, x. i. 15, from Ruffinus, Sozomen, &c.

⁸ Duns Scotus. See Forbes, x. i. 22.

⁹ Locke's distinction between actual and habitual knowledge, is similar to this. On the Understanding, iv. i. 3.

¹⁰ Card. Bona died 1674, æt. 65: De Missâ, cap. i. sect. 5, p. 180, col. 2.

IV. *proveniens et non revocata adhuc remanet secundum suam virtutem.*" I give this sentence at length in order to shew what niceties the subject of Intention admits of. Indeed, it is
 259 so far from being limited to *three* sorts, that it contains an infinity of degrees, and an endless variety of mixtures.

If all the Romanists said no more than that a priest ought to intend what the *Church* intends, it might be taken as meaning only, that whoever acts by *commission* ought to follow the intention of his *principal*; but in some writings composed for the *people*, the business of intention is much abused. We need not a stronger instance than the rubric produced by Bishop Burnet, on the Article. Bishop Porteus's account also is worthy to be read¹¹. And in the year 1788 a French Protestant clergyman told a friend of mine, that the then Archbishop of Paris "had given great offence to the generality of his clergy by reviving, in a note on one of his *Mandemens*, the doctrine, that the efficacious grace of the Sacrament was divided into *three portions*; one of which was for the officiating priest, one for his assistants, the third for him who received; but that the priest might, if he thought proper, by his *intentio*, and the private act of his mind, take the last portion to himself, and cheat the communicant of it."

4. I will trouble you with no more history.

Let us now see what may be wanted in the way of *explanation*.

In this twenty-sixth Article we must conceive the subject of sacraments in general to be continued. Though what has now been said may seem to relate to one or another sacrament in particular, yet it ought to relate to one only *as* a sacrament; if it does that, it may be affirmed of sacraments *in general*.

The *title* is expressed in terms which were usual at the
 260 time; the passages cited may shew that—particularly the margin of the Trent Catechism.

In this Article it is *supposed* that the ministers spoken of are, though real, yet *unworthy* ministers, and that those who receive a sacrament are worthy receivers; whereas in the twenty-ninth Article we shall find the ministers are supposed worthy, the receivers unworthy.

For "visible church," see the nineteenth Article, sect. 4. "Have chief authority"—in Latin it is only "*præsint*," which might seemingly have been translated *preside*. The English,

¹¹ Brief Confutation, p. 70.

as it stands at present, directs our views to the highest **IV.**
prelates; but the Latin, to any minister who happens to preside
in giving sacraments.

The latter paragraph seems intended to obviate an objection
which might be made to the former. Men might say, you
esteem the wickedness of ministers too lightly: no, says the
latter paragraph (in effect), the evil of wicked ministers is very
great and important; but if you apply a wrong remedy to it,
you make it still greater. Punish the guilty, not the innocent.
Proceed against the ministers, but do not prevent the people
from benefiting by those institutions which are intended for
their benefit. Let no man be hindered from doing his part.
Whatever stumbling-blocks may lie in his way, every man
will be sure to get good if he does his best to proceed in
the paths of duty.

The idea of the efficacy of ministerial acts has been con-
founded with that of the duty of ministers; certainly it is
wrong for ministers to be vicious, but if they continue to act by
commission from heaven, benefits may be received through 261
their agency¹. It is *wrong* for any *magistrate* to be vicious;
but yet the people may receive redress and protection from
warrants signed by him.

When we speak of "the effect of the sacraments," we should
distinguish between their effects as such, and their *accidental*
effects. A sacrament given by a good minister will have more
effect in raising pious affections than given by a bad one; but
this I call accidental. Its effect as a sacrament, that effect which
no sacrament can fail to produce when entire and regular, will
be produced, though the minister be not a good man. This
distinction, between accidental good effects, and such as may be
called essential, Augustin seems to have been master of².

5. It does not seem as if our *proof* need run into any
great length.

'Sacraments are not to be neglected by the people, because
they think ministers blameable.'

We may look at Matt. vii. 22; Acts iii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 5;
or we may, with Bishop Burnet, use the *reductio ad absurdum*,
and say, if faults of ministers vitiate sacraments, a man can

¹ Trent, sess. 7, can. 11, we have,
"requiri intentionem:" now intention
may be required as *duty*, or in order to
efficacy. Does the Council mean at all

to leave such an ambiguity?

² See passages quoted in Forbes, x. ii.
14, and x. iii. 6.

IV. never know whether he has been *baptized* or not, or whether he has received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; he cannot even know whether he be a Christian. We may add, that as all men are faulty, there can be no true Church of Christ. But the Article itself contains sufficient proof of what it asserts. If an Article contains only propositions which are assertions, 262 our business is to give proofs; but when the propositions which an Article contains are themselves arguments, or proofs, all additional arguments are superfluous.

Bishop Burnet also reasons, in the same form, on the other point, of the *intention* of the priest being necessary towards the complete effect of a sacrament. If the secret acts of the priest's mind can prevent admission into the Christian Covenant, no one can tell whether he be a Christian or not. Nay, who can tell whether he who acts as a priest be a Christian? Salvation at the discretion of priests, not only good but wicked, is not conceivable. More need scarce be added on such a notion.

6. We come then to our *application*.

A form of assent does not seem necessary; but something may be said on the subject of *mutual concessions*. If we take in the subject of *intention*, which does not properly belong to our Article (if it did Du Pin would scarcely be silent) we have two adversaries;—on the subject of unworthiness, some dissenters; on that of intention, the Romanists.

1. To such dissenters, or sectaries, we might grant, that they have good *motives* for ascribing great evil to the unworthiness of ministers; and that, in one sense, the good effects of sacraments are really hindered by vicious clergy; that is, sacraments ill administered make a weaker impression on the heart than when well administered. And their "spiritual grace" does partly consist in their good effects on the mind according to the natural course of things³.

263 But then we must expect to have it granted, on the other hand, that no man is to *absent* himself from any sacramental institutions under pretence of the wickedness or unworthiness of ministers; that every man is to do his own part in the best manner possible; and that a person as an *agent*, or under a commission, may do *valid* acts, though he be of an immoral private character⁴.

³ Art. xxv. sect. 2.

⁴ Charles Leslie has a discourse enti-

tled, "Who they are that are now qualified to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

2. To *Romanists*, with regard to *intention*, we may IV. grant, that a mere casual, jocular sprinkling, though with a sacred form of words, does not constitute a *Baptism*;—that the receivers of sacraments should have reason to think, that those who administer act under commission from God, or Christ, or from a religious society. Whence we are led to call the boyish sprinkling of *Athanasius* no Baptism, because he could not, whilst a boy, have any commission to administer sacraments.

But we must expect the *Romanists* to grant, in return, that the people *have* reason to think a man regularly commissioned who appears in a sacred place, habited for sacred purposes, under authority. We must expect to have it allowed, that salvation, laboured for by Christian obedience, cannot be capriciously put out of the reach of the pious and virtuous, the faithful and diligent, by those who are perhaps more frail than themselves.

Lastly, as to *improvement*, it seems as if some might be drawn from observing cases in human life, in which men act by commission, where the same difficulties occur, but occasion no 264 dispute. An *ambassador* acts for his sovereign; if he be a worthless man his vices do harm, but his acts are *valid*. They are not valid without some kind of *intention*; and he must intend what his *sovereign* intends; yet he may be *absent* in mind while he is signing a treaty. Nevertheless his inattention will not make his signature of no force.

Improvement might also arise from reflecting how very *practical* subjects are which are treated as speculative. Who maintains any doctrine about unworthiness or intention of ministers, but with some farther view? Let then practice be professed, and then we can urge, do your best; endeavour to prevent unworthiness of every kind; to prevent men from depending on mere external acts, done without any intention or meaning of virtue or piety. But judge no man. Indeed, it must not be denied, that when men do use their best endeavours to attain the highest good, they are liable to get obstructions

Supper." (Works, vol. II. fol. p. 719). He says, some Quakers, after reading his Discourse on Baptism, "stand chiefly upon the *personal holiness* of the administrator:" he means *private* virtue; for he says, that besides *personal holiness*, *sacerdotal* is required. These half-converted Quakers thought "that the spirit-

ual effects of Baptism cannot be conveyed by means of an unsanctified instrument." This is to our purpose, but the discourse is chiefly to prove that ministers *ordained* by *bishops* are the persons duly qualified. The fifth section, however, p. 735, is upon our question.

- IV. and hinderances from others, even in things of a moral and spiritual nature; but yet if they act with honesty and diligence, they may assure themselves that nothing which they do will be lost on him to whom they look up for a reward.

ARTICLE XXVII.

OF BAPTISM.

BAPTISM is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of Regeneration, or New Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

1. The *history* of this Article might be very long, and might draw us into a number of controversies. I will endeavour to select what is most material, and best founded. We should, nevertheless, divide our history into *two parts*: the first relating to Baptism without any regard to the *age* of the person baptized; the second relating to the Baptism of *Infants*.

2. First of Baptism without regard to age. *βάπτω* signifies to tinge, or wash; *βαπτίζω* much the same; *βαπτίζομαι* in the middle voice is reflective, and implies washing one's *self*.
 266 Washing, as a religious rite, is not confined to Christianity: it has been practised both by *heathens* and *Jews*; and probably takes its rise from the *natural* principles of the human constitution. I know not that the natural principles of cleanliness, purity, delicacy, and their opposites, nastiness, filthiness, &c. have ever been philosophically analyzed; but men act upon them continually, and recognize the sentiments which they are adapted to produce. Mr. *Hume*, in his *Essays*, (*Principles of Morals*, sect. 8,) speaks of cleanliness as a quality agreeable to *others*, but he says nothing of its effects on one's *self*; which

nevertheless seem to be very powerful. Every one makes IV. cleanliness a part of merit and excellence; but there is certainly a great connection between bodily cleanliness and purity of *heart*. No one ever thought that purity was not acceptable to superior Beings; and those who have worshipped different ranks of deities have always been the more exact in their *purifications*, the more noble they conceived the Deities to be, to whom they had occasion to address themselves.

Perhaps acts of purification have generally, or always, been *emblematical*; they have been performed as *signs* of internal cleansing from vice; but yet the natural connection between external and internal purity makes the representation to operate as a reality. Whatever expresses purity promotes it. Hence it appears natural, that different sets of men, in different ages and countries, should have agreed in the practice of ablutions and purifications¹.

Any one, who wishes to see a short account of the *Lustrations* 267 of the Greeks, may consult Potter's *Antiquities*².

The distinction between clean and unclean was very strongly marked in the Law of *Moses*. And the Jewish traditions carried it still farther. The sixth *Order*, or great division, of the *Talmud* or *Misna*, is the Order of *Purifications*; in which the rules are very numerous and complicated³. But we are most concerned with the Jewish manner of admitting proselytes into their religion. They used circumcision, if it had not been used before, but always *Baptism*⁴.

It is worth while to observe, that when a proselyte was baptized and admitted into the Jewish religion, he was said to be *born again*; his Baptism was *regeneration*⁵. And there was something of the same sort amongst the *heathens*. A person who had been considered as dead, on account of long absence, &c., went through an emblematical *new birth*, before he recovered his *rights*, or was admitted to certain holy *ordinances*⁶. Nay, Tertullian says, persons were baptized in the

¹ Some reasoning of this sort was made use of in the Appendix to the first Book, sect. 5—9.

² Vol. I. p. 219. Justin Martyr tries to account for the lustrations of the heathens by some notion relating to true Christian Baptism. *Apol.* I. p. 91.—Thirlby, quoted by Middleton, in *Letter from Rome*, p. 139.

³ See Wotton on the *Misna*, vol. I. p. 160.

⁴ *Introd.* to Wall on Infant-Baptism. Wotton on the *Misna*, chap. viii. But see also Lardner's *Works*, vol. XI. p. 320.

⁵ See Authorities in *Introd.* to Wall, sect. 6.

⁶ See Potter, vol. I. p. 223; *Δευτερόποττοι, or ύστερόποττοι*. The authors of the Greek Primitives make the latter to mean one whose funeral pile was built in his life-time.

IV. mysteries of Apollo and Ceres, with a view to regeneration and impunity. (“*Idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuriorum suorum agere præsumunt.*”—*Ter. de Baptismo*, c. 5)⁷.

268 3. In the Christian religion, Baptism was used from the beginning. “The law and the prophets were until John⁸.” When John began to preach and baptize, the Christian religion began to be published; but the Baptism of John seems only to have been preparatory. He preached, in a very awakening manner, *repentance*; and he made his disciples go through a ceremony of purification, expressive of repentance; but all by way of preparing them to acknowledge the great Personage who should come after him. He did not pretend to confer the gifts of the Holy Ghost⁹.

Christ himself followed. There are several places of Scripture, in which it is said that Christ baptized¹⁰; but John iv. 2 shews that, in some way, it might be said, and at some time, that “Jesus himself baptized *not*, but his disciples¹¹.” Whoever performed the office, converts were admitted into Christianity by Baptism; and such Baptism may be called the Baptism of Christ. As far as we can judge, it was wise to adopt a custom generally received, and one falling in with the natural feelings of all mankind. The Baptism of Christ differed from that of the heathens as being the seal of a contract; for whatever admits any one into a society must imply conditions and contracting. Nay, this contract was to mankind of boundless extent and of endless duration. Christ is repeatedly said to *baptize with the Holy Ghost*¹². Possibly we may not see the
269 full force of the expression. It might be, that the Baptism of Christ was immediately attended with spiritual gifts, as distinguished from that of *John*, which was only an emblem of repentance; or from that of succeeding Christians, which seems to have been followed by gifts of the Holy Ghost¹³, but not always immediately.

Under the subject of Confirmation¹⁴, we saw something of the manner in which the gifts of the Holy Ghost followed

⁷ Wall, p. 25, quarto.

⁸ Luke xvi. 16. Lardner, in the place above-mentioned, thinks that Baptism was *first* used as an initiation rite in the Christian religion. Works, vol. xi. p. 320.

⁹ Acts xix. 1—6.

¹⁰ See Matt. iii. 11. John i. 33; iii. 22, 26; iv. 1.

¹¹ This expression might perhaps bear to be interpreted as a *comparative* phrase, like Matt. ix. 13, and parallels. If so, it would mean that Jesus baptized *less frequently* than his disciples.

¹² Matt. iii. 11. John i. 33. Acts i. 5.

¹³ Acts ii. 38.

¹⁴ Art. xxv. sect. 3.

Baptism at a distance, as described in the Acts of the Apostles. IV. St. Paul has been thought rather to disclaim the office of baptizing¹; he does not seem to me to do that. He only mentions that preaching was his department; and speaks of baptizing in such an easy way as if he had always baptized when he had had leisure, and occasion had served, and as if he had never taken any exact account of those whom he baptized. But yet the number of those he had baptized at *Corinth* when he wrote his first Epistle, seems to us very small; and puts us upon thinking how, from the nature of preaching and baptizing, they must interfere much more with each other according to primitive than according to modern customs. Certainly many could baptize who could not preach or govern.

The Baptism by *fire*, Matt. iii. 11², does not seem to mean any particular kind of Baptism to be described by an historian, or antiquarian. The expression, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with *fire*,” seems of the prophetic kind, and not intended to be understood at the time of speaking it. It would excite a sentiment of dread, immediately after—“hewn down and cast into the *fire*;”—but it might predict the *fiery tongues* which sat upon the Apostles. 270 Compare Acts i. 5³.

The Baptism of Christ, and that of his followers, seem still *emblematical*. This is well described by *Cyprian*⁴, where he says, there is no need of “soap and other helps, and a large pool,” &c.

4. The early Fathers seem to speak as if Baptism had been always, that is, in all ordinary cases, in ancient times, performed by *immersion* of the whole body—performed any where, at any pond or river, till baths were made for the purpose, in buildings on the outside of churches, which were called *Baptisteries*. If we consider how very short and general the directions of Scripture are with regard to Baptism, and how few circumstances are related in the narrations, we shall not wonder if we find very great variety in the ancient rites of Baptism, before churches were regulated by civil laws. Irenæus’s account of the Valentinians is translated by Wall⁵; but,

¹ 1 Cor. i. 14, 17.

² *Kai πρὸς* is omitted in several MSS.

³ Those who are most conversant in oriental idiom might inform us whether Holy Ghost *and* fire could mean the

same as the Holy Ghost assuming a *fiery* appearance.

⁴ Wall, p. 464, quarto, from Ep. 69. This is applicable to the subject of *sprinkling*, sect. 10.

⁵ Part II. chap. v. sect. 1.

IV. without repeating their extravagances, we may mention, that frequently Baptism used, amongst sober Christians, to be preceded by *prayer* and *fasting*⁶;—that the head of the person in the water was put under water three times, in which case writers use the expression, *trine immersion*. It seems, at first, as if this ceremony had arisen from the form of baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but yet, for some reason or other, a custom of im-
 271 merging three times has prevailed both amongst the heathens⁷ and the Jews⁸. The trine immersion afterwards got into disrepute, on account of some heretics who used it; and was ordered to be left off, by a council held at Toledo⁹. After Baptism a mixture of *milk and honey* used to be given, and a *white garment* put on; all these were emblematical. Some *unction* used to be practised; and the ceremony was never performed without an abrenunciation of the *Devil*, and some profession of faith. I mentioned exorcism under a former Article, and how soon Baptism was sometimes followed by confirmation.

It used to be reckoned that *martyrdom* supplied the place of Baptism; that is, that if a convert, who had not been baptized, suffered martyrdom for the Christian religion, his martyrdom would complete his admission into the Church of Christ, as much as Baptism would have done; and particular reasons and analogies were urged in favour of the notion; as the person baptized is wetted with water, so is the martyr with his own blood¹⁰: &c.

5. The rites of Baptism used in the *Greek Church* may be found in Sir Paul *Ricaut's* Present State¹¹, &c.; and an account of their grand annual purification may be seen in *Cave's* Appendix, before referred to, under the word *ἀγιασμός*.
 272 And one chapter in Bingham's History of Lay-baptism is about the Greek Church.

6. The *Romanists* profess that pure *water* is the only proper matter of Baptism¹²; yet by rules built on tradition

⁶ Wall, Part II. chap. ix.

⁷ Potter's Antiquities, vol. i. p. 221, 223. *Idem ter socios purâ circumtulit undâ, Æn.* vi. 229.—Terque senem flammâ, ter aquâ, ter sulphure lustrat. Ovid, *Metam.* Lib. VII. cap. ii. In the latter passage the word *flamma* reminds one of the scriptural baptizing with *fire*;

though no way probably connected with it.

⁸ See Wall's Introd. p. Lxi. and p. 488.

⁹ See Sparrow's Rationale, p. 260.

¹⁰ Wall, Part II. chap. ix. sect. 2, p. 466, quarto.

¹¹ Chap. vii.

¹² Trent Catech. sect. 11, or 7.

they use holy *chrism*. They also use exorcism, salt, spittle, IV. the white garment, and burning the wax-light; and sign *eight* parts of the body (reckoning the eyes *two*;) with the sign of the Cross¹. They consider Baptism as valid by whomsoever performed², layman, Jew, infidel, woman, &c., but only in cases of necessity; that is, they had rather have a person baptized irregularly than not at all. Heretics who administer baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and who *intend* what the Church intends, are held to baptize effectually, without any consideration of necessity³.

7. The *Reformed* churches shew their abhorrence for Popery by departing more or less from the Romish customs. Those who think that the Church of England has not carried Reformation far enough, speak with a kind of horror of any Baptism whatever performed by women⁴. And direct the ceremony not to be performed where popish fonts used to be superstitiously placed⁵; they also omit the sign of the *cross*, and are much scandalized by it in others. The *Lutherans* are said, on the other hand, to use exorcism; the *English*, according to their usual moderation, dropped most popish ceremonies by *degrees*, (see Wall, p. 470. Puller, p. 281,) and probably sooner than they would have done, had all their divines 273 staid at home, or none of them gone to *Geneva*, &c.; but they still use *fonts*, with the sign of the Cross.

8. Charles *Leslie*, a celebrated writer against the Quakers, says, that no one spoke against water-baptism before *George Fox*, whom he places in the year 1650⁶. And Archbishop *Secker*⁷ says, that a “sect (meaning the Quakers) sprung up amongst us within a little more than 100 years, deny” the sacred appointment of water. But it seems to me that some of the ancient heretics had the same turn of thought with our modern Quakers—the same way of understanding, or rather, of feeling, the Scriptures⁸. For there is a sort of *temper*, which, in any

¹ Trent Catech. sect. 61, &c.

² Ibid. sect. 22.

³ Council of Trent, session 7, 4th canon on Baptism.

⁴ Scotch Confession, chap. xxii. *imò, quod magis est horrendum, fœminis baptizare permittunt. Syntagma*, p. 154, second paging.

⁵ Directory.

⁶ On Water-baptism, end of sect. 2. Works, vol. II. p. 679. Charles Leslie

was a Protestant adherent to the Pre-tender in 1714, and would have converted him from Popery.

⁷ Lecture xxxv. p. 222.

⁸ Compare Barclay's Apology, p. 386, Edit. Birm. with what was said in Art. xxv. of the *Ascodrutæ*, &c. See also Aug. *Hær.* 59. Wall, II. vii. 7. But with regard to the Manichean Baptism, Wall, II. v. 3, and Lardner, vol. III. p. 490, are of contrary opinions.

IV. age, if not corrected, will bring men to aim at being all spirit. *Quintilla* seems to have had this quakerish turn, and was a self-commissioned female teacher⁹;—a great rarity, I fancy, in ancient times. The Council of Trent has a canon against the deniers of water-baptism; such therefore existed¹⁰.

9. The *Socinians* have been mentioned before as allowing but one ceremonial *præceptum* of Christ, an injunction to break
274 bread¹¹. They consider *Baptism* as a visible ceremony, admitting men into Christianity, when they have been Jews, or Pagans; but not to be used in a *family already Christian*. Faustus Socinus has written a treatise on Baptism¹².

The *Jews* had a notion like this of the *Socinians*¹³.

10. I will only mention one thing more, before I proceed to the history of Infant-baptism; and that is, the custom of *sprinkling* or *pouring* water on the person baptized; or the custom of partial immersion, as supplanting, in some countries, that of total immersion. The Baptists do distinguish between sprinkling and pouring, but to no end that I can perceive. Indeed, more attention has been paid to the distinction between dipping and sprinkling than it appears to me to deserve: two modes of performing an emblematical act may be equally good, if they be equally adapted to circumstances.

Wall says that Mr. *Walker* has studied this subject of aspersion, affusion, &c. more diligently than any other person¹⁴.

In early times of Christianity, Baptism was performed by immersion ordinarily, but *clinic* Baptism was always, probably, performed by affusion, or pouring; though it was reckoned to leave a man in some respects less qualified for some public offices. Wall quotes a good instance¹⁵ out of *Cyprian*: he also men-
275 tions the case of a *prisoner*. But so far, affusion was only allowed in clinic Baptism, or in cases of necessity.

Near the end of the fifth century, *Gennadius* of *Marseilles*¹⁶ speaks as if it was an *indifferent* matter whether a man were wetted with water, or plunged into it; but he is the first

⁹ See Wall, Part II. chap. v. sect. 2.

¹⁰ Canon 2, of sess. 7, (*de Baptismo*.)

¹¹ Art. xxv. sect. 2, from *Racovian Catechism*, p. 143. And Ep. to *Radicus* in *Socinus's Works*, fol. vol. i. pp. 380, 383, 384.

¹² See *Vossius de Baptismo*.

¹³ See Wall on Infant-Baptism, *Introd.* sect. 3 and 5, or the last chapter of the

book, p. 524, quarto. *Introd.* p. 1.

¹⁴ See Wall, p. 470, quarto; the title of *Walker's Book* is, "Doctrines of Baptisms."

¹⁵ Part II. chap. ix. sect. 2, p. 464, quarto; quoted sect. x. It is scarcely needful to say, that *clinic* Baptism is Baptism of those who keep their beds.

¹⁶ *De eccles. dogm.* cap. Lxxiv.

who does so. Indeed, the custom of immersion was first left off IV. in France; and last in England, in the time of Queen Elizabeth. But still it is said, that all countries continue the practice of immersion except the Western or Latin Church; except those who are, or have been, under the government of the Pope. It is natural that the custom of sprinkling should gain ground, as being more commodious than immersion, especially in cold countries¹. Some very eminent men of our own country have, however, been desirous to restore the practice of immersion, in ordinary cases². It is favoured by our rubric.

11. We come now to the history of *Infant-baptism*.

As the custom of baptizing in general, so that of baptizing infants in particular, seems to have had some foundation in the nature of man. Parents are anxious that their offspring shall be secured from dangers, and put in a way to obtain advantages, as soon as possible. And the same motives which impel parents to admit their children into the family of a master, in the way of apprenticeship, or into any literary society for the purpose of education, impel them to make their children members of Christ, in order that they may be inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. By the law of nature a parent makes any engagement for his son, during minority, which his son would make for himself, if fully informed of the benefits resulting from it; and if any bond or security is to be given, it must be given by the parent. Would then a youth, if for the moment enlightened, and informed of all the benefits resulting from Christianity, and of the hazards of neglecting it, be baptized or not? on the answer depends the rectitude of baptizing a youth during his minority³. But these moral remarks must not here be pursued farther than is requisite to set the *history* of Infant-baptism in a right point of view⁴. 276

Amongst *heathens* there was such a thing as Lustration of infants⁵; which was accompanied, both amongst Greeks and Romans, with the giving of a *name*.

¹ In Russia, it is said, children are bathed in cold water; yet, generally speaking, immersion may suit the warmest climates best.

² Wall, Part II. chap. ix. sect. 2, p. 474, quarto.

³ Minority, in any one affair, if not fixed by civil laws, must mean the time, from birth, during which a person is un-

able to judge for himself, in that particular affair.

⁴ This was farther explained in my Lectures on Dr. Balguy's Moral Syllabus, Part II. chap. iii. sect. 1, subsect. 1, 35, and subsect. 2, 3. But both the Syllabus and the Explanation are in MS.

⁵ See Wheatly on the Common Prayer, Office of Baptism, p. 360.

IV. Amongst the *Jews*, circumcision was performed on the eighth day after the birth, and a *name* was given⁶ at that time. And what was before mentioned, from Wall's Introduction, about their baptizing proselytes, may be extended to children; as Wall proves from Jewish writings⁷. The Jews had, moreover, a reference to our moral principle, the good of the child⁸; and they expected *Jews* to be baptized on the coming of *Elias* or *Christ*⁹.

12. But the most difficult matter to settle is, how the *Christians* acted, in early times, with regard to the baptizing of infants. Wall's History of Infant-baptism seems to me an excellent book;—clear, learned, rational, candid, unaffected; and I should add, speaking from my own experience, lively. I sincerely recommend it, not only on account of the information it gives with regard to Infant-baptism, but as laying open Christian antiquity in general, and treating, in a masterly way, many subjects useful to a divine¹⁰. Nevertheless I do not pretend that it removes all doubts whatsoever, even on its principal subject. With regard to the *Scriptures*, what can be deduced from them lies in a small compass. On the one hand, they mention *no instance* of Infant-baptism; on the other, they afford no instance of Baptism being *delayed*. Some *families* are spoken of collectively, as being baptized; but the *children* are not mentioned particularly¹¹.

13. How soon any accounts of Infant-baptism appear in reputable writers is a matter in dispute. Some Pædobaptists have, in their candour, allowed a longer time before any appear, than others have approved of. Bingham¹² begins his evidences from the earliest times; so indeed does Wall; but the first proofs are only by implication¹³. To these writers I must refer you. The substance of the proofs is well collected in a short

⁶ Gen. xxi. 3, 4. Luke i. 59, 60; ii. 21.

⁷ See Introd. sect. 3, 5; and sect. 2 of this Art. ⁸ Wall's Introd. sect. 3.

⁹ This is affirmed at the conclusion of Wall's Introduction, but I see no proofs: they may be in Selden, Lightfoot, &c. However, the notion makes the message of the Jews, John i. 19—25, intelligible. Who art thou that baptizest *Jews*? *Jews* need not be baptized till Christ, or at least *Elias*, come: art thou then the *Christ*? or art thou *Elias*? or who art thou?

¹⁰ This book was before recommended, at the opening of the Pelagian Controversy. Art. ix. sect. 8.

¹¹ Acts x. 48, and xvi. 15, 33, and 1 Cor. i. 16. See moreover Acts ii. 41, and viii. 12, or 16, where numbers are baptized in which must probably be some children.

¹² Book XI.

¹³ The manner in which Wall *investigates* the practices of the apostolic age, has been already mentioned under Art. xxiv.

popular dialogue done by Wall from his larger work, and IV. entitled, “A Conference between two Men that had doubts about Infant-baptism.” From this I may read a few words about the first centuries¹. What I shall attempt is to give you some of the most remarkable things in the history, and such as have had the most influence on mens opinions.

14. 1. No dispute or controversy was ever held in ancient times concerning our subject: all the passages produced in evidence are incidental².

2. Several persons are spoken of in history as having been baptized *late in life*. Now when it appears, on examination, that such persons were themselves converts from paganism, there is no great difficulty; but when they appear to have been born of *Christian parents*, it is not so easy to account for the delay. However, there is another thing to be inquired into; whether the parents were baptized before the children were born; if not, one may see, that such as were unbaptized themselves would scarcely baptize their children in infancy, if they could avoid it. That some converts did delay their baptism, is clear from martyrdom³ being thought equivalent to Baptism; and from Gregory of Nazianzum preaching against such delay. But it seems as if our adversaries spoke of some instances without sufficient proof⁴. 279

3. One thing which makes passages in ancients seem less to our purpose than they really are, is the variety of names by which Baptism is called; as, *Regeneration, Renewal, Sanctification, Illumination, the Seal, the Grace, &c.*; and the originals of these words are sometimes translated by other English words. These are mentioned in Wall’s Preface. In Theodoret I find ἀπολύτρωσις⁵. Wall quotes it from Irenæus⁶.

4. Justin Martyr, who lived about forty years after the death of St. John, discourses “of baptism being to us instead of *circumcision*.” Irenæus, near forty years later, mentions

¹ Conference, p. 72.

² Augustin says, that the doctrines of the Trinity and Repentance, and Baptism, and Unity of the Church, were never fully opened till they were controverted; (see Art. i. sect. 4.) We may observe, that the reason why the practice of Infant-baptism was never fully opened, was, because it was never controverted: and we call every mention of Infant-bap-

tism incidental, which occurs when that subject is not the point in dispute.

³ Sect. 4.

⁴ The notion results from reading Wall’s book. Gregory of Nazianzum preaches against delaying Baptism, Orat. 40; or, *de Baptismo*, for which see Wall, Part I. chap. ii. ⁵ *Hæret. Fab. I. 10.*

⁶ Part II. chap. v. sect. 1.

⁷ Conference, p. 72.

IV. infants as “by Christ *born again* unto God.” Origen, about fifty years later still, “does, in several places, speak of Infant-baptism as a known and undoubted practice; and (in one of them) as having been, according to a *tradition*, ordered by the Apostles⁸.”

5. The greatest difficulty arises from *Tertullian*, who is placed about 100 years after St. John’s death, and therefore before Origen. He, in his Book *de Baptismo*, cap. 18, dissuades (and he is the only Father who does dissuade) from early bap-
 280 tism, though he seems as much afraid of any one’s *dying* unbaptized as any writer; that is, he advises putting off Baptism till the age of *reason*; but only on this supposition, that there is no danger of death. By dissuading he acknowledges the *practice*, however difficult it may be to account for his dissuading; and the opinion of a single man, who in several things was eccentric, is not of so much consequence as the practice. But it seems odd he should not know, as well as Origen, of the tradition, that Infant-baptism had been ordered by the Apostles. Many things are said, with great good sense as it appears to me, to account for this singular phenomenon; and it is shewn how much better opportunities Origen had of learning what the Apostles had said than Tertullian; but what occurs to me does not seem to have been mentioned by others, and therefore I am diffident about it. He seems to me to be, when he advises putting off Baptism to the age of reason, *growing* a *Montanist*: the followers of Montanus “did not allow the Church the power to forgive great sins *after Baptism*⁹.” Tertullian himself held *mæchia* to be “*immundabile vitium*.” Now the only reason for which he dissuades from early Baptism seems to me to be an horror of sin after baptism; and he particularly dissuades single persons, and young widows, as being most likely to yield to carnal lust. The austere temper of a Montanist seems likely also to make a man dread any one’s *dying* without baptism, at the same time that it makes him dread baptizing. Such inconsistencies are apt to attend excessive passions—not less those of a morose kind than any others.

We may here mention *Fidus*’s application to Cyprian, (who
 281 is placed in the year 248,) though it is only the misrepresentation of it which has occasioned any difficulty. *Fidus*

⁸ Wall, p. 27, quarto, or Part I. chap. v. sect. 3.

⁹ Art. xvi. sect. 2. From Iardner’s Works, vol. ix. p. 489.

desired to be informed whether he might, in any case, baptize IV. a child *before the eighth day*; the answer was, yes, if it be in *danger*—if there be *necessity*. This is represented as if no infant, even *after* the eighth day, was to be baptized except in cases of *necessity*. Whereas Fidus had no difficulty *after* the eighth day. He had baptized commonly; but the rite of circumcision, corresponding to Baptism, having been delayed till the eighth day, together with the objection or disgust which some might have to giving a very young child the Kiss of Peace, and other reasons, not very forcible, made him doubt, whether, even supposing there was some danger, he should baptize. Children, though in danger, had not been circumcised, that he knew of, sooner than the eighth day.

6. *Augustin* lived about 200 years after Tertullian: he very frequently speaks of Infant-baptism, though incidentally. And says, that he *never heard* of any “Christian catholic, or sectary, who taught any other doctrine but that infants are to be baptized¹ [for pardon of sin].” The Pelagians (incidentally) allow the same². It seems strange, that neither they nor *Augustin* should ever have seen Tertullian’s book *de Baptismo*. I do not see that Wall solves this difficulty. I can conceive that Tertullian might not *occur* to *Augustin* when he made his assertion; and for this reason, because the ruling idea in *Augustin*’s mind was not Infant-baptism, but the danger of suffering from original sin; about which danger Tertullian was no adversary.

7. The case of *Gregory of Nazianzum* is not free from difficulty. He says, in an oration about Baptism, that if 282 infants are out of all danger of dying, his *own* opinion is that they should be baptized when they are about *three* years old;—an opinion, as Wall remarks, “which would please neither the Pædobaptist nor Antipædobaptist.” The Pædobaptist however sees that the custom of baptizing infants is here allowed, as a *fact*; and urges, that a child is no more capable of contracting when he is three years old than when three weeks old. All objections of any force are against a child’s being baptized during what may be called its *minority* in religious matters. This is what occurs if we consider *Gregory*’s sentence by itself: but it should be considered with the context.

There is certainly something extraordinary in this private opinion of *Gregory*’s—something which has a *solution*, if one

¹ Conference, p. 46.

² *Ib.* pp. 48, 49.

IV. could but find it out. The oration is a forcible harangue against *deferring* baptism; the *pretences* for deferring it are answered; and with regard to *children*, the preacher urges, *Νήπιον ἔστι σοι; μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἢ κακία, ἐκ βρέφους ἀγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω τῷ πνεύματι*:—and then he proposes to mothers the example of *Hannah*, who made *Samuel* holy immediately, as soon as he was born, (*γεννηθέντα ἱερὸν εὐθὺς ποιεῖ*): and immediately after delivering his notion about three years, he speaks of the sudden dangers to which an human being is subject, and advises securing infants against them by means of Baptism. How is it then that this peculiar notion comes in amidst directions which seem inconsistent with it? Wall considers it as a compliment to the preacher's father³; which, from certain circumstances, seems no groundless conjecture. We know so little of the minutiae of Gregory's history, that we seem unlikely to go farther than to see an *inconsistency*; from which one may venture to conclude, that the notion of three years had some *extraordinary* origin; that it was not a natural conception, agreeable to the scope of the discourse—not the genuine offspring of Gregory's unbiassed understanding⁴.

283

To dwell on more particulars would exceed our *limits*. I have laid before you every thing (as far as I know) that seems *against* the custom of baptizing infants: the historical authorities *for* that custom are too numerous and extensive to be given; for them I must refer to Wall. I believe you may conclude all the numerous authorities which I have not mentioned to be *in favour* of Infant-baptism. In general, it may be mentioned, that Infant-baptism was never ordered or enjoined by any *council*; was never inserted in any *creed*; and that all established *national* churches have practised it. Peter *Bruis* (perhaps Bruce), a Frenchman, whose followers were called *Petrobrussians*, is thought by Wall to have been (with one *Henry*) the first Antipædobaptist teacher who formed a *church*, about A. D. 1030. The German Anabaptists are placed in A. D. about 1420: these were mentioned formerly. If there was any continuation of doctrine from the Petrobrussians to

³ Wall about *Cæsarius*, p. 306, quarto.

⁴ *Robinson* says, this oration was delivered to an audience in which were many persons *unbaptized*. That must be true; at least there must have been enough to make it worth while to per-

suaude to Baptism: but yet by far the greatest part of those parents who were themselves baptized might baptize their children in infancy. If Infant-baptism was unusual amongst such, Gregory could not have used the language he does.

them, it was obscure, and held by a few men. The aim of IV. both was to *reform*—to improve religion, and make the Church of Christ perfect in practice as well as in theory. The Anabaptists were slow in getting footing in *England*: Neal places their first congregation or Church, in England, in the year 284 1640. Probably Cromwell found them of use, and encouraged them. Mr. *Tombs* is reckoned their best writer.

Servetus, who suffered death at Geneva in 1553, on the prosecution of Calvin, censured Infant-baptism “with the utmost severity.” (Mosh. Cent. 16. III. ii. 4, 5.)

Here it may be proper to mention the subject of *Sponsors*. Susceptores, or sponsors, have been used in Baptism for a great length of time: Bingham (xi. viii. 1) divides them into three sorts.

1. Those who answered for infants.
2. Those who answered for infirm persons, unable to answer for themselves.
3. Those who attended at the Baptism of adults, as *witnesses*, and thereby received a commission to remind them of their baptismal vow.

In the Baptism of adults, the sponsors with us are used as witnesses only; and as persons authorized to remind the newly-baptized of his baptismal vow. It does indeed seem improper that such a solemn act as Baptism, making such a change in a man's condition, should go unattested, or be left to casual testimony; and as reproof or advice to adults, though they constantly want it, is impertinent from those who have no authority to give it, there is an evident utility in the Church's commissioning some friend to suggest occasionally a friendly admonition in spiritual affairs.

Wall shews that sponsors were in use amongst the *Jews*, when they baptized proselytes.—(See Part II. 10. 17.)

I do not recollect whether the *Puritans* had any sponsors. In the comedy called *the Puritan*, amongst Shakspeare's works, they are called “*ungodmothered varlets*.”

And now what is the *result* of the facts here stated? 285

1. Could they have happened on a supposition that Christians always baptized infants? or, that there never was a time, since Christianity was published, when some infants were not baptized? yes, they might. The silence of Scripture, considering how very small its records are¹, is consistent with the

¹ In Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* we find several instances of events relating to the

Apostles which are not recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

IV. practice. Thousands must have been baptized, at one age or other, whose baptism is never mentioned: more important events demanded the pen of the historian, than the Baptism of the infant-children of those converts who had been themselves baptized.

2. Could the facts have been as we find them, supposing all Christians had been plainly and positively commanded, by written edict, to baptize their children in infancy? I think not. Neither Tertullian nor Gregory of Nazianzum would, in that case, have presumed to occasion any delay.

3. Are the facts consistent with the supposition, that all Christians might baptize infants if they pleased? yes: I see no marks of any prohibition, or discouragement.

4. Lastly, could the facts have been as we find them, supposing that as many Christians left infants unbaptized, as baptized them? I think not: the evidence shews the *majority* of those who baptized infants to be very great.

On the whole, it is probable that many parents, &c. baptized children, in all ages of the church; very many, in some; but that none were compelled to baptize them in any age.

286 In speaking of Infant-baptism, we have paid no attention to the difference between immersion and sprinkling; but as what was said before on sprinkling related to Baptism in general, or without regard to age, it must relate to all particular sorts of Baptism. Therefore we may content ourselves with observing, that there has been a *trine sprinkling*² as well as a trine immersion; and that sprinkling may be more easily justified in baptizing infants, than adults, because immersion has an effect upon the feelings and sentiments of adults, but no mental effect upon infants.

15. I will here insert an observation or two on what may be called *irregular* Baptism—such as occasions a doubt whether a person shall be re-baptized. We said something allied to this under the twenty-third Article; and under the present, when describing the notions of the Romish Church and the reformed churches. The subject is very copious, as any one finds who reads Bingham's History of Lay-baptism.

Some ancient Christians used to re-baptize those persons, more than once, whose first baptism they themselves accounted valid; these were the most strictly Anabaptists. The Christians whom we call Anabaptists in modern times, baptize those

² Wall, p. 468, quarto.

over again who were baptized in infancy; but it is because IV. they look upon infant-baptism as not valid. Hence they choose to be called not Anabaptists, but *Baptists*. The followers of Marcion used to baptize, in their own way, more than once; and we now see old people, who wish to be *confirmed* repeatedly. Wall says, he knows of no other ancient Christians besides the Marcionites who reiterated their own Baptism. (Part II. chap. v. sect. 5.)

Irregularities may arise from *place, time, matter, &c.*; but 287 those seem most attended to which arise from the want of due qualifications in the *persons* who baptize. These may be inferior orders of ministers, as deacons; or the assistant ministers mentioned Article xxv. sect. 5, subdeacons, readers, acolythists, &c.; or degraded priests become laymen, or confessed laymen, or women. The validity of Baptism may also become doubtful from its being administered by heretical ministers, though that is because such are deemed no ministers at all¹. In our own country, midwives have been allowed to baptize, in cases of necessity. Neal² gives us a form of a licence for that purpose; and says, with some surprise, that notwithstanding such licences were given, Bishop Whitgift affirmed, "that Baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed by the Church." The case was, that an ambiguous rubric had divided the learned³; and Whitgift probably spoke his real opinion.

As a full history of irregular Baptism would detain us too long, I must content myself with a few general remarks; the result, as it were, of history.

But we must distinguish between authorising certain persons beforehand to perform any sacred act in certain extraordinary cases, and confirming acts on looking back upon them, which have not only been irregular, but have been performed without any previous authority. Acts authorized must be confirmed, however irregular; but doubt may arise about a 288 person having gone beyond what he was authorized to do. The greatest difficulty, however must arise in debating, 1. Whether any act is to be authorized; 2. When an unauthorized act is to be confirmed.

1. When we debate about authorizing certain persons to baptize in extraordinary cases, our inquiry must turn on this:

¹ Marcionites and Pepuzians are mentioned by Rogers, p. 141, with reference to Epiphanius. Hæc. 52, in regard to Baptism by non-ministers.

² See Hampton-Court Conf. in 1603.

³ See an account of this rubric in Bingham's History of Lay-baptism, chap. iii. sect. 5. Works, vol. II. p. 567.

IV. which is the *least evil*—to let a man infringe the rights, and intrude into the province of the sacred ministry, or to let men die unbaptized, in original sin. The Scotch Church is shocked at the idea of women baptizing: the Directory forbids all private Baptism⁴. If they feel no shock at the thoughts of an human being not becoming a Christian when he might, they act consistently; but ought they not to allow, that others may be as much shocked at the latter evil as *they* are at the former? If a case is really one of necessity, there is no alternative but irregular baptism, or dying in a state of heathenism chosen voluntarily.

2. When sacred acts have been performed without authority, people are apt to reason as if they could lay down rules for necessity; but necessity knows no law. Whoever acts in cases of necessity, according to the best of his judgment and with an honest intention, must act rightly; and what he does ought to be confirmed. Men may dispute historically about Baptism in cases of necessity, in order to determine what has
289 been done; but if men under necessity act *bonâ fide* for the best—if they return to rule as soon as they are able, and make what compensation they are able for damage arising from their acts—it signifies nothing to them what the Romanists or what the Calvinists have settled; they are right, and those who annul their acts are wrong.

3. But as disputes may arise about the effects of Baptism in cases of necessity, would it not be best to have some ordinance for admitting those, who have been irregularly baptized, to regular Baptism? Such ordinance need not assert that the former baptism is invalid; but only say, that *if* it be so in any degree, there is now a completion given to it. We have such a form in the Church of England when it is not sufficiently proved that private Baptism has been performed. Indeed the whole reception of one privately baptized into the Church, may be considered as a completion of an irregular Baptism. And in our civil government, when a measure has been taken during a recess of parliament, enjoined only by proclamation, &c., I believe it is always confirmed by parliamentary authority at the ensuing session⁵.

⁴ Puller says, "the Directory did forbid, very uncharitably, all private Baptism; notwithstanding most of its followers now-adays admit only private Baptisms." Moderation of the Church

of England, London, 1679, p. 280. The Directory was approved by the Assembly of Divines in 1645. For the Scotch Church, see *Syntagma*, p. 154, cap. xxii.

⁵ Dr. Burn, under *Baptism*, says, from Bishop

16. If I have seemed too prolix on this history of Baptism, it must be considered that history here answers two purposes: it not only relates facts, but it contains arguments. Besides, the history of Baptism has been, of late, in my opinion, much misrepresented, and in a manner likely to do harm:—I mean by the late Mr. *Robinson*, Baptist teacher at Cambridge¹. It came in my way, on a former occasion², to shew how he misrepresented Augustin: something of the same sort may be expected now. But, in truth, Wall has already answered him; and to see his misrepresentations, nothing more is needful than to look into a book to which he himself refers. I have mentioned the cases of those who were baptized late in life³: that of Cyprian⁴ with Fidus, of Tertullian⁵, Augustin's⁶ ignorance of Tertullian's advice, and the case of Gregory of Nazianzum⁷. These are the strongest things against Infant-baptism that I know of in antiquity, and these are specimens sufficient. Let any one, then, who wishes to study the history of Baptism, *compare* Robinson's account of these with Wall's; I desire nothing more. But what are we to think of a person who proposes, in an earnest way, arguments to which he himself has read complete answers? I speak only to those who, with myself, think them undeniably such. We must accuse no one of wilful falsehood: misrepresentation is indeed falsehood; but there may be things to make men think differently from ourselves, of which we have no conception. This however I may be permitted to say, that it is totally above my comprehension how any honest candid lover of truth could use the arguments which Robinson has used, after reading what Wall has written. This is by no means denying Robin-

Bishop Fleetwood, that there has been no law in England to forbid or invalidate *Lay-baptism* in cases of necessity. He supposes it good, and understands that a person so baptized is not to be re-baptized. After the Restoration he supposes there might be in Wales two or three hundred thousand persons who had received only *Lay-baptism*.

Neal gives (1661), as one of the things settled by the Commissioners for reviewing the Common Prayer, (p. 612, quarto) —“10. Private Baptism is not to be administered but by a lawful minister.” History of Puritans, quarto, vol. II. p. 614.

¹ In the History of Baptism, quarto, London, 1790.

² Book III. chap. xiv. sect. 14.

³ Robinson, pp. 218, 250. Wall, 2. 3. See also Bingham, xi. iv. 12.

⁴ Robinson, pp. 184, 193, partic. 195. Mentioned p. 219. Wall, 1. vi. 1.

⁵ Robinson, chap. xxi. Wall, 1. iv. 5.

⁶ Robinson, p. 218. Wall, 1. xix. 17, p. 174, quarto.

⁷ Robinson, p. 249. Wall, 1. xi. 1, &c. One might compare what Wall and Robinson say about Pelagius: Wall, pp. 210, 218. Or what they say about the Council of Milevis, in 316; Wall, pp. 197, 220. Robinson, p. 216.

IV. son the character of an honest man; for many conclusions of reason, and dictates of wisdom, may be above my comprehension. I myself have a poor opinion of Robinson's reasoning powers; whether his understanding or his education may have been the cause, I know not; or a pursuit of eloquence, or an indignation at the prosperity of his adversaries, or any thing else. I suppose his verbiage, and his quotation, will keep him from contempt; but those who are able to see no farther than I am, if they allow him to be a man of good abilities, must read his great work, his elaborate History of Baptism, if a love of *truth* be uppermost in their minds, with disgust and abhorrence^s.

You may say, I am prejudiced: I should certainly be more upon my guard against prejudice than I am, if I had ever had the least dislike, either to the man, or to his doctrines. I never heard the least harm of the man; and, though I prefer the practice of our Church, yet I think I could live upon terms of the most intimate friendship with one who preferred the custom of delaying Baptism to the age of maturity.

17. Our history then being finished, we come to *explanation*.

292 “Baptism is not *only* a sign of profession,” &c.—This is affirming the same of Baptism in particular which in Art. xxv. was affirmed of sacraments in general. Saying it is “not only” a sign, implies that it *is* a sign; or that there ought to be something *external* in Baptism:—contrary to the notion of the *Quakers*.

Our Church holds as “essential parts of Baptism,” water, and the form given in Matt. xxviii. 19. See Rubric, end of Private Baptism, or of receiving into the Church.

“It is also a sign of regeneration.” The term *regeneration* occurred in the ninth Article, and was there explained⁹. From what has been said under the present Article, it appears to be a term borrowed, or adopted, from the Jews (if not used by heathens,) denoting what we call Baptism. Now a name of a thing consisting of parts, is often taken from one part; so Baptism denotes the whole sacrament, though strictly it be only the name of the external washing. And in like manner *regeneration*, amongst the ancients especially, denotes the whole sacrament, though strictly it be only the name of the internal

^s See the conclusion of Wall's last chapter but one.

⁹ Art. ix. sect. 24

benefit¹, or improvement—the “spiritual grace;” that is the IV. favour, or benefit accruing to the *mind* or *spirit*, in this life or the next; which benefit may always be ascribed, with humble gratitude, in an indefinite manner, to God’s *Holy Spirit*. Nor is it inconsistent with this, to understand the Spirit, in the sacrament of Baptism, as the *meaning*² of the outward sign, and as explained by being opposed, or contradistinguished to the visible sign. The meaning of the sign is the spiritual 293 benefit annexed to it: all the expressions seem to come to the same thing.

“Whereby”—*per quod*, by which *sign*, the promises of God are sealed, &c. or, in one word, regeneration is enacted, executed, sealed.

“As by an *instrument*.”—I know not that any explanation of this word *instrument* is wanted: it signifies means, or a deed. Here it is the means of grafting and of signing and sealing.

The particulars which follow seem to be component parts of *regeneration*: if so, we have, in this Article, the notion of the Church of England, of regeneration, given by itself; which, to the members of our Church, is an authentic definition. The first part, or ingredient, of regeneration, is being admitted into the society of Christians, or “*grafted into the Church*,”—the Catholic church. The second is, remission of sins committed before Baptism, or afterwards, upon repentance; or a promise “of the *forgiveness* of sin.” The third is, *adoption* as “sons of God, by the Holy Ghost.” The fourth is a confirmation of *faith*. The fifth an increase of *grace*, or of such holy, pious, virtuous dispositions and principles, as are most particularly to be ascribed to the divine assistance. Indeed, *faith* was shewn, under the tenth Article³, to be rightly ascribed to God’s Holy Spirit.

We might here ask, whether John Wesley’s conception of regeneration is the same with that set forth by the Church of which he professed himself to be a member, the Church of England? His regeneration is subsequent to Baptism; which makes his brother say, that with him “Baptism was nothing⁴.” 294

¹ An instance of the general observation here made was explained Art. iii. sect. 3.

² See Dr. Balguy’s last Charge, p. 302. Also Art. xxv. sect. 2.

³ Art. x. sect. 36.

⁴ Samuel Wesley, after Mr. Hutton; see Wesley’s Letters, p. 72. See also pp. 116, 65, 70. Wall contends, that the word Regeneration is “never used by the ancients but when they speak of Baptism,” pp. 354, 520.

IV. If it was not more than a mere “sign of profession,” his idea of Baptism must be contrary to that of our Church.

Adoption “by the *Holy Ghost*” is a reference to *Scripture*. See Rom. viii. 14, 16; but that may occur better in our proof.

“By virtue of *prayer*.”—This is *true*, but is it not making prayer essential to Baptism? In the *Reformatio Legum* there is the same idea⁵: “Verbo Dei quod intercedit, &c.—erudiuntur fideles, &c.”

“*Young children*,” *parvulorum*.—This seems definite enough; but the age of the infants here spoken of seems still farther defined by the Rubrics of our Office for baptizing adults. From them it appears, that a person may be baptized as a child who happens not to have been “baptized in his infancy.” Indeed, this Office for adults is comparatively modern; having been made in the year 1661, after the Restoration, in order that any who had been brought up Quakers or Baptists might, if they pleased, be received into the established Church; and with a view⁶ to missionaries. But the divines who composed it must be considered as very able expositors of the Church’s meaning and intention.

“In any wise,” rather obsolete; the Latin, however, is *omnino*.

18. “To be retained in the Church;”—that is, not given up. This expression seems free from austerity and preciseness. A rite may be retained in a Church, even though every one be not compelled to use it. And the declaration is easy and liberal with regard to the particular circumstances of Infant-baptism, as age, &c. Our Office for Public Baptism of Infants speaks the same liberal language; the sponsors are exhorted to believe that God favourably *alloweth* Infant-baptism; which plainly acknowledges an imperfection in it. It is called a “*charitable work* ;” and so distinguished from an indispensable duty of a kind perfectly determinate. The next expression of the Article is in the same spirit.

“As most agreeable with the institution of Christ.”—There is more latitude in doing any thing as suitable to an institution, than as enjoined by positive command: in the former case, you may reason from analogy, follow your common sense, and feelings; in the latter case, you only obey orders—you do not think for yourself.

⁵ *De Hæresibus*, cap. xvii.

⁶ See Preface to the Common Prayer-

book made in 1661. Also Wheatly on the Common Prayer, octavo, p. 31.

Dr. *Priestley* (Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 93) seems to think our IV. Church not very candid; at least, he represents it as saying in its public forms, “that Baptism is *necessary* for salvation.” Perhaps the office to which he alludes may be that for the Baptism of adults; in which, the Exhortation, after the Gospel, does say something very like it; yet it clearly excepts extraordinary cases, by the words, “*where it may be had.*” so our Catechism—“*generally necessary to salvation.*”

Our Church is certainly against all *neglect* of Baptism: the exhortation to adults consists chiefly of practical scriptural exhortations to Baptism, and scriptural reasons for them. It does not enter into speculations. Moreover, our Church takes no part in the question about infants dying unbaptized, (except so as not to *bury*, Wall p. 377,) though it pronounces (rubric, end of Private Baptism) those to be “undoubtedly saved” which die baptized; a sentence in which ancient Christians 296 were unanimous. In such a case, what can hinder salvation? The truth is, that we hold the necessity of Baptism as *agents*, but not as *judges*. We think that we do not do our part if we neglect what seems ordinarily a means of salvation; and we think it the *preferable* measure to procure good for *children*, as far as lies in our power, in things spiritual as well as temporal. But we judge no one. Three heads of our Church have published this opinion: Archbishop Whitgift, Archbishop Laud, and Archbishop Secker. [See Wall, II. vi. 8, p. 377. And Secker’s thirty-fifth Lecture, near the end.]

19. Let us now come to our *proof*.

There seem to be seven propositions in our Article; and one more seems wanted, in order to justify the modern practice of partial immersion, or *sprinkling*, or pouring, which prevails in our Western Church.

1. Baptism implies an *external* ceremony.
2. It is the instrument by which men are *grafted* into the Church of Christ.
3. It marks God’s promise of *forgiveness* of sins.
4. It marks God’s promise of *adopting* us for sons.
5. It confirms our *faith*.
6. It increases *grace*.
7. *Sprinkling*, or pouring, is not unlawful, when used instead of immersion; (especially in Infant-baptism.)
8. Baptizing *infants* is to be *preferred* to leaving them unbaptized till they are able to answer for themselves.

IV. We need only undertake here to give *sufficient* proofs, not such as might be given by those who made the subject of Baptism a separate study.

297 20. Baptism has an *external* part, or contains an external ceremony, in which *water* is used.

This seems sufficiently clear from the word βαπτίζω, which signifies to *wash*. We may consult Matt. xxviii. 19; John iv. 1. When a person is said to do a thing *more* than another, the thing must be of the same nature in both cases. Now John's Baptism was confessedly by water. The minister of the Ethiopian queen¹ waits for baptism till some water appears. *Cornelius's* Baptism depends on water: "Can any man forbid water," says the Apostle, "that these should not be baptized?"² The Quaker's Baptism, by the Holy Ghost, was just over. More passages will occur under the following propositions.

21. Baptism is the instrument by which men are *grafted* into the Church of Christ. This may appear from the texts already quoted, as they all shew that the end of baptizing was to make men *disciples*. Μαθητεύσατε πάντα ἔθνη, means make *disciples* (μαθητὰς)³ of all nations; the two cases above mentioned are plain. We may add 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27.

It will follow, from this proposition, that all benefits, which arise on any man's becoming a Christian, may be spoken of as accompanying Baptism.

22. Baptism marks the divine promises of *forgiveness* of sins:—Acts ii. 38; xiii. 38; xxii. 16. Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14.

23. Baptism marks the divine promises of *adopting* us as his sons:—Rom. viii. 14, 15, 16, 17 (here the *Holy Spirit* is mentioned.) Gal. iii. 26, 27. Gal. iv. 5. Eph. i. 5.

298 24. By Baptism our *faith* is confirmed. It must be so, in the natural course of things. You cannot take a measure proposed for your good, by those who have a power of promoting it, without feeling your confidence strengthened. Whatever seals promises must confirm faith. Any person, by enlisting himself in the service of *Christ*, and receiving promises made on his account, must feel a greater faith in Christ. It has been just now observed, that such faith may, on scriptural authority, be referred to the agency of God's *Holy Spirit*, according to Gal. v. 22. If therefore we receive the Holy Spirit through Baptism, we strengthen *faith*.

¹ Acts viii. 36.

² Acts x. 47.

quarto, or 1. ii. 6. Also p. 519. Con-

³ See Wall, Introd. sect. 5, and p. 13,

ference, pp. 15, 28.

25. By Baptism our *grace* is increased. This, in the IV. language of our Church, means, good dispositions and principles, as in 2 Peter, end. It is inconceivable that good dispositions should not be increased by any worthy receiver of Baptism. A solemn act of self-dedication to a religious society; to a society carried on under the immediate protection of Heaven itself; for the institution of which all mankind had been in a course of preparation from the beginning of the world; for which the greatest things had been done, the greatest evils suffered;—such a solemn act must correct, regulate, meliorate, the heart and principles, if any thing can. Conceive the amendment of the heart and actions to be ascribed to the *Holy Spirit*, and then study the expressions of *Scripture*:—John iii 5. Rom. vi. 4. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Eph. iv. 22, 23, 24. Eph. v. 26, 27. Col. ii. 10, 11, 12. Titus iii. 5. Heb. x. 22. 1 Pet. iii. 21. The proof of this proposition shews that Baptism is “*not only* a sign of profession,” &c. but a sign of a spiritual good also.

The metaphor of *putting on*, used in the texts, arises from 299 dressing after Baptism: it seems connected with the ceremony of the *white garment*¹; nay, was probably the cause of that ceremony. The metaphor of being *buried*, was probably the effect of the custom of immersion. Men were as it were buried in the water, and rose again to newness of life, or new birth. All *renewing* is supposed to take place on the change made at Baptism; the idea is that of new birth, varied a little in the expression. And Col. ii. 11 should be remarked, as justifying our reasoning by analogy from Circumcision to Baptism; whence we may apply Rom. ii. 28, 29. These metaphors must not be *confounded*; but each may be used. And being aware of them is a great help to understanding some passages of Scripture.

We have now gone through the several parts of Baptism, external and internal; only two propositions remain, which regard the *manner* of it, and the circumstances which sometimes attend it.

26. Though Baptism was at first administered by total immersion, its validity is not destroyed if safety or great convenience requires its being administered by *affusion*. The *mode* of performing an *emblematical* ceremony, as was before observed, cannot well be a thing of the last importance. The

¹ Sect. 4, 5.

IV. word βαπτίζω does not imply total immersion only²; and if it did, we seem in such a case to be at liberty to consult our *safety*, from Matt. ix. 13, and xii. 7—or even our great convenience: it signifies to *wash*. βαφή signifies a *spot*: a spot is partial. Conceive first that the Jews used to wash their hands by having water *poured* upon them, and then read, in the Greek, Luke xi. 38; read also Mark vii. 4; Heb. ix. 10.

300 Besides, what we call baptizing, is not always expressed by βαπτίζω, but sometimes by λούω, which is certainly used for ordinary³ washing—generally of the whole body, but not always. Acts xvi. 33 could not be total immersion. See Eph. v. 26; Titus iii. 5, in the *Greek*.

Archbishop *Secker* introduces Isaiah lii. 15, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, and some other passages which mention sprinkling⁴; but the word sprinkling in Heb. x. 22 does not seem to me to mean the external part of baptism, but the internal, metaphorically⁵; the external being expressed by the following words—“and our *bodies* washed with pure *water*.”

In general, I have felt some reluctance to admit the passages cited by Archbishop *Secker* in support of sprinkling in Baptism. There are various sprinklings enjoined in the Law of Moses, as those with ashes, water, oil, blood; and with some mixtures, such as ashes and water, blood and hyssop, &c.; and some of these are alluded to in the New Testament. But I feel unwilling to apply to the external part of Baptism any allusions to the sprinkling of *blood*: they seem more applicable either to purifying the *heart*, or to the death of Christ, and the doctrine of atonement. If there were, in the *New Testament*, allusions to the sprinklings with *water*, I should

301 be willing to adopt them; and I think the Prophecies, Is. lii. 15, and Ezek. xxxvi. 25, may be applicable; but I do not recollect any allusions to sprinklings with water. Heb. x. 22 may seem to be one, as blood is not mentioned; but of that I have spoken. Nevertheless there certainly are, in the *Old Testament*, emblematical purifications by water, both in the way of

² Wall, p. 433, quarto.

³ Properly, *νίπτω* signifies to wash *hands*; (sometimes to wash feet);—*πλύνω*, to wash *clothes*; *λούω*, to wash the whole body. *Βάπτω* does not, I fancy, make one feel, so strongly as the others, the idea of aiming at cleanness—only as cleanness comes of *course* from immersion; but

it seems applicable to a greater number of things than the others.

⁴ 35th Lecture on Catechism, p. 226.

⁵ The sprinkling corresponds to those sprinklings which were intended to *purify*, (see Lev. viii. 15; Heb. ix. 18—22): these were made with *blood*.

bathing and sprinkling¹; and as that is the case, there seems IV. some degree of scriptural authority for our using both methods in our sacramental cleansings. The case is such as to admit of all kinds of arguments and authorities; especially as it is not easy to understand how some baptisms mentioned in the New Testament could be performed by total immersion².

27. Baptizing *infants* is *preferable* to leaving them unbaptized till they are of age to answer for themselves.

1. This seems to follow from reason, and from the principles of natural law already mentioned³. If an infant was enabled to judge for himself, a Christian, (and it is of Christians we speak), must conclude that he would choose to be admitted into Christianity. One good effect of Infant-baptism is, that it precludes the painful question, ‘when shall I be baptized?’ and prevents that procrastination which Gregory of Nazianzum laboured so much to prevent. One may conceive a young person to *delay* baptism, sometimes through fear and scruple, sometimes deferring it to a “convenient season,” with a view of enjoying an illicit gratification a little and a little longer. And why should not infants enjoy the benefits of Christian society, as well as worldly rank and property? Those who refuse them the privilege mean well; but they act like a formal and precise, though well-meaning servant, who would stand still and be useless, though much wanted, rather than do any thing which his master had not *ordered* him to do. 302

2. The religion of *Moses* obviates the great objection to our plan; which is, that an infant cannot enter into a covenant. Whereas circumcision admitted children into the Old Covenant by divine appointment⁴.

3. The practice of the first teachers of Christianity seems to me, upon the whole, to be much in favour of Infant-baptism. I should imagine, with the learned Lightfoot⁵, that as the Jews usually baptized the children of proselytes, they would, when they went out to be baptized by *John*, take their young children to be baptized with them. This is not mentioned; but the baptism of children seems to be taken for *granted* in

¹ Numb. xix. 19—21, and “diverse washings,” Heb. ix. 10, (διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς,) seem to include both sorts: will not our βάπτισμα therefore allow of both sorts, bathing and sprinkling?

² Secker’s Lect. 35, p. 227.

³ Sect. 11, beginning.

⁴ Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12, with Gen. xvii. 12, 13, and Lev. xii. 3.

⁵ *Horæ Hebr.* on Matt. iii. See Wall’s Introd. p. i.vi.

IV. Scripture, as are moral duties of the greatest importance⁶. When we have not words to judge by, we must judge by actions or customs. As the children of converts to Judaism were always baptized, the order to convert and baptize all nations would, of course, be understood to include children⁷. Suppose the order had been, 'Go ye and *circumcise* all nations;' would not the circumcision of children have been included? If one of our *Baptist* congregations was to send out a minister, with the commission, 'Go and baptize the Indians or Gentoos,' I should think he grossly perverted his commission if he baptized children. But if one was sent from the Church of *England* with the same commission, 'Go and baptize the Gentoos,' I should think he grossly neglected his commission if he did *not* baptize children. When a custom was once settled, which the solicitude of parents would strongly impel them to continue, not to check such a custom was, in a manner, to encourage it, and give it a sanction. And such a custom prevailing, it is difficult to conceive that *households* would be baptized, and the children omitted.

4. Besides the practice of the first publishers of Christianity, thus gathered, there is a particular passage, or perhaps two, of the New Testament worth considering.

1 Cor. vii. 14 shews, that if *either* parent of a child was a Christian, the child might be brought up a Christian, and called *holy*, or of the peculiar people of God⁸. Christians have often in Scripture the name of *saints*, or *sancti*. Now Wall contends, that *holy*, ἅγιος, means or implies *baptized*; and this he seems to support with great force of argument⁹.

⁶ Dr. Balguy, p. 87, beginning of 6th Discourse.

⁷ Wall's Introd. pp. xlvi. and lvi. Conference, pp. 28, 29.

⁸ Locke on the place.

⁹ Wall, quarto, pp. 67, 99, 175, Conference, p. 40, &c. 46, &c. The idea seems to be this:—'I (Paul) am now giving you prudential advice of my *own* (ver. 12): do not leave your husband (or wife) because he is an heathen; for the *fact* is, it hath often happened that the Christian wife hath converted her heathen husband; so that the man hath been baptized (ἁγιασται), or *sanctified* (a word often used for baptized) through his wife;

and *vice versâ*. Besides, if you leave your husband, what will become of your *children*? Live together, and though he continue a heathen, you may prevail upon him to let your children be brought up Christians, (or made *saints*, *sancti*).' Now no one, says Wall, is called *saint*, or *holy*, who was not *baptized*. How can we conceive that a child, whose father was an heathen, and mother a Christian, could be made a Christian any *other* way but by being baptized? Gal. iii. 27. Augustin says, (see Wall, p. 175,) that whatever is meant by the text, no one can be made a Christian without the *sacraments*.

Mr. Locke's expression is as if the child must be a Christian, if born of Christian parents¹; but he only takes the Baptism for *granted*: he only compares Christians with Jews (see his note); and though a child might, in some sense, be said to be a Jew born, all things being supposed to go on regularly in their ordinary course, yet circumcision was, in strictness, necessary to make a Jew, and so Baptism to make a Christian. As Mr. Locke took the Baptism for granted, so might St. Paul. IV. 304

I will only farther mention, Mark x. 14, or the four verses which make the *Gospel* in our Office for the Baptism of Infants. "They brought young children to Christ,"—perhaps an Anti-pædobaptist would say, why did he not baptize them? Because their parents did not bring them for that purpose: the parents were not yet Christians; Jesus was not a professed *Baptist*; perhaps his disciples might afterwards baptize some of these. Whatever argument this Scripture may be for the baptism of infants, it shews plainly how eager parents were, at the time, to gain every spiritual benefit for their young children. They desired that their children might be *touch'd*² by an Holy Man, not thinking he would take them up in his arms. It appears 305 from the accounts of the other Evangelists, that Christ took a child in his arms as an *emblem* of innocence, in order to teach his disciples how simple and free from guile they ought to be—children in *malice*³, though men in understanding; but St. Mark's account gives more idea of our Saviour's attending to the children *themselves*. Why might not our Lord *both* feel a kind concern for the children, and take occasion from them to inculcate godly sincerity and simplicity? if his feelings were lively, his moral would be strong. He admitted them to no *covenant*, but he *blessed* them affectionately, holding them in his arms: his benediction, surely, must be some *spiritual* good. My reason dare scarcely make an argument from this interesting scene; but, when I contemplate it, I always wish myself a painter, that I might give a lasting representation of it. What an attitude might not that of Jesus be! what a countenance! looking down, with a mild and gracious benevolence, on the infant in his arms! expressing a deep knowledge

¹ This may be the ground of the Socinian notion; see sect. 9. But if our reasoning here is just, that notion is not to be admitted: it is to be considered as unscriptural, if not dangerous; and as pro-

bably arising from prejudice against the doctrine of the Trinity.

² Compare touching for the king's evil. Woman touching the hem of Christ's garment. ³ 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

IV. of what was in man ! Other children, of different ages and characters, grouped in various employments ; the officious disciples, with ill-grounded apprehensions, and needless importance, endeavouring to disperse them ; the mother of the child in our Saviour's arms, near him, expressing, as one principal figure, in her face and gesture, suspense and hope, not without some degree of fear—joy, refined and meliorated with parental affection and piety ; other parents, some mildly triumphing in the benediction already received, others gently pressing forward to attain it ! Though reason may scruple to draw an argument
306 from this scene, yet who that performs the ceremony of Baptism does not feel its efficacy ? The infant in one's arms excites a sentiment of tenderness ; the Gospel has been just read ; the ceremony becomes, to the imagination, an imitation of the benevolence of him who appointed it ⁴. And then this Scripture pleads to the *heart* more forcibly than any coarse audible eloquence : it even convinces more intimately than the logic of any precise reasoners, who, by too great stiffness in adhering to what is minutely right, are often found substantially in the wrong.

28. We here close our direct proof. Let us see whether any *objections* occur, of weight enough to induce us to dwell upon them.

Objections may come from *Quakers* (ancient or modern), or from *Baptists*.

With regard to *water-baptism*, we have only such objections as are made by those whom I call ancient Quakers, the *Ascodrutæ*, &c., and by the Quakers of modern times.

The ancient heretics would have our religion to be entirely *spiritual* ; but can we throw off our earthly tabernacle in this life ? are not our minds affected by means of our senses ? are not the generality of men affected chiefly by their means ? nay, amongst those who reflect, are not ideas of reflection allowed to have their first origin in sensation ⁵ ? And can Christians set aside matter, one of whose peculiar articles of faith is, the Resurrection of the Body ?

29. The modern Quakers produce passages of Scripture in support of their spiritual notions ; but without a sound interpretation. When they have seemed to follow Scripture,
307 it has been because they took it in a *literal* sense ; which is

⁴ "This *charitable* work of ours."

⁵ Locke on the Human Understand-

ing. Book II. chap. vi. and chap. i. sect. 3, 24.

apt to strike the *people*, though often grossly wrong—so wrong IV. as to be universally thought so, in a little time. Wall¹, apologizing for Irenæus's book against early heresies, and for writers who were obliged to confute "such idle and enthusiastic stuff as seems to us not to deserve three words," adds, "So any book written now, in answer to the reasonings of the *Quakers*, &c. will, in the next age, seem to be the work of a man that had little to do²." Such books however have been written, by *Bennet* and *Charles Leslie*; and to them I will refer you; contenting myself with a short specimen. St. Paul, exhorting to unity, says³, "there is one Lord, one faith, *one baptism*:" how then, says *Barclay*, can there be *two* baptisms?—one by water, another spiritual? This argument is not mentioned by *Barclay* in passing, but it is insisted on⁴; yet to say, there is only one baptism, therefore it has no water, seems the same thing as to say, one thing is never composed of *parts*:—the king of England is but one *man*; therefore he has no *body*, or he has no *soul*. That is but one *tree*; therefore it has no *root*, or it has no *branches*.

Several arguments of the Quakers turning upon *one form* 308 of expression, it may be mentioned:—I mean the scriptural negative form of *comparison*; such as we find 1 Cor. i. 17, and 1 Pet. iii. 21:—"Christ sent me *not* to baptize, *but* to preach the Gospel." Baptism—"not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, *but* the answer of a good conscience," &c. But there are a multitude of such comparisons; see Matt. ix. 13, and Col. iii. 2. One might add, Matt. vi. 19, 20, and xxv. 33, and 1 Tim. ii. 9, 10, according to *Fordyce*. And, according to *Archbishop Sharp*, Matt. xii. 31⁵. Who will make all these to be absolute negatives?—if not all, why the first two?

30. But to drop the enemies to water-baptism—as our Church holds it essential to Baptism⁶, that a person be bap-

¹ P. 43, quarto.

² I would not be thought so far to adopt the observation of *Wall* as to say, that any one may at first sight perceive the fallacy of *all* the arguments of the *Quakers*: they have by some been thought perplexing, even when not convincing. *Mr. E.* told me once, coming from one of my Lectures, that he had been in more danger from *Barclay's Apology*, than from any book written against our religion. And *Rev. John Norris*, of *Bemer-*

ton near *Salisbury*, who died in 1711, said, "that he would rather encounter ten *Cardinal Bellarmine's*, than one *David Barclay*." So the newspaper says; but without referring to the part of *Mr. Norris's* works where the saying is to be found.

³ Eph. iv. 5.

⁴ *Barclay's Apology*, Prop. xii. sect. 3.

⁵ Art. xvi. sect. 4.

⁶ Rubric to Private Baptism, at the end; already mentioned, sect. 17.

IV. tized “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” it may be proper to mention an objection of the *Baptists*; that, in the Acts of the Apostles, converts are sometimes⁷ said to be baptized in the name, or *into the name of Christ*, or of *the Lord*. But this seems to mean only admission into *Christianity*, by Baptism; it might be in the usual form. Baptism in the name of *Christ* seems contradistinguished to the Baptism of *John*, or of the *Jews*, or to heathenism. Such an expression would not preclude the farther inquiry, by what *form* was such a person baptized into the name of Christ? probably, by the usual form⁸. For the
 309 expression, the *name* of Christ, we should read Acts iv. 12, which was introduced into our eighteenth Article. There is no other *name* under heaven whereby men may be saved but that of Christ: the names of *Moloch*, *Remphan*, &c., are insufficient and impotent. When we were accustomed to this language, being baptized into the *name* of Christ, would only convey the idea of *becoming* Christians, without implying any particular form⁹.

With regard to *Infant-baptism*, several objections have already occurred; I will therefore now mention only two.

31. If infants are to receive one sacrament, why not *both*? It used to be a custom, for many centuries, to give infants the Lord’s Supper; nay, it is now with the Greeks, and with “near half the Christians in the world¹⁰.” But to make them *members* of Christ was more necessary on account of original sin, than to make them go through a ceremony in *commemoration* of his death. Those who receive the Lord’s Supper renew their baptismal vow, broken by actual sin; but infants
 310 have committed none, and it may be doubted whether, regu-

⁷ See Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5.—P. S. See Wall, p. 435, quarto.

⁸ This may be right reasoning, though some ancient Christians did sometimes baptize in the name of *Christ*, instead of baptizing in the form prescribed, Matt. xxviii. 19. They might misunderstand Acts xix. 5. See Art. i. sect. 18. Vol. i. p. 527.

⁹ Gal. iii. 27, “For as many of you as have been baptized *into* Christ have put on Christ.”

Acts xix. 2. Some persons at Ephesus told St. Paul that they had not heard of the *Holy Ghost*; he immediately asked,

“unto what were ye then *baptized*?” Does not this seem to imply, that if they had been baptized as Christians they must have heard of the Holy Ghost? that is, they must have been baptized according to Matt. xxviii. 19.

¹⁰ Wall, p. 517, 4to, or ii. ix. 17. He adds, that probably the Western Church would have continued the practice, had it not been for the doctrine of transubstantiation: this may be just, though Sir Edwin Sandys says that the Greeks hold transubstantiation. *Speculum Europæ*, p. 233. But see farther Art. xxx. sect. 3.

larly, *confirmation* should not precede a partaking of the Lord's IV. Supper. We have reasoned from the Jewish to the Christian law. Amongst the Jews, children were initiated by circumcision, but did not partake of the Paschal supper, which is analogous to the Lord's Supper with us; so at least it is supposed¹. Infants cannot receive in remembrance of Christ. But if any church is, at last, of opinion, that infants ought to have the Lord's Supper, let such give it them: our reasoning in favour of Infant-baptism remains unaffected.

32. Baptism consists of two parts, external and internal; persons baptized are accordingly said to be born again of water and the Spirit². Children may be born of water, but how of the *Spirit*? how can their faith be confirmed, or their grace increased? It does not seem necessary that all the benefits of Baptism should belong to every person baptized: it is enough if the sacrament has both an external and an internal part. An infant cannot have faith³, or good principles; but it may be "*grafted* into the Church" and *adopted*; and it may even have *forgiveness*, though not of actual sin—it may have remission of the penalties inflicted on the human race⁴. Our Saviour was baptized; but he who knew no sin, of any kind, could have no forgiveness. He who was from the first the Son of God could not receive *adoption*.

33. Here we put an end to our proof, direct and indirect; 311 and therefore proceed to our *application*. I have been in doubt whether a new form of assent is wanted, and have tried one; but, on the whole, I do not think it worth while to detain you by giving it here. We come therefore to mutual *concessions*.

34. Here, again, we have to deal with *Quakers* and *Baptists*.

Concessions to Quakers, of the ancient or modern sort, we have none to make;—nor to the Socinians. Some Baptism we think clearly appointed in the Scriptures; but, at the same time, we disclaim all judging of our brother;—"to his own master he standeth or falleth⁵."

¹ Exod. xii. 26 does not prove this. Bingham quotes it, xv. iv. 7, end, and gives some reasons. Wall, at the end of chap. ix. (Part II.) mentions the Pass-over twice, as understood not to be for children; but quotes no text.

² John iii. 5.

³ The Lutherans allow them faith; and

the Pelagians used to ascribe to them actual sin, in order to avoid original.

⁴ This may seem less strange or harsh to those who have considered what was said under the ninth Article.

⁵ Secker's Lectures, Lect. 35, near the end. Rom. xiv. 4.

IV. 35. As to *Baptists*, they differ from us, both with regard to *sprinkling* and to baptizing *infants*. But if they agree with us in other things, there seems nothing in these which need hinder us from uniting. At some⁶ times the Baptists have professed to think, on most subjects, with the Church of England; but sects are apt to veer about “with every wind of doctrine”⁷ (preventing which is one great good of an established church). The Socinians are now labouring to unite all sects of dissenters against our National Church⁸;—an union which could answer no *religious* purpose. It is indeed ridiculous to think of the Baptists and Socinians favouring each other, merely because they both oppose Infant-baptism, when they do it from principles so different, that they should rather
 312 dispute than unite; one holding Baptism to be necessary, the other to be unnecessary. But as to immersion and sprinkling, a Baptist need not quit the Church of England; because, according to our rubrics, I do not see how a priest could refuse immersion if it were required. Our fonts have indeed grown less and less suited to dipping, but that surely is not to be mentioned in arguing about doctrines.

Nay, our baptizing *infants* does not seem to lay the Baptist under an absolute necessity of separating from us. Suppose a Baptist was to try the experiment; would he be compelled to bring his *children* to Baptism⁹? does not our Church provide for baptizing at any age? But if a Baptist was called upon to subscribe to our xxxix Articles, could he subscribe to our present Article? To every part of it, except the last clause, Baptists *have* subscribed¹⁰. But the clause, “the Baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church;”—could he subscribe to that? If he could not, it might be altered. ‘The Baptism of young children is to be *permitted* to those who prefer it,’ would do as well for our Church. But some might be contented with this sense: ‘I desire and wish that the Baptism of young children may be “*retained in the church*,” and I think it ought to be, in order that those who think it their duty to bring their children to Baptism, may not be deprived of an opportunity; but, on the other hand, as I think it right to afford my Christian brethren, who differ from

⁶ Wall, p. 551.

⁷ Eph. iv. 14.

⁸ See Dr. Priestley’s Address to the Methodists, prefixed to Wesley’s Letters.

⁹ I do not see that he would, by the *Canons*. Burn mentions an Act of 3 Jac. ordering the children of *Popish* recusants to be baptized within a month.

¹⁰ Wall, p. 551.

me, an opportunity of baptizing in their own way, I hope they will grant me the same liberty. IV.
313

Limborch is of opinion, probably after *Grotius*, that all Christians might, consistently with the Scriptures, follow their own notions with regard to the manner and circumstances of Baptism; including in these the age of the person baptized¹. But he thinks, of course, that Infant-baptism ought to be deemed *valid*, and therefore he blames the Anabaptists for re-baptizing. And he thinks Infant-baptism valid, not only because every one should have liberty, in such a case, to act as he pleases, but because it is agreeable to the *genius* of the doctrine of Jesus Christ;—an expression not unlike the concluding one of our Article².

Dr. Priestley concludes his History of Baptism with giving his opinion³, that those who are called *rational dissenters* baptize children more from the influence of settled *custom*, and through a desire of avoiding all disturbance, than from any fixed persuasion that they are under an obligation to baptize them.

Even Mr. *Tombs*⁴, the best as well as the most candid of the Baptist-writers, who continued an Antipædobaptist all his life, wrote against separation from the Church, and “continued in communion with the Church till he died.”

What greater encouragements to unity can be had? 314

36. I have frequently finished my application with some hints of *improvement*; but none occur to me at present, except such as the preceding remarks cannot fail to suggest.

¹ *Limborch, Theol. Christ. v. lxxviii. 25.* Wall somewhere says, that *Grotius* was the first who represented it as a matter of *indifference* whether a man was baptized in infancy, or his baptism delayed. He blames *Grotius* as disingenuous.

² *Limborch, Theol. v. lxxix. 9.*—“Doc-

trinæ Jesu Christi genio optimè convenire.”

³ *Hist. Corr. 11. p. 94.* There is afterwards an *Appendix*, to both Sacraments.

⁴ *Wall, p. 454.* Also 429, 430, 528. See also 11. ii. 15.

IV.
315

ARTICLE XXVIII.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean, whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

1. The *history* of this Article might be made very extensive; but I will endeavour to confine myself to such incidents as seem likely to be most useful. As all incidents are built upon the scriptural account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, it will be proper to give that before we proceed; in full, or in substance. All the passages of Scripture which mention it might be soon read; but that account which is contained in our prayer of consecration, and makes a kind of *harmony*, seems sufficient:—"In the same night that he was betrayed," &c. The things principally to be noticed are the metaphorical expressions. But we should not suffer ourselves to be hindered, by the familiarity and commonness of the sounds, from observing, how strange a thing it is to be commanded to eat the flesh of our teacher and Lord⁵; and how

⁵ This command does appear (take, eat, this is *my body*) independently of John vi.—though when I read that chapter as *prophetical*, and consider what Bishop *Cleaver* says of the analogy between John iii. and John vi., I am of

opinion it does relate to the Eucharist. It is not so plain as a narration; and it contains obscure intimations in the way of reproof, like John iii.; but I feel satisfied with that interpretation which refers it to the sacrament.

much more strange to be commanded to drink his blood, IV. though it were only in an emblematical way; especially considering, that the persons who first received the command were Jews, to whom tasting blood was prohibited. This strangeness will naturally make us go back to the Old Testament, in order to see the nature of the Jewish sacrifices, to which allusion is made: *sin-offerings*¹, *peace-offerings*, *passover*.

The *sin-offering*; *blood, shed, sprinkled*—called the blood of the *covenant*. *Loaf broken, part given to God* (or his priest); *animal broken, or divided into pieces*. The *peace-offering*; for benefits past, or future; “in remembrance” of mercies. *Animal partly given, partly made into a feast, eaten with friends*. *Drink-offering, implying cup*. The *passover*³¹⁷—a *lamb slain, eaten “in remembrance” of redemption*. He who reads these things will be aware also (Hammond on Matt. xxvi. 26) of the Jewish custom of *breaking* and distributing *bread*, as an act of *kindness*, and of putting round a *grace-cup* or cup of *blessing* or *salvation*;—and will know that the heathens had *sacrifices* and *feasts* upon them, with *libations*, or *cups* of *blessing*; (cup of *salvation*, Psalm cxvi. 13). These things considered, we shall perceive that our Saviour’s commands would appear natural and *intelligible* to Jews; unless they should think, that, in the new institution, the different sorts of sacrifices were oddly mixed and confounded together.

2. No such notion, nor any other, hindered the institution from being universally adopted by Christian converts. They might see that the death of Christ, taken as a sacrifice, resembled, in different points, *different* sorts of offerings; and therefore that they *all* had *prefigured* his death. (Appendix to Art. xi. sect. 27.) At first the ordinance was probably *simple*; but afterwards it became more varied and complex, as well as more animated, or *passionate*; and more *adorned* and magnificent. When persons had great dangers to encounter in the profession of Christianity, it naturally heated their imagination and passions, and led them to do every thing with earnestness and fervour².

The idea of the *Ascodrutæ*, and others of the same turn, would have place here³, as well as in Baptism.

¹ These were mentioned, Append. to Art. xi. sect. 2, and 27.

² This was said of sacraments in general, but the remark is wanted here.

³ Art. xxv. 2, and xxvii. 8.

IV. We meet with the expressions, *Missa Catechumenorum*,
 318 and *Missa Fidelium*⁴, to denote certain parts of divine service,
 in ancient times. The *fideles* were mature, complete Chris-
 tians, who staid in the place of worship, and received the Com-
 munion, after the catechumens were *dismissed*⁵. I do not
 think that our knowledge is perfectly clear about all the parti-
 culars of these matters; but it is probable, that *Missa Cate-
 chumenorum* meant the service before the Communion, and
Missa fidelium the Communion-service; and that the word
Mass, with its connections, *missal*, &c., had this origin, (*Messa*,
Messe). *Mass* continued to be the name for the Lord's
 Supper⁶ in England during part of the reign of Edward VI.,
 but was probably odious.

3. Whoever came to the Communion (and all the *faithful*,
 except penitents, communicated at first) brought some *offer-
 ings*, proportioned to their respective fortunes—chiefly of *bread*
 and *wine*; out of these the priests took as much as it was
 necessary to *consecrate*. The bread was common leavened
 bread, such as was ordinarily used. The Romish *wafers*,
 which are unleavened, and very thin, and round, like a coin,
 and so small that each person can take a whole one in his
 mouth without danger of letting any of it drop, did not come
 into use till the eleventh or twelfth century. Some chose to
 use unleavened bread, as what had been used at the Jewish
Passover, the type of the Lord's Supper; and that occasioned
 a long dispute between the Greeks and the learned of the
 319 Western Church⁷. Attempts were made at different times to
 introduce *water* instead of wine; and water *mixed* with wine;
 and *milk*, and honey: *grapes* also, and even *cheese*, had their
 advocates. Those who avoided wine were called *Enkratitæ*,
 as avoiding it on principles of abstemiousness; if they were
 for pure water they were called *Aquarians*; and those who
 used bread and cheese were called *ἀρτοτύριται*.

Mixing some water with the wine seems to have been a
 prevailing custom amongst rational Christians for a great length
 of time. It arose from a notion, that the *Jews* used to mix
 water with their paschal cup, on account of their wine being
 strong; and it descended even to the time after our Reforma-

⁴ Bingham, Book xv. Wheatly, p. 328.

⁵ Catechumens are called, in our Homily, "*learners* in religion," p. 356, 8vo. Hom. 27th on the Sacrament.

⁶ And the Augsburg Confession (said to be like ours) will not allow that it abolishes the *Mass*. *Syntagma*, p. 30.

⁷ In the 11th cent. Priestley's Hist. Corr. II. p. 56.

tion in England. See Wheatly on the Common Prayer, pp. IV. 289, 292.

4. In the earlier part of the *ceremony* it was thought a proper thing (as in Baptism) to follow the advice of the Apostle literally—"salute one another with an holy kiss¹;" but the different sexes did not salute each other.

The ancient Christians rose gradually in their devotion, till they came to the most solemn and animated giving of *thanks*. That was called *εὐχαριστία*, and thence the solemnity got its name of *Eucharist*². In this part was the *Trisagium*, a short hymn so called from its having the word *ἅγιος*, holy, repeated thrice; it was much the same with ours, "Therefore with angels," &c.³

5. *After* the communion, part of the consecrated elements was sometimes *preserved* in the church, for such as had not been able to attend; and part was sometimes allowed to be carried to the houses of the *sick*; but this last custom, being afterwards abused, was left off. *Children* had a part, and sometimes a part was *burnt*. (Lev. viii. 32.)

A good deal, I suppose, of the offerings remained unconsecrated. The priests had a portion of them; and the rest furnished the repast called *Ἀγάπη*, or *Love-feast*—an entertainment originally of a truly Christian sort⁴, at which the rich and poor met together. Pity that any *scandal* should ever occasion its being left off!

These things, or most of them, may be found in Bingham's *Antiquities*. He mentions such a thing as a *Family-Communion*⁵.

6. For many *hundred* years after the publication of the Christian religion, though *we* now find that religion the more rational the more we consider it, reason was on the decline. Passion had, on that account, the freer scope; and religious passion, when not regulated by reason, becomes superstition, mysticism, enthusiasm. In the dark ages, men ran into all these. Though no form of speech is more natural than

¹ Rom. xvi. 16, and parallel places.

² See Wheatly's account, p. 302. Bingham, Book XV.

³ For the Greeks, see Cave's second Appendix. They seem to have been quite enthusiasts about this hymn. *Allix* has written an history of it.

⁴ See Lardner's account of Pliny's Ep.

to Trajan, where he mentions *Hallett* as treating on the subject. Lardner's Works, vol. vii. p. 311. See also Lardner, vol. viii. p. 71. Lucian's account of *Peregrinus*, and the Christians having a good supper together, and being brethren.

⁵ Bingham, xv. iv. 3.

IV. *metaphor*, when an emblematical rite is intended to express a fact of great importance, yet nothing is more obvious to fanaticism, than to seize upon a metaphorical expression, in things grand and awful, and raise its sense to every height that it will bear: indeed the most extravagant sense of a metaphorical expression may be its *literal* sense. Thus
 321 we may conceive that, when high and lofty things had been said, for a long time⁶, in a declamatory way, of the necessity of eating the *flesh* and drinking the *blood* of Christ, and men kept trying to surpass each other in flights of devotion, they might at last come to profess, as a *doctrine*, that the consecrated bread and wine were *really*, without a figure, turned into the body and blood of Jesus Christ! This doctrine is usually called the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; because those who hold it say that, on the consecration, the bread and wine lose their own *substance*, and are changed or transmuted into the substance of the Body of Christ. Yet as the bread and wine *appear* to be still the same, this hypothesis is helped out by another, that though the *substance* be changed, the *accidents* remain unchanged; accidents are *hardness*, colour, and, in short, all the qualities by which we know one substance from another. The discovery of this doctrine of transubstantiation is ascribed to one *Paschaise*, in Latin *Radbertus Paschasius*⁷, a French monk, who had afterwards the magnificent German abbey of
 322 Corbey, with the sovereignty annexed. But the term, or *name*, was not given till the thirteenth century; and in the same century the doctrine first received the support and authority of a *council*⁸. *Lanfranc* (Archbishop of Canterbury at last) was the person who first brought the doctrine into *England*, about the middle of the eleventh century.—(See

⁶ *Chrysostom* is said to have written and spoken some very declamatory expressions on this subject: as, that the *lips* were *tinged* with the *blood* of our Lord, &c.; but Collier, (*Eccles. Hist.* vol. II. p. 369, or near it,) distinguishes between the *oratorical* works of *Chrysostom* and his reasoning works. Of the reasoning sort is the Letter to *Cæsarius*, which the Papists are unwilling to allow genuine. By the way, Collier takes the *tinging*, &c. in an higher sense than I do: when we *drink* the blood of Christ our lips must be *tinged* with it: it is

only fixing the *attention* on the *same* metaphor.

⁷ Cave, *Hist. Lit. Paschasius*, or vol. II. p. 2, opening of the 9th century. That it was not known during the Nestorian and Eutylian controversies, appears from a passage quoted by Bishop Pearson; on Creed, p. 328, 1st Edit. or p. 162, folio,—from *Gelasius* (Bishop of Rome in 490)—*de duabus naturis Christi*.

⁸ In 1215, at the third Lateran Council. See Cave's *Hist. Lit.* under Innocent the Third.

Fox's Mart. vol. II. p. 457.) Strange as this doctrine seems, IV. it has been found to seize and affect the mind, so that even improved nations have been unwilling to give it up. A crucified *Deity* present to the *senses!* not through incarnation, but *impanation!* what an idea! enough to fill the mind with sacred horror, (no *doubt* intervening), and to make every ordinary sentiment appear insipid!

7. It must not be concluded, from what has been said, that all those who professed what is commonly called the doctrine of transubstantiation, explained the particulars exactly in the same way. Where there was so much room for supposition, it would have been a wonder if several hypotheses had not appeared: they may, however, all come under the general notion of *corporal presence*¹. And so may the hypothesis of *consubstantiation*, of which by and by.

8. *Opposition* was soon made to the doctrine of transubstantiation, particularly by *Bertram*, or *Ratram*, a monk of Corbey², and John Scot, called *Erigena*, because he was a native of Erin, or Irin, that is, of *Ireland*. Scot's book is 323 lost, but Bertram's remains.

9. This doctrine comes under the general observation made on all the Popish doctrines contained in the opening of the twenty-second Article. And we should now see in what way it has "given occasion to *many superstitions*."

Some *superstitions*, to which the doctrine of transubstantiation gave occasion, will be the subjects of some of the following Articles; a few others may be mentioned. It occasioned the custom of *sopping* the bread in the wine;—of *reserving* the wafer with a view to performing cures, and stopping public calamities;—of burning the elements to ashes;—of making *processions* in the streets, during which every one present is to *kneel*;—of *elevating* the *Hostia*, that every one may see and *adore* his God. This doctrine has also occasioned the multiplying of *altars* in churches; and has drawn the attention of the Romanists from every part of public worship which we look upon as valuable. The Romish casuists very gravely determine what punishments are to be inflicted on

¹ See the Disputation at Oxford in 1554, before Latimer, &c. suffered. Collier, vol. II. p. 368, or Fox's Martyrol. (by the date), or *Syntagma*, p. 120. *Angl. Confessio*, from Jewel's works:—"immutari, &c. somniarunt; neque adhuc

potuerunt unquam satis inter se de suo somnio *convenire*."

² Cave's Hist. Lit. vol. II. p. 2, *con-spectus*, or opening of 9th century. (For *Berenger*, see sect. 10.)

IV. a *mouse*³ that is so unfortunate as to gnaw the consecrated elements; and how things are to be conducted in case a sick priest should vomit them up.

On the other hand, the doctrine of transubstantiation is thought to have put a stop⁴ to the custom of giving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to *infants* in the Western Church. They used to have it given by the priest, who
324 dipped his finger in the chalice, and then put it into the child's mouth. But the moderns mix the bread with the wine, "and put to the child's lips a drop or two of that mixture quickly after his Baptism; after which he receives no more till the age of discretion⁵."

10. But let us come to the age of the *Reformation*. The doctrine of which we are speaking was one of those which were objected to by the *Waldenses*⁶. But yet it was not decidedly opposed for some time. Even *Luther* only changed transubstantiation into *consubstantiation*⁷. *Wickliffe* had, in some parts of his works, expressed himself strongly against this abuse; but *Melancthon* complained⁸, that, on comparing different parts, he found him confused in the question about the Holy Sacrament. Of the forty propositions of *Wickliffe* which the Council of *Constance* condemned, the first three relate to our present subject. (See *Baxter* on Councils, p. 431, or chap. xiii. sect. 2.) And the third is against the *Bodily Presence* in general; and therefore against what *Luther* afterwards called *consubstantiation*. I think *John Huss* and *Jerome* of Prague did not differ from *Wickliffe* in this, materially, if at all.

Consubstantiation meant, that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood were present in the Holy Sacrament *with* the substance of the bread and wine. *Luther's* persisting in
325 this notion caused an unhappy division amongst the reformed Churches; which, I believe, continues to this day.

³ See the original passages in *Bennet's* Directions, under this 28th Article. See also *Mosheim*, Cent. 13. 11. iv. 2. And the thing is mentioned briefly in *Fulke's* Rhemish Testament on 1 Cor. xi. 29, opposite to folio 288.

⁴ *Wall*, p. 516, 4to, or 11. ix. 16.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 515, 517.

⁶ *Ibid.* 11. vii. 3. p. 386.

⁷ This may just be mentioned here, as *Luther* is said to have borrowed his con-

substantiation from *Berenger*, in 1035. See his Recantation in *Cave's* Hist. Lit. *Conspectus Sæc.* xi. But *Berenger* made several Recantations: they are not to be depended on. What *Fox* gives as his (*Berenger's*) real sentiments, out of a book of *Lanfranc's*, seems most worthy of notice (*Mart.* vol. 11. p. 458). *Berenger*, from that, seems to have thought much as we do now.

⁸ *Gilpin's* Lives of Reformers, p. 65.

Luther explained his consubstantiation by saying, that in IV. *red-hot iron* two substances are united, *iron* and *fire*¹. He supported it by what was called *ubiquity*; by affirming, that the Son of God was *every where, ubique*;—or thus: God is every where; Christ sits at the *right hand* of God; therefore Christ is every where². Yet *Luther* was, in general, a good and forcible reasoner; but when a man is determined to maintain by reasoning a doctrine totally unintelligible to reason, he must take the appearance of argument for the reality. What led him, probably, to change transubstantiation for consubstantiation, was, what is urged in our Article, that transubstantiation takes away the essence of a Sacrament³.

The *Romanists* make the ordinance of which we are speaking very complicated and gaudy; and they profess the doctrine of transubstantiation without reserve⁴. I may use the present tense, as they have made no material changes, that I know of, since the age with which we are now concerned, the age of the Reformation. The acts of the Council of Trent, and the Catechism made by its direction, will supply us with any particulars of which we may want to take notice.

The thirteenth session of the Council is upon the Eucha- 326
rist. The first chapter declares, that there is no contradiction between Christ's body being always naturally at the right hand of God, and *sacramentally* in other places. Where ideas are wanting how useful are words! Yet such manner of existence, we are told, is not expressible by words, but is possible to God. Afterwards we are told, that, in the sacrament, the *real* Body of Christ exists *sub specie panis*, &c.: nay, that the *whole* body of Christ exists in every *particle* of the bread, and in every particle of the wine; and there is a *conversion* of substance, which is aptly (*proprîè*) called *transubstantiation*;—that the same worship of *latria* is due to the consecrated elements, which is due to the *true God*;—that *processions* are proper, as a *triumph* over heresy, and to make it *pine* away, or be ashamed;—that the custom of *reserving* is ancient,

¹ Maclaine's Mosheim, Cent. 16. l. ii. 21. and note (z).

² *Luther* is said to have given up this ubiquity as a proof of Christ's corporal presence in the Eucharist; but rigid Lutherans were still Ubiquitarians.

³ "Necessitas ipsa veritatis sacramenti exigere videtur," &c.—*Confessio Witemb. de Eucharistiâ, Syntagma*, pp.

159, 160.

⁴ See Art. i. sect. 18, vol. i. p. 528, note (c), where is an expression from a French Prayer-book: after Communion the communicant is directed to say, "Seigneur, &c. je vous ai reçu avec joie." This order is also given:

Ton Créateur tu recevras
Au moins à Paques, &c.

IV. and that of carrying the sacrament to the *sick* necessary;— that the proper preparation for receiving is sacramental confession. The *anathemas* are eleven, the second against consubstantiation.

The *Catechism* has the same things, with reasons; and some things more minute. The sacrament is to be taken *fasting*. The bread ought to be *wheat*; it ought to be *unleavened*, but may be leavened. “The Church of God *always* mingled *water* with the wine;” for several “weighty” reasons; so that such mixture “may not be neglected under *mortal sin*.” The Eucharist is to be judged of “by *faith*, not by sense.” Our senses tell us “nothing at all but the *species* of bread and wine.” “*They* will judge that there is only bread and wine in the Sacrament.” “One may see indeed all the *accidents* of bread and wine, which yet are inherent in no substance”—³²⁷ (what would Mr. *Locke* say to this?) “but they consist of themselves.” “We are not too narrowly to inquire into transubstantiation.” If the Romanists had been “seen to eat” “their Lord under his own species,” they could not easily have avoided the “reproach of infidels,” as feeding upon human flesh and blood—“the most *horrid* thing in the world!”

Though these things were settled by the Council, yet we must not conceive that they were settled without debate or dissension. The *Cordeliers* and the *Jacobins* were opposed in their methods of solving the bodily presence⁵.

The festival of *Corpus Christi*, or the *Holy Sacrament*⁶, is said to have been founded on a revelation, which one *Juliana*, a devout woman of Liege, declared she had received. Her pretensions were supported by the Bishop (in 1264), and afterwards by Pope Urban IV. and, in 1311, by Clement V. The festival is to be looked upon as *in fact* the *cause* of transubstantiation, as a settled and popular *doctrine*. It seems to be held the Thursday after Trinity-Sunday: it is sometimes called *Fête-Dieu*.

Dupin⁷ is willing to give up the word transubstantiation; but still it must be professed “that the bread and wine are *really changed* into the body and blood of Christ,” &c. The word *substance* is dropped.

⁵ Voltaire, vol. x. 4to, p. 156. *Du Concile de Trente*. Probably from Fra. Paolo (aliàs Sarpi.)

⁶ Mosheim, Cent. 16. Part II. chap. iv. sect. 2, octavo, Vol. III. p. 108.

⁷ Append. to Mosheim.

After the Romanists, let us look at the *Reformed churches*¹. IV. *Luther's* opinion of the *presence* of Christ in the Eucharist 328 was mentioned just now; as well as the separation occasioned by his persisting in it. This separation consists of a number of particulars; but it may suffice for us to be aware, that the great opponent to Luther was *Zuingle*, who formed the churches in Switzerland; and afterwards, *Calvin*. *Zuingle* looked upon the sacramental bread and wine as only *signs* and *symbols*²; but it does not appear to me that he did not look upon the sacrament as a commemoration of a *sacrifice*. The greatest difficulty arises from the history of *Melancthon*, about whom we are interested as the divine on whose judgment very great reliance was placed in the forming of our own Articles. The truth may be, that as he was of a very mild temper, and a singular lover of peace, and as he had sense enough to see that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is a thing entirely above human comprehension, and one that does not immediately affect practice, or virtue, he might speak undecidedly, and endeavour to pacify each of the contending parties, as much as possible, by respectful attention and candour. He was connected with Luther, and in conference³ appeared as one of his company; and he is sometimes said to have been of his opinion; but sometimes he is said to have thought differently from him—I mean on the subject now before us⁴. It is certain, 329 that the Confession of *Augsburg*, which was drawn by him, favours consubstantiation⁵; but in that Confession he is thought to have complied too much for the sake of peace. From what has been said, we know what to expect in the confessions of the Reformed. Corporal presence is the most fully professed in that of *Wittemberg*⁶; and the most avoided in that of the *Helvetic churches*. The opprobrious name given to those who denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, was that of *Sacramentarians*⁷, or *Sacramentaries*.

¹ I mean here all those churches which separated from *Rome*. Abroad, those churches are called *reformed* which separated from the *Lutherans*, under *Zuingle*, *Calvin*, &c. See *Mosheim*, Index, or vol. iv. 8vo, pp. 54, 62. And, if I mistake not, they are sometimes all together called *Calvinists*.

² *Mosheim*, Cent. 16. sect. 3. Part II. ii. 4. Also Cent. 16. sect. 1. ch. ii. sect. 21. And compare the *Helvetic Confession*,

p. 71, with that of *Wittemberg*, p. 159.

³ At *Marpurg*, in 1529. *Mosheim*, Cent. 16. I. ii. 28.—Also Cent. 16. sect. 3. Part II. ii. 4. note (y).

⁴ Compare *Mosheim*, Cent. 16. 3. ii. i. 27, with *Maclaine's* note (r).

⁵ *Syntagma*, p. 14. x.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 159; for *Helvetic*, pp. 71, 73.

⁷ *Neal's Hist. Pur.* vol. 1. p. 20, 4to. A. D. 1538. *Mosheim*, vol. iv. 8vo, p. 87, *Maclaine's* note.

IV. 11. Let us now come to our own country. In the reign of Henry VIII. very great stress was laid upon the corporal presence; nay, several people suffered *death* for opposing it. *Cranmer* was, at that time, a Lutheran⁸; and the king himself raged against Sacramentaries. In 1539 the act was passed which made a kind of regress of the Reformation. It was called, *The Statute of the six Articles*. The first Article affirmed the corporal presence⁹; and if any persons preached or wrote against it, they were to be burnt, and their estates forfeited. In 1543 the "Necessary Doctrine," &c. was published. It maintains, in conformity to the statute, the law of the land, that in the "most high sacrament of the altar" the bread and wine are "turned to the very *substance* of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesu Christ." Yet when we have taken it, it "is not turned into *our substance*." There are several other things mentioned, but they are only popish, and therefore they have occurred already;—as, that the sacrament is to be received *fasting*, &c. But when a church, which had been trying to reform, could accept or retain the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, we need not wonder at its retaining anything else¹⁰.

330

In the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. it is not so easy to give an account of the doctrine of the English Church. In his *First Book*, (that is of Common Prayer) the *wafers* is continued¹¹, only it is to be so large that it may be *broken*; but "men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole; but in each of them the *whole body* of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Afterwards both *transubstantiation*, and all ways of bodily presence, seem to have been decidedly *rejected*: this appears from our Article of 1552, and from the *Reformatio Legum*.

In the *Reformatio Legum* we find a pretty long *chapter* against both *transubstantiation* and *consubstantiation*¹², and against corporal presence in general. The expressions are much the same with those of the Article of 1552. We also

⁸ Cranmer's progression was the natural one. Giving up *transubstantiation*, he kept some belief of corporal presence; giving up that, as untenable, he became a Sacramentarian. He was famous for resisting, in Parliament, the statute of the *six Articles*. See his *Life* by *Strype*.

⁹ Neal, A. D. 1539.

¹⁰ The profaneness of the *Anabaptists*, mentioned in Art. xxv. sect. 2, might be here recollected. Indeed it would have suited our present Article full as well as that about sacraments in general.

¹¹ Wheatly, p. 332. A. D. 1548. The second Book was in 1552. See p. 337.

¹² *De Hæresibus*, cap. xix.

find a chapter against *ubiquity*¹; saying, that Christ, in his IV. *divine* nature, might be every where (*ubique*) even after his resurrection, but that in his *human* nature he could not: his body, if human, must be in some *one place* at one time. This chapter also agrees exactly with our Article of 1552.

Latimer, in the Disputation at Oxford in 1554, (or in the 331 *paper* which he gave in,) said, that he maintained the *real* presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but not the *corporal*. (See Fox, or Collier, A. D. 1554.) Archbishop Secker, (Lect. vol. II. p. 251,) says, the Church has always acknowledged the *real* presence. Yet Wheatly, (page 320,) says, it (real, essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood,) was not allowed at first, in the time of Edward VI.; it seemed to approach so near transubstantiation. Fulke on Heb. i. 6, denies *reality* of Christ's *corporal* presence.

Queen *Elizabeth* seems to have been willing to *comprehend* as many as possible in the new English Church; and with that view to have endeavoured to use a language which all might adopt, who did not profess transubstantiation in the strictest sense², and which might nevertheless be used by those who did not admit any presence of Christ in the Eucharist perfectly corporal. Such language would comprehend all Lutherans, and some Papists³. I think this remark will be sufficient to account for the change of the expressions in the twenty-eighth of our present Articles, (on which Bishop Burnet speaks judiciously), and for the language in the second Book of Homilies; both as to the word "*incorporation*"⁴, and the insisting on *faith* and *spiritual* eating of the sacrament.

There was published, in Latin, in the year 1560, a very 332 short office for a Communion at *Funerals*, if the friends and neighbours of the deceased chose to attend⁵. The *Collect* is the last prayer in our burial-service,—“O merciful God,” &c. And there is an Epistle, and a choice of two Gospels. I suppose the rest would be taken from the Communion-service; beginning, probably, at the Lord's Prayer. Indeed, if the

¹ *De summâ Trinitate*, cap. iv.

² See Wheatly, end of Communion-office. Mosheim, vol. IV. 8vo, p. 37, or, Cent. xvi. 3. II. i. 27.

³ See sect. 11. See also Mosheim, Cent. xvi. 3. II. ii. 6, or pp. 70, 71, 8vo. vol. IV.

⁴ Homily, on worthy receiving of the

Sacrament, p. 350, 8vo, and 351. The language now is very like *Calvin's*; see *Institutes*, IV. xvii. 32. "*Incorporate*," occurs in the next prayer before *Gloria in excelsis*;—alluding to 1 Cor. xii. 27, and parallels.

⁵ Sparrow's Collection, p. 200.

IV. priest began there, some Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, would be wanting.

Of the *Familists* we said enough under the twenty-fifth Article; and so of the *Socinians*; and in general of those, who, near the time of the Reformation, spoke of the sacraments in general as *mere signs* of unity amongst Christians. I doubt how near those moderns come to them who make the Lord's Supper a *mere commemoration*.

The chief part of the doctrine of the *Quakers*, with regard to the Lord's Supper, seems to be this: they look upon what was done by Christ in the institution as a *shadow*, intended to vanish, or cease; the *substance* being *internal*⁶, and intended to remain. Col. ii. 16, 17, applied to the Lord's Supper, might express their mind. This doctrine is generally, I believe, considered as invented in the last century; but those *Petrobrusians*, who were just mentioned before⁷, seem to have been *Popish Quakers*, as it were, in the eleventh century, when transubstantiation was taken for granted. Their preachers said, that the Clergy deceived the people "notoriously; for the
333 body of Christ was only *once made*, by himself, at the supper before his Passion⁸; and was once only, viz. at that time, given to his disciples. Since that time it was never made by any one, nor given to any one."

In *Wesley's Letters*⁹, we have an account of the notions of the *mystics*: they need not "the Lord's Supper, for they never cease to remember Christ in the most acceptable manner." "Love is your end." "Different men are led in different ways" (to love). "You must judge for yourself. Perhaps fasting may help you for a time, and *perhaps* the holy Communion."

12. Those whom we commonly call *Dissenters*, in England, sit at the table on which the Lord's Supper is celebrated. The minister presides, according to the *Directory*¹⁰, breaks the bread, with prayer and benediction, and gives it to some one, but not to every one; and so of the cup. The ceremony may be grave, decent, and edifying, for anything I see. Dr. Priestley mentions a Mr. *Henry*¹¹, whose treatise on the Sacrament is

⁶ Barclay's Apology, Prop. 13.

⁷ Art. xxviii. sect. 14.

⁸ Wall, end of chap. vii. Part II.

⁹ Pp. 60, 62, 13th Letter.

¹⁰ See Directory, and Preface to Grey's *Hudibras*. I have been told that one

kind of dissenters will receive a teacher or pastor from another kind, but will not sit down with him; that is, will not receive the Sacrament with him.

¹¹ Free Address, p. 53.

much read, and he refers to a chapter, entitled, "*Sights to be seen at the Lord's Table.*" This title has a mystical sound, and Dr. Priestley says, that *experiences* are sometimes examined into before admission to the Sacrament.

The *Baptists* also receive the Sacraments *sitting* "at a common table," "and handing the elements one to another¹."

13. Early in this eighteenth century Bishop *Hoadley* con- 334
tended that the Lord's Supper is a *bare memorial* of the death of Christ. Bishop Warburton that it is a *feast on a sacrifice*. This last seems the most *approved* opinion, and is ably defended by *Bishop Cleaver*². Dr. *Balguy's* seventh Charge amounts to the same thing. But if Bishop Hoadley looked upon the *death* of Christ as a sacrifice, a memorial of his death, considered *in that light*, would not perhaps differ materially from a feast on a sacrifice, where no real sacrifice is performed³; and would agree with the expressions of our *Catechism*⁴. Nay, when the modern Socinians make the Sacrament a bare memorial of Christ's death, and throw out all notion of a sacrifice, I do not regard the difference as one belonging to the *Sacrament*, but to the nature and efficacy of the *death* of Christ, or the doctrine of *atonement*. Each party commemorates the death of Christ as what he imagines it to be.

14. We next come to the *explanation*.

The *title* is taken from 1 Cor. xi. 20. The Article consists of four paragraphs.

15. The first thing it does is, to affirm, of the Lord's Supper in particular, what was before affirmed of sacraments in general, that it is not a mere *badge*. Yet it *is* a badge; and the way in which it is a badge, is by denoting Christian social kindness, such as would be shewn by an *Agape*, or feast of charity, which meant only to bring those of the same com- 335
munity together, in a way likely to produce cheerfulness, good humour, and benevolence. The Lord's Supper used to be called *the sacrament of peace and charity*. (Trent Cat. p. 159, bottom.)

¹ See Wall, Pt. II. ch. viii. p. 446, 4to.

² Two Sermons, Oxford, 1789. Warburton's Sermon is called a *Rational* account, &c. Hoadley's a *Plain* account, &c.

³ Maclaine thinks that Bishop Hoadley's notion is the same with that of

Zuingle. Mosheim vol. III. 8vo, p. 331, or Cent. xvi. 1. ii. 21, note (a). Had they the same notion of the death of Christ as a sacrifice?

⁴ "For the continual remembrance (memorial) of the *sacrifice* of the death of Christ," &c.

IV. 16. "But rather"—*verùm potius*—this does not *exclude* the notion of a badge, but only declares the Lord's Supper to be something *more*—to have, as a sacrament, not only an external, but an internal part.

17. "A Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death."—In Art. xxix. those who take the Lord's Supper, are said to "eat and drink the *sign* or *sacrament* of so great a thing" (as the body and blood of Christ.) From this comparison it appears, that "*sacrament*," in our Article, means much the same as "*sign*;" which agrees with the account⁵ before given of the most literal or proper signification of the word sacrament. *Redemption* was explained in the Appendix to the eleventh Article⁶. The Lord's Supper, then, is an emblematical representation of our being redeemed from spiritual evil, or bondage, by the *death* of Christ: but in what *way* has the death of Christ any efficacy to free us from spiritual evil? by being a *sacrifice*: (that it *was* a sacrifice, has been proved *before*⁷;) therefore the Lord's Supper is a *sacrifice-feast*, or a feast *upon* a sacrifice—in some respects a *paschal* supper.

18. If this be understood, all the rest follows naturally; as is implied by, "*Insomuch that*." In all such feasts there was a *communion*, that is, a *communication*, or a *partaking in common*⁸, (*in common* with the *guests*—in common, in some sort, with the *Being* to whom the sacrifice was offered⁹) of all the *benefits* at which sacrifice aimed; as pardon, favour, thanksgiving. Should not this be satisfactory, the remainder of our paragraph is a proof of it, from Scripture; expressing indeed, at the same time, what might always be a tacit condition, the *worthiness* of the receiver. That he who partakes must not be wholly unworthy, is so plain, that the Scripture, may, at any time, take it for granted. We shall have occasion to speak of it under the next Article. The passage introduced, in proof or confirmation, is 1 Cor. x. 16; the word in the English Article is *partaking*, but in the Latin Article it is *communicatio*; which is Latin for either partaking, or "*communion*;" that is, partaking *in common*. Communion is the word in our English Bible. In the Vulgate there is first *communicatio* and then *participatio*; these must have the same meaning, the

⁵ Art. xxv. sect. 2.

⁶ App. to Art. xi. sect. 17.

⁷ Append. to Art. xi. sect. 14, 22, 27, 28.

⁸ Dr. Balguy, p. 312.

⁹ Damascene has both these connections, Trent. Cat. sect. 5, or p. 195.

Greek to them both being *κοινωνία*¹. To be sure, a single, IV. unconnected sentence of Scripture in an Article, would make a kind of identical proposition; for in every Article we mean only that each thing affirmed can be proved by Scripture; and therefore when the thing affirmed is itself Scripture, we say, in effect, Scripture may be proved by Scripture. However, in difficult subjects, we had perhaps most of us rather subscribe to a sentence of Scripture than to a human interpretation of it. And a sentence of Scripture may reasonably be introduced, to confirm something else which is not Scripture. But let us now come to the second paragraph.

19. "Transubstantiation" was explained in the history. 337 It "cannot be proved by Holy Writ."—This expression will occasion what may be called *indirect* proof; that is, answering the arguments of the Romanists, which to our doctrines are *objections*. But that which follows will bring on direct proof; it "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." "*Plain words*"—all sides talk of *plain* words: we will only observe, that some words are more plain when used metaphorically, than literally;—as, a *plagiary*, in English; *pravus*, in Latin; *saisissement*², in French.

"Overthroweth the nature of a sacrament"—by confounding the outward and visible sign, with the "inward and spiritual grace"—the figure, with the thing figured³. Transubstantiation makes the bread (the sign) to be also the Body of Christ, (the thing signified). Explanation here is proof.

The "superstitions" to which this doctrine hath given occasion were mentioned in the history⁴; and no farther proof can be wanting that the doctrine "hath given occasion to many superstitions."

20. The third paragraph is not more easy to explain than that in whose room it was substituted. It mentions only the *Body* of Christ; but that is for the sake of simplicity and perspicuity. What is said of the body may be extended to the 338

¹ I am not sure that the scope of this reasoning will be immediately perceived, except the reader finds that the concluding expressions of the first paragraph of the article might, without it, give too little feeling of a *social* partaking.

² Dict. Acad. says of *saisissement* "il ne'st pas en usage au *propre*, mais seulement au *figuré*." There are many such

words. *Candor* is never used for whiteness. I never knew any sense of *unwarrantable* but the figurative, till a keeper in a king's forest told me certain *venison* was unwarrantable; that is, could not be sent in return to the *warrants* issued by the officers of the crown.

³ Fulke on Rhem. Test. Luke xxii. sect. 7.—Heb. i. sect. 1. ⁴ Sect. 9.

IV. *blood*, by parity of reasoning. Let us, in order to explain it, read, in addition to what was read before⁵, John vi. 48—58; and compare Heb. x. 5—10. From these two scriptures one may get some idea, how, by eating the sacramental bread, or bread in a sacrifice-feast, one may be said to eat the body of Christ. Whether John vi. relate to the Lord's Supper, has been disputed. I think Bishop Cleaver proves that it does as a *prophetic* intimation; but we are sure that many people have so understood it; and so probably did they who compiled our Article⁶. In that chapter something is meant which is not intended to be expressed with perfect clearness. It may, as a prophetic intimation, be interpreted by the institution of the Sacrament, as an *event*; and by a comparison of Christ's reasoning in the sixth chapter, about the Lord's Supper, with his reasoning to Nicodemus in the third, about Baptism. The difficulty lies in giving a meaning to such expressions as that in our Catechism, "*verily and indeed taken,*" when used by those who reject both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and deny, in general, the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. It is a difficulty which seems to have occasioned some unsteadiness of language; some expressions seemingly inconsistent in those who have departed both from the Romish and the
339 Lutheran Church⁷. My own idea is this; when I say, that, in the Lord's Supper, the inward part or thing signified is, "The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper;" I mean, that, though I may not know precisely what may be intended in Scripture by our eating Christ's body and drinking his blood, yet I believe, that *whatever* is meant, a worthy receiver comes up to *that meaning*; he performs that action which is prescribed; he obtains that good which is annexed to it.

If this be admitted, great *latitude* is allowed, when Scripture speaks of eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood, to different notions, and conceptions, or imaginations about particular *means*, or intermediate steps; and in things

⁵ Sect. 1.

⁶ Bishop Cleaver says, that the *Reformers* were *against* applying John vi. to the sacrament. He excepts (in some degree) *Cranmer*. Two Sermons, p. 25.

⁷ Barclay observes this in his *Apology*, Prop. xiii. sect. 3 and 4. *Reality* (of Christ's presence) seems to be the most

unsteadily used; sometimes with *body*, sometimes without. See sect. 11, about *Latimer*, &c. We *eat* Christ's body *really*; we cannot eat that really which is not *present*. Thus men seem to have been led to acknowledge the *real presence*, even of Christ's *body*, though they deny the *corporal* presence.

above reason why should latitude be denied? One man thinks, **IV.** that eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, means only a bare *commemoration* of his death; another thinks it is emblematically *accepting* the benefits of the Christian *sacrifice*; a third thinks that it is eating, in some inexplicable way, the *substance* of Christ's body, into which the bread has been *changed*; a fourth, that it is eating the *substance* of Christ's body *along with* the sacramental bread. These are but different *fancies* or conjectures of *men* about the particular *means* of bringing about what is called in Scripture *eating the flesh of Christ*¹. Still therefore I say, whichever of these is right, **340** or if *none* of them be right, the *worthy* communicant *does* that which is really *meant* in Scripture by eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood; and he gains all the benefits which God intended should arise from such eating and drinking. He does that which God hath commanded, and he obtains that which God doth promise.

I could wish any one, who enters into what I have said, to try whether the paragraph before us would *exclude* the *Lutheran*, or even the *Romanist*. The *Romanist* who professed transubstantiation in the strictest sense could not subscribe to the *preceding* paragraph; but would he not own that even *his* eating the body of Christ is a *spiritual* eating²? He does not mean to satisfy his *hunger*; and he professes that what he eats does not *mix* with his *bodily* substance³. And as to *faith*, he professes that "we must judge of the Eucharist by faith⁴;" nay, in the form of consecration he calls it "*the mystery of faith*." And as all must own that the eating of the flesh of Christ is a spiritual and not a carnal eating⁵, all must likewise own that faith is more properly the instrument than the jaw is. The Trent Catechism says, "what food is to the body, that the Eucharist is to the *spirit*⁶." *Romanists* speak

¹ The *Romanists* and *Lutherans* would not deny either that eating Christ's body is a *commemoration*, or a partaking of the benefits of a *sacrifice*; nor should we *Calvinists*; but still, every thing *between* the precept "take, eat," and the *obedience* to it (including the *reward*, or benefit), is *human*.

² It is called "our *spiritual meat*," Trent Catech. sect. 5, or p. 196.—*Spiritual* eating is distinguished from *sacramental* eating, and both are required.

Council, sess. 13, cap. 7, and canon 8; but sacramental eating is not ordinary eating.

³ Trent Catechism, sect. 49, or p. 220, bottom. Sect. 11 of this Article. This might be held, in order to obviate the charge of *Stercorianism*. (Mosh. Index).

⁴ Trent Catech. sects. 23, 24, or pp. 206, 207.

⁵ *Panis cibus mentis est, non cibus ventris*. Cypr. See *Synt.* p. 121.

⁶ Sect. 49, p. 220.

IV. of faith chiefly with a view to their incredible conversion of
341 bread into flesh; we, of Christian faith in general; yet they sometimes use it in our sense.

When I think in this train, and consider how transcendent and astonishing a thing the Eucharist must, on *any* supposition, appear to one who fixes his thoughts fairly upon it; how solemn and affecting the first institution, especially when opening the sense of the prophetic intimation recorded by St. John; how strong the declarations of the necessity of eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood;—I seem to be in the place of those persons of our persuasion⁷, who have scarcely known how to express themselves, so as to deny the corporal presence of Christ, and yet not let down the ordinance, nor give the Romanists and Lutherans a pretence for charging them with want of veneration for it. I feel inclined to use the same expressions, though sensible of the same difficulties. Though their expressions seem to vary, yet they always speak so as to be consistent with my idea just now stated. They *may* always mean, by receiving *really* the body and blood of Christ, receiving the sacrament according to the *real meaning* of Scripture, be that what it will—in *opposition* to mere bread, vain ceremonies, empty signs, unfeeling formality. They are all words explaining by opposition, or attempting to give the force of Scripture.

As I doubt not but the high and strong expressions which those of our persuasion use, have given offence or disgust, or caused perplexity, to many, and made them prefer Popery,
342 Socinianism, or Quakerism, I will refer to some place where they are used; in hopes that, in the light in which I have placed them, they may be thought natural, and such as arise from right notions and feelings. I will, at the same time, refer to some passages in which our idea of the Lord's Supper is illustrated by opposition and contradistinction⁸. Dr. *Balguy* defends "*verily and indeed,*" by the *context*.

⁷ I include, in this case, the Calvinists, and all who have departed from the Romish and Lutheran churches; (except Socinians and Quakers, &c.)

⁸ See the prayer preceding the prayer of Consecration. And *Reformatio Legum, de Hæresibus*, cap. xix. Maclaine's Note, or Mosheim, Cent. xvi. 3. II. ii. 12 (and 6). Calvin's Institutes, iv. xvii. 32, and Barclay's mention of it, Apol. xiii.

3, 4. Fox's Acts and Monuments (or Martyrology), vol. III. p. 82. col. 2. disp. in April 1554, at Oxford. *Syntagma*, p. 120, part of the English Confession, from Bishop Jewell. Fulke on the Rhemish Testament, fol. 152, (comp. on Heb. i. 6.) *Homily* on the worthy receiving of the Sacrament, Part 1st, (every word must be attended to, in some places): "*incorporation*" occurs twice (John vi.

21. The *practices* mentioned in the fourth paragraph have IV. been explained in the history. The expression “*by Christ’s ordinance,*” may be observed, because by the ordinance of some ancient *churches* some elements were reserved¹. Bishop Burnet accounts for their being so²; circumstances, at some times, required it; but ancient churches did not reserve their *God* in any sacarium, nor expose him to the inroads of mice; for they did not believe in transubstantiation. Nor does it seem as if they had encouraged superstitions. Generally speaking, they considered circumstances; they left off carrying the sacrament to the sick, because of some abuses, and so of the *Agapæ*. And I doubt not but anything, not quite essential, would have been left off, if it had given occasion to superstitions or scandals. But we are only *explaining* the expression, “*by Christ’s ordinance.*” 343

22. Come we now to our *proof*:

The Article seems to contain *six* propositions:

1. The Lord’s Supper has an *external* part, or *sign*.
2. It has an *internal* part, or “*spiritual grace*;” that is, it denotes or represents our *redemption* by the *death* of Christ.
3. Transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ.
4. It is repugnant to Scripture.
5. The body of Christ is, in the Lord’s Supper, eaten *spiritually*,—by *faith*.
6. Christ has not ordained that the Sacrament under consideration should be *reserved, carried about, elevated, or adored*.

23. That the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper has an *external* part, is sufficiently proved by the *institution*:—Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 23, with the practice mentioned 1 Cor. x. 16—made perpetual, 1 Cor. xi. 26. What better proof could be required?

This external part of the ordinance being visible, and peculiar to Christians, must be a *badge*. And whatever is a badge of Christians must be a sign of mutual *affection*. See John xiii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 17. Mutual love must also result from what is urged 1 Cor. xii. 13.

56), the latter time near the end. The scriptural *metaphors* of the head and members (“*incorporation*”) vine and branches, &c. are well introduced. This is the 15th Homily of the 2d book, or

the 27th of the whole number. Dr. *Balguys*’ 7th charge would illustrate the Article, if the expressions were carefully compared.

¹ Sect. 5.

² P. 429, 8vo.

IV. 24. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper denotes, or represents, our redemption by the death of Christ; and so has an *internal* part, or "spiritual grace."

If it be intended to commemorate Christ's death, and his death be a *sacrifice* for the sins of the world, it must be an application to one's self of the benefits of such sacrifice. That it is intended to commemorate Christ's *death*, appears from the body broken, the blood shed, and from 1 Cor. xi. 26. And also from 1 Cor. x. 16. In the institution also we are told, that Christ's blood was shed for us, and for the remission of sins: these things are there connected with the Lord's Supper; and we are told of a *διαθήκη*, sometimes translated *testament*³, sometimes *covenant*, in the blood of Christ; which being the word used for the Old Covenant, (Deut. iv. 13; Exod. xxiv. 8,) implies, at least, some great benefit arising from the shedding of the blood of Christ;—which is confirmed by Heb. viii. 8, &c. And it is said, that *διαθήκη*, and the Hebrew *ברית*, are connected with *sacrificing*: because it is thought solemn *leagues* and contracts used to be sealed, as it were, by sacrifices. But I see nothing about sacrificing in Henry Stephens's account of *διαθήκη* or *διατίθημι*, &c. For this, consult Parkhurst under *בר* and *διαθήκη*. Potter (Antiq. vol. i. p. 252) mentions sacrifices at solemn covenants. If we allow that John vi. relates to the Lord's Supper, the benefits of it must be endless. And all *virtues* naturally resulting from a worthy receiving make a *part* of the "*spiritual grace*"⁴.

25. Transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ. This must be deferred to the indirect proof, for the reason mentioned in the explanation.

26. Transubstantiation is repugnant to Scripture. The *Jews* did not use *blood* for any sort of victuals; and the Scrip-

³ *Διατίθημι* is to dispose, in various ways; by *will*; Christ might be conceived as both *testator* (or *dispenser*, author of a dispensation,) and *victim*: different characters, as well as different *types*, meet in him. Perhaps we do not see the *full force* of *διαθήκη* and *διαθεμέ-νου*, Heb. ix. 16, if we have not these *different* ideas in mind.

But what *led* our Translators to use *testament* for *διαθήκη*? perhaps *διαθεμέ-νου*. *Διαθήκη* is classical for a *will*, (as a mode of *disposal*); but the LXX. always use it for *ברית*, as *fœdus*; *Aquila* puts

συνθήκη, a compact. Christians use *testament* and *covenant* *promiscuously*; so that *testamentum* in Scripture often means *pactum viventium* (Stephens, Greek Lex.) God *covenants* with those who are called his *inheritance*; yet God's covenants are gifts, dispensations.

⁴ See of sacraments in general, Art. xxv. sect. 2. Our Homily calls these virtues *graces*, and describes them well: if *graces*, they must be *spiritual* *graces*, (p. 350, bottom, and 351, top,) they cannot be corporeal.

tures have made some suppose that *Christians* ought not. It IV. is not therefore *likely* that Christ should mean drinking his blood in a *literal* sense. Christ calls the wine the *fruit of the vine* after consecration, Matt. xxvi. 29. In John vi. Christ ascribes the same effects to eating the *bread* of Life, and to eating his *flesh*; and the Papists own John vi. to belong to the *Sacrament*¹. Christ's body may therefore as properly be *bread*, as *flesh*; but eating the *bread of Life*, and eating *Christ's flesh*, must be both proper, or both figurative expressions: they cannot be both literal, therefore they are *both figurative*. Acts. iii. 21 excludes any corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which can properly be called such. 1 Cor. xi. 26, "till he come," shews, that Christ is *not* come in the Sacrament. This last was Bishop *Ridley's* argument in the day of his trial. More may be found in Fox's account of the *Disputation* at Oxford in 1554, and that at Cambridge in 1549.

27. The body of Christ is, in the Lord's Supper, eaten *spiritually*, by *faith*. The arguments just now used must tend to prove this. The body of Christ, in the Eucharist, is 346 eaten in some sense; if not *really*, it must be *spiritually*.

After what was said in the explanation, about the paragraph from which this proposition is taken, it seems almost needless to give a proof of it. Every emblematical ordinance (or sacrament) must be executed by faith. John vi. 35, is a key to the whole discourse. And the gross, carnal notion of the inhabitants of *Capernaum*, in ver. 52, with the reception of it by Christ, shews that carnal eating could not be meant.

28. Christ has not ordained that the Sacrament called the Lord's Supper should be *reserved*, carried about, elevated, or adored. It rests upon our adversaries to prove that Christ has ordained these things; if they offer any arguments worthy of your consideration, they must appear under our indirect proof. The words "take, *eat*;"—"as often as ye *eat* this bread," &c.—seem to prove the Romish superstitions here mentioned to be even *repugnant* to Scripture; as they seem to prove the design of Scripture to be, that the sacred bread should be *eaten*: eating it would cut off the rest. Besides, all the four practices here mentioned are grounded on *transubstantiation*; that being disproved, these are disproved by consequence.

I may close this direct proof with a passage from Dr. Middleton's Preface to his Letter from Rome, page LXXV. &c. He

¹ Rhemists on John vi. 53.

IV. says, that it was too *absurd* a thing even for heathens to worship that which they eat². Yet, in fact, the *elevation of the Host* is so striking a ceremony, and so affecting to the devout, through the help of sympathy; besides pomp, shew, music, sometimes military exercises, and “a *present Deity*”³, that calm reason seems unable to abolish it.

29. Having finished our direct proof, we must see what indirect may be wanted; or, what *objections* there are which it may be worth our while to consider.

Those of the *Quakers* come first in our way. The chief of what they urge seems to turn upon this: if we make a perpetual sacrament of breaking bread, why do we not make a perpetual *pedilavium*, or washing of feet? one is as much enjoined as the other. This was mentioned in the eleventh chapter of our first Book⁴. *Pedilavium* is a ceremony in the *Greek*⁵ Church; and the *Pope*, I think, goes through the ceremony of washing some people's feet. But let any one compare the institution of the Lord's Supper, with John xiii. 14, and the general importance of the Lord's Supper, with that of the other ceremony, only mentioned by one Evangelist; let him compare the customs in Judea, of travelling, &c. with those in our own country; let him compare the practice upon the one ceremony, with that upon the other; and he will find many reasons for establishing the rite of the Lord's Supper, which will not apply to the washing of feet. This was once a sacrament, and may now be called so by the Greek Christians, in the extensive sense of the word; but the *five Popish* sacraments, which we reject, seem more important than this, and more adapted to general use; yet they fall much below our two sacraments. Our Saviour's washing his disciples was probably only emblematical *teaching*; it was indeed followed by a verbal precept (John xiii. 14), but that might be only the explanation of the action, or the moral of the parable. After all, if our reasons seem to any one insufficient, let him imitate our Lord; he will do no harm. If the ceremonies must be adopted or rejected together, it is a much less evil to adopt the *νίπτρον*, than to reject the Eucharist.

30. It may be objected, that the Gospel-institutions are not to be made complicated and abstruse unnecessarily. Is not

² Referring to Cic. *de Nat. Deor.* Lib. iii. 16.

³ Dryden's Ode on St. Cecilia's Day.

⁴ Book I. chap. xi. sect. 6. The Lord's Supper is sect. 7.

⁵ Cave, *Diss.* ii. Νίπτρον.

the “*simplicity* that is in Christ” best observed by taking the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper as a *mere commemoration*? Bishop Cleaver answers this objection in his first discourse; and Dr. *Balguy* answers it, in effect, in his seventh Charge. If you make the Lord’s Supper, as it was instituted by Christ, a mere commemoration, you make it a strange and unintelligible rite: for what can be more² strange than eating the flesh and drinking the blood of one who is to be regarded only as an instructor and benefactor? If we had been ordered, in the Sacrament, to kill an animal, and shed its blood, or only to break bread, and pour out wine, the rite would have been intelligible, as a simple memorial; it would have represented Christ’s *Death*, merely *as* a death; but it would have been a *different* rite from ours. Now conceive it as a feast on a *sacrifice*, and all is easy and simple. We indeed are not in the habit of sacrificing; but what is that? who could not understand that, when sacrifices were in use, part of the victim was served up at a religious *feast*; and all who partook³ of the material feast were understood to partake of the spiritual 349 benefits of the sacrifice⁴. Christ was our victim; on his body we do not feast literally, because it is in heaven; but he appointed bread to represent it; on that we can feast, and so partake of his body; that is, feast upon the *victim*. Such bread is “*the bread of Life*,” because, by his own appointment, it represents his *flesh*. This appears to me plain and *simple*.

31. We must now take some notice how the Romanists prove *transubstantiation* from Scripture. They have several weak arguments which, as I said in the case of purgatory and invocation of saints, it will be no improvement to consider. Such as John ii. 9, the transubstantiating of water into wine; (it did not, after the change, *appear* to be water); and 1 Cor. xi. 29, not *discerning* the Lord’s body; by which St. Paul means, not making a religious meal of the Lord’s Supper, but a profane one, and that with excess and intemperance—with

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 3. See Dr. Priestley’s expression before.

² Before, sect. 1. Dr. *Balguy*, p. 309.

³ See *Potter’s Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 145, which though about heathens, is worth our notice. Heathens, deliberating about Christianity, must have had their minds full of ideas of heathen sacrifices; and these ideas must have affected both their conversion, and their religion after

conversion; besides making it easier to them to conceive and celebrate the Christian sacrifice.

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 18. “Are not they which eat of the *sacrifices* partakers of the *altar*?” Lardner, speaking of food, says, (*Works*, vol. II. p. 332,) “The worshipper, as well as the priest, partook of the altar, excepting in the case of whole burnt-offerings.”

IV. violation of the rules of *sobriety*⁵. Their chief argument lies in the words, "*this is my body*⁶;"—plain words, as they contend. Archdeacon Sharp rightly replies; yes, they are plain words, for they are a very *plain figure*⁷. Many exceptions may be taken to their being used in a literal sense; but I shall content myself with the context. If the bread in the hand of Christ was literally his body, what was the cup? "This cup is the New Testament in my blood⁸." Was the cup a testament? was the cup in Christ's blood? And if we may not take words figuratively, was Christ really and literally a *vine*⁹ and a *door*? It seems odd, that the Papists should insist upon setting aside metaphor here, and yet understand *bread* metaphorically in John vi. 48 and 51. For they do not allow that *bread* is ever eaten in the Sacrament¹⁰.

32. Our Article affirms, that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, *reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped*."—We might therefore have arguments to examine on these four points. But (besides that they must all be built upon transubstantiation) I do not see any which are likely to detain us. Something is said by the *Rhemists*¹¹, of paying distinguished *honours* to Christ's body, and of doing officious things similar to *spreading garments* in our Saviour's way, when he entered Jerusalem in triumph. They also would make an application of those

⁵ Suppose a large room, many Christians met; the rich making separate little parties, having a good supper and good wines; (a feast on an heathen sacrifice was a jovial thing); the poor obliged to mess as they could; feeling mortified and insulted by those who ought to be as their *brethren*, and make with them one company, one party. Small select parties of great persons in the midst of numbers generally mortify, if not made by some useful rule.

⁶ Matt. xxvi. 26.

⁷ Sermon on the Sacrament, preached at York Cathedral. Sect. 19 of this Article.

⁸ Luke xxii. 20.

⁹ See Append. to Art. xi. sect. 27.

¹⁰ If I was a Papist I would say thus:—The passages in which Christians are ordered to eat the flesh of Christ are very strong; they strike, amaze, almost terrify; I cannot wonder when devout people think, that, in some way or other, they

ought to eat Christ's flesh: they have no way of doing it but in the Sacrament. God must therefore contrive some way that they shall do it there: but how? all things are possible with God: he could change the bread which we eat into Christ's Body; surely then he *does*: he would not command things impossible. Thus I might argue if I was a Papist: as a candid Protestant I add,—This hypothesis might go down in an ignorant age; it might get associated with religion in general; it might influence the whole praxis of religion, and therefore might become very difficult to extirpate. There might be an appearance that it could not be removed without a total overthrow of a great religious establishment—one splendid and opulent; nay, without total destruction of Christian principles in those who professed it.

¹¹ Rhemists on Matt. xxi. 8. Mark xi. 8. 1 Cor. xi. 29.

passages in which *Christ* is said to have been¹ *adored*, to IV. the adoration of the *Host*. But I see nothing urged by Romanists from *Scripture*, which relates to the peculiar nature of the elements in the Lord's Supper, after consecration.

Here ends our proof, direct and indirect.

33. In regard to *application*, I will only observe, that, on this Article, there seems great room for *mutual concessions*. But we have been already led to enter into these, in what was said of Queen Elizabeth, and in the explanation of the third paragraph. Queen Elizabeth (see sect. 11) seems to have followed a right plan, and *Melancthon*² seems to have had the same idea with her ministers.

What can³ seem more desperate, at first, than Dupin's insisting on its being still professed, "that the bread and wine are *really* changed into the body and blood of Christ?" Yet if that had been said by a Protestant, and perhaps put in a shape a little different, we should have made no objection to it. Might not a Protestant preacher, addressing that part of his congregation who would attend the Communion, and exhorting them to pay due reverence to the sacred elements, say, that he who should eat of them *now* would eat only simple *bread and wine*; but that he who received them properly after consecration would "*verily* and indeed"⁴ receive "the body and blood of Christ?"

Ambrose has a similar expression, which the Papists would have us take in their sense, but I fully believe that it was meant in ours. I take it as I find it in the Trent Catechism⁵ — "There is *bread* before the consecration, but after the consecration the *body* of Christ." Now, how could this be, if the bread were not *changed* into Christ's body? But suppose it was proposed to Dr. Dupin to say thus? 'The

¹ Rhemists on Matt. ii. 11; viii. 8. Heb. i. 6.

² Mosheim, 8vo. vol. iv. p. 37; or Cent. xvi. 3. II. i. 27.

³ Bishop Cleaver observes, that there are three notions of the Lord's Supper, all allowing to it "what our Church considers as essential to a sacrament, an outward visible sign and an inward spiritual grace."

⁴ Catechism of Church of England.

⁵ Trent. Cat. p. 210; or sect. 27.

P. S. I have looked into *Ambrose*, Edit. Paris 1603. The passage appears p. 366, tom. II. in his 4th book and 4th chapter, *de Sacramentis*. The books and chapters are very short, and the style very declamatory. The subject of the Chapter is, *Christus est auctor Sacramentorum*; the passage is, "Tu forte dicis: Meus panis est *usitatus*. Sed panis iste panis est *ante* verba Sacramentorum: ubi accesserit consecratio, *de pane fit caro Christi*."

IV. bread, after consecration, is changed into what is *meant in Scripture* by the *body* of Christ : ' who could refuse his assent ? and whose purpose would not this answer ? Something of this sort might effect an agreement ; but it is idle to use words, and, by limitations, to take away their customary meaning. As words are arbitrary signs, they depend for their meaning on custom wholly. What signifies talking of a *body*, not present as to *place* ⁶ ? That which is not present in such a sense as to occupy a place, is not body, in human language. And so that which is without the qualities, or accidents⁷, of substances, is no substance. *Man* has no idea of such a thing ; nor could the notion have been admitted in any but an ignorant age⁸.

354

ARTICLE XXIX.

OF THE WICKED, WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST
IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, (as Saint Augustine saith,) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.

1. In the way of *history*, we may observe, that people have always been much inclined to provide themselves with charms, amulets, &c., in order to drive away evils. Often, to use a thing which was *ordinarily* efficacious, if rightly managed, as *mechanically* efficacious. Sometimes indeed things used as charms may seem to be no way naturally efficacious ; but to use such is the extreme of superstition ; and such things may originally have been esteemed natural medicines. We have already mentioned, that people have taken home the water used in *baptism*, and applied it to bodily *sores* ; in like manner,

⁶ Trent. Catech. p. 218, or sect. 43. Locke, Hum. Und. II. xiii. 11.

⁷ See Locke, Hum. Und. Book II. chap. xxiii. sect. 2 and 4.

⁸ The Romanists are very *tender* about this, as one sees by their care to exclude

sense from judging of transubstantiation ; and their cautions about explaining it, and inquiring into it. (Trent Cat. sect. 39. 41—also 24.) What right has any human being to set aside the judgment of the *senses* ?

consecrated bread¹ and wine have been given to infants, have IV. been kept for medical purposes, and even buried with the dead². 355 *Heathens* and *Jews* have run into similar superstitions³. Such folly ought to be opposed; but our present Article was aimed chiefly at the Romanists, who are accused of saying, that the *mere receiving* of the Lord's Supper merits *remission* of sins, *ex opere operato*, (translated in the Article of 1552, answering to our twenty-fifth, "of the work wrought,") that is, *mechanically*⁴—without any good disposition of the communicant⁵. What was said of Sacraments in general, at the close of the twenty-fifth Article, is applied here to the Lord's Supper in particular. This Article is not in the set of 1552; from whence one may presume, that the early Reformers did not think such particular application necessary.

What the Romanists say, of the efficacy of sacraments in general, was stated under the twenty-fifth Article; what they say, of the efficacy of the Eucharist in particular, must be mentioned here. The Rhemish annotators say, "Ill men receive the body and blood of Christ, be they infidels or ill livers:" their answerer, Fulke, says, "Wicked men receive *not* the body and blood of Christ⁶." But the Romanists have three ways of receiving. The first, *sacramental*, the second 356 *spiritual*, and a third made up of these two *conjoined*⁷. They who receive only sacramentally, only *eat* the consecrated wafer, without due preparation or disposition. They who only receive after the second manner, spiritually, do nothing but what we should call *hearing* Mass; or, in the words of the Trent Catechism, eat the "heavenly bread *in desire* and *wish*;" that is, as I understand, they do not eat it *at all*. But they who *both eat* the wafer, and eat it with a good *disposition*, after sacramental confession, receive in the third way.

It is possible that our Church, by *inserting* this Article here, might intend it as an argument against *transubstan-*

¹ See Fulke in answering Rhemists on John vi. 58, where he mentions, from Tertullian, a superstitious woman keeping the Sacrament in a chest, to eat fasting. Also Art. xxv. sect. 7.

² Bingham, xv. iv. 19. It appears from II. v. 8, and XVI. v. 6, that care was taken to prevent such follies.

³ Potter speaks of *φάρμακα σωτήρια*, Book II. chap. xviii. or vol. I. p. 353; amulets, p. 355. The Jews had phylacteries. These are mentioned together

in the Saxon Confession, *Syntagma*, p. 104. Heathen and Christian *Holy-water*; Middleton's Letter from Rome, p. 136.

⁴ Some author says, *magically*; but I do not recollect who.

⁵ Saxon Confession, p. 103, *Synt.*

⁶ See Rhemists on 1 Cor. xi. 27, and Fulke's answers on the same; and on John vi. 27.

⁷ Trent Catechism, p. 224, or sect. 77, of Eucharist. The Council, Sess. 13, cap. 8, canon 8.

IV. *tiation*, in the way of a *reductio ad absurdum*; for if all who eat the consecrated wafer eat Christ's Body, then mice and flies, any animals or insects, eat Christ's body, as much as the most pious Christian.

Our Article might be aimed also at the *Lutherans*; because, according to the doctrine of *consubstantiation*, all receivers of the Lord's Supper receive the body of Christ; and Dr. Bennet⁸ argues, that Archbishop Parker could not be a Lutheran, because he subscribed this Article; and that the reason why other prelates did *not* sign it, was, probably, because they were Lutherans. I do not, however, perceive anything in the Lutheran Confessions which our Church would wish to oppose, as bringing on the same evils with the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation; indeed, I see nothing allied to the Romish doctrine, either in the Confession of Wittemberg, or in that of
357 Augsburg. The Saxon Confession calls it "portentosum errorem monachorum." These are all the historical remarks which it seems necessary to make.

2. Nor need the *explanation* be long.

The *title* sounds more like *French* phraseology than English. *Le voilà qui vient*, see he is *coming*. We should commonly express the meaning of the title thus: 'Of the wicked, not really *eating* the Body of Christ.' The Latin is, "De Manducatione Corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare." The *wine* is not mentioned; probably for the sake of simplicity and perspicuity⁹.

The chief part of the Article is expressed in the words of *Augustin*, as a Father much venerated by the Romanists. The passage is in his twenty-sixth Tract on St. John. It is quoted at length by Bennet¹⁰ and Welchman.

As all men are "wicked" in some degree, it may be proper to observe, that *worthiness* is here opposed to the *opus operatum*, or the supposed *mechanical* effect of the Lord's Supper. "The wicked," who eat "to their condemnation," are the *decidedly* wicked; the abandoned; "such as be void of a lively faith." The meaning is, to *oppose* the notion, that a man eats the body of Christ how wicked *soever* he be. A lively or living faith was explained under the twelfth Article¹¹.

⁸ Essay on the Articles, p. 187. Bishops Gest and Cheney did *not* sign.

⁹ Art. xxviii. sect. 20, the same.

¹⁰ 1794. Mr. Porson, p. 229, calls this passage of Augustin *spurious*: that

should be inquired into. It is in the *Catholicus consensus* prefixed to *Synagma*, p. 207.

¹¹ Art. xii. sect. 14, 24.

3. We have here but *one proposition* : ‘ Christians do not IV. get the benefits annexed to what in Scripture is called eating the Body of Christ, merely by partaking of the Lord’s Supper.’

For proof, I will only cite Hab. ii. 4, with the New Tes- 358 tament applications of it¹; John vi. 35, 54; and 1 Cor. xi. 29, which last is alluded to in the Article; and 1 John i. 7, which intimates, that we must walk in the light, before the blood of Christ cleanses us from sin.

4. Our *application* may be confined to *mutual concessions*. And for these I think there is greater room in this Article than in any other. The dispute between the Romanists and the Reformed is merely *verbal*²; I mean about the present Article as separated from all others. They say, the bread, after consecration, is the body of Christ, even in *substance*: it follows, supposing this true, that *whoever* eats that substance eats the body of Christ; that is, it is not *desecrated* by one mouth more than by another. We say, that the bread continues bread after consecration, and therefore, that every receiver eats bread; but that he who does what the Scripture requires may be said, in the prophetic, strong, figurative language of Scripture, to *eat the Body* of Christ; as he eats what is appointed to represent that body, and what the Scripture calls briefly that body itself. The Romanists, therefore, and we use a phrase, eating the body of Christ, in two different senses; and we also use this proposition, ‘ *The wicked eat Christ’s Body,*’ in two different senses; consequently, to dispute about its truth is idle and childish. They too use it as a corollary from a proposition which we think false, though we own the corollary to be rightly deduced. Now it must always be trifling to dispute about such a corollary, as if it were an independent proposition. We both require *preparation* for the Sacrament, indeed Romanists more than we; we both 359 say, that unworthy receivers may draw *punishment* upon themselves; we both quote the passage of *Augustin*³ which is in our Article. In short, we both mean, that the consecrated bread is not desecrated by the unworthiness of the receiver, and that worthiness is required in order to obtain *benefit*.

Dupin says⁴, that the body and blood of Christ “ are truly and really received by *all*, though none but the *faithful*

¹ Art. xiii. end of section 2.

² Might this be the reason why Cranmer made no Article on this subject?

³ Trent. Catech. sect. 57. See also sect. 58, 59.

⁴ Third Append. to Mosheim.

IV. partake of any *benefit* from them." What can we dispute here? The former part of his affirmation is true, upon his supposition, of transubstantiation; but that we think false; yet we might use the same *words*, with a different idea. The latter part agrees with our opinions. The former is the same thing as if he had said, '*Supposing* transubstantiation, the body and blood of Christ are received by all communicants.' This could not be disputed; why then should not the Romanists now express themselves so, if it comes to the same thing? why should we discuss a doctrine an hundred times over, in an hundred consequences deduced from it?

I am apt to think we take the Romanists too strictly about the Sacrament producing *virtues*⁵ or *graces*: that which is to be *expected* of course, is spoken of, in human language, as a consequence, and no uncertainty is expressed about it. Luke xvii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 19. What Protestant teacher would scruple to tell his hearers that attending the Sacrament would *make* them better men? Our Homily⁶ describes the *graces* and *virtues* "*wrought*" (*operatæ*) by the Sacrament; and I have done the same in explaining⁷ the expression, "spiritual grace." If the Romanists held what they are charged with, they must hold that *all* persons receive the *same* benefit from the same Sacrament. But this is contrary to many passages of the Trent Catechism⁸.

5. I shall *conclude* what I have to observe on this Article, by reading Dr. *Balguy's*⁹ account of our obligation to *prepare* ourselves for the worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And may that Scripture comfort the feeble-minded, which says, that we may trust we have a good conscience if we are in all things willing to live honestly. (Heb. xiii. 18.)

⁵ "An admirable and *sure* virtue to cure our souls." From Trent Cat. p. 145.

⁶ On worthy receiving, p. 350, 8vo.

⁷ Art. xxv. sect. 8.

⁸ On the Euch. sect. 51, &c. And 57, 58, 59.

⁹ Charge 7th, p. 315.

ARTICLE XXX.

OF BOTH KINDS.

THE Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

1. The principal part of the *history* of this Article consists in shewing how the Romish custom of not giving the cup to the congregation arose from the doctrine¹ of *transubstantiation*. When the sacramental wine came to be considered as the *blood* of Christ in a literal sense, and that in an age of weakness and superstition, though reverence for the elements seems to have been excessive *before*, men became seized with an *horror* at the thoughts of any of it being profaned, lost, dropped by the trembling hand, or even lodged upon the beard. I think there are stories of some *judgments* coming upon individuals on account of such profanation. How to apply a remedy? At first the desperate expedient of wholly withholding the cup did not occur; the bread was *sopped* in the wine; the wine was conveyed into the mouth by means of *tubes*. Still, probably, accidents did not cease. At length the ordinance of Christ was maimed, through an excessive fear of spoiling a false shape, into which it had been tortured. The *Cup* was denied to the *people*; including such *priests* as, at any particular communion, made a part of the *congregation*. For a time the authority of the ruling ecclesiastics might be sufficient to prevent the people from murmuring; but the practice was afterwards settled by the authority of a *Council*—the Council of *Constance*, begun so late as the year 1414—a very numerous one, as we have shewn before². 362

2. That the ancient Fathers, and all before the twelfth century, had no notion of such a thing as preventing the people from receiving the Cup, appears sufficiently from the gradual manner in which the ancient practice was left off. But their expressions are also plain, as taking for granted, and

¹ Middleton's Letter from Rome, Pref. p. Lxxix.

² Art. xxi. sect. 2, from Fox, 1. 765. Sess. 13. See Labbe's Councils, col. 100.

Baxter on Councils, p. 437, has the decree. As also has Bishop Burnet on the Article. See Comber's Advice, pp. 12, 17.

IV. supposing that every man received both bread and wine³, and reprimanding those who wanted to make a change. The *Manicheans*, indeed, avoided *all* wine, on principle; and therefore avoided the *cup*, when the liquor in the cup was wine. At Rome, when they wished to be concealed, they sometimes were *discovered* by this declining of the cup⁴.

363 3. The *Greek Church* has no custom of refusing the cup to the people⁵. The Roman custom arose from the doctrine of transubstantiation; which I do not conceive to be *properly* a doctrine of the Greek Church; for although Sir Edwin Sandys says⁶, the Greek Christians do hold transubstantiation, yet that seems by no means a settled thing. From Sir Paul Ricaut's account I judge, that only those Greek Christians who have resided in Italy have favoured it. The patriarch Cyril agreed wholly with the reformed Churches in this particular⁷.

4. As we might be suspected of exaggeration if we gave our own account of the Romanists, we will let them speak for themselves.

The twenty-first session of the Council of Trent was upon the business of communion in one kind, something being annexed about giving any kind of communion to *infants*. The members of the Council do not say that it is *wrong* for Christians to receive in both kinds, only that is *not necessary*.—They hold, that though the *primitive* manner was to receive in both kinds, the *Church* has power to alter it, as to anything but the substance of the institution; making allowances for circumstances, of time and place, &c.—and that the alteration in question was made for *weighty* and *just causes*; but those causes are not specified. It is however said, in the way of argument, that Christ is received *whole* and entire under one kind; and therefore that they to whom only one kind is administered are defrauded of no *saving grace*, no beneficial effects. But in the Council two questions occurred.

³ See Burnet on the Article. Bingham, xv. v. 1.

⁴ Leo. I. in his Sermon. 4. *de Quadragesimâ*, quoted by Lardner, Works, vol. III. p. 491. Burnet mentions this, p. 438, octavo.

⁵ "The laity, as well as the priests, communicate in both kinds, taking the bread and the wine together in a spoon

from the hand of the priest." Paul Ricaut, p. 187.

⁶ *Speculum Europæ*, p. 233.

⁷ Paul Ricaut, p. 182. There was, however, such a term in the Greek Church as *μετονομασία*, coined on purpose to express the notion which had been brought from Italy;—which might be used by some to express the change made in the bread and wine by consecration.

1. Whether the Church's weighty and just causes were so strong that the use of the cup was to be allowed to no persons whatsoever? IV. 364

2. Supposing it might be allowed to some particular nation, whether it should not be on *conditions*, and what those conditions should be? These questions were left undecided till the next session, and then they were left by the Council to the decision of the *Pope*¹.

The *Trent Catechism*² directs the people to be taught, "That by the law of the Church it is *prohibited* that any one, without the authority of the Church, (except consecrating ministers) should take the sacred Eucharist in both kinds." Some authorities of ancient *Fathers* are quoted; and *six reasons* are specified.

1. The fear of spilling.
2. The fear of wine growing sour when kept for the sick.
3. The *dislike* which some persons have for the taste or smell of wine.
4. The fear of hurting the *health* of the communicants.
5. The *scarcity* of wine in some places.
6. Lastly and principally, the desire of opposing those *heretics* who *dishonour* Christ by saying, that he cannot be received *entire* under one kind; that being to deny his *Divinity*. It is added, that such as have treated on this argument have assigned still more reasons.

The *Rhemists*, on John vi. 58³, say, that the Church has only regulated manner, order, and particular points; (that is, has not hurt the substance or *essence* of the Sacrament;) that such regulations the Church has authority to make, according to time and place, for the honour of God, reverence to the Sacrament, and profit to the people (edifying). Then they mention some of the same *Fathers* which are referred to in the *Catechism*; and some of the same reasons; assigning, moreover, the *number* of communicants, a "*dreadful regard*" of "Christ's *own blood*," and the practice of some centuries. To their authorities from the *Fathers*, and indeed to their arguments, Dr. Fulke seems to me to have given a complete answer. 365

Though the *language* of the *Council* seems to imply an opening for variety and *liberty*, yet the constant practice of the

¹ See end of 22d session. Voltaire, vol. x. quarto, p. 160. ² Sect. 70, &c.

³ Fulke's *Rhem. Test.* opp. fol. 152, on John vi. 58.

IV. Church of Rome has been, for no one to receive the cup except the consecrating priest⁴.

In later times, with a view to agreement, *Dupin*⁵ declares for mutual toleration in this point, and for leaving it to be settled by *each Church* for itself.

5. One would think that the practice of administering to the people in only one kind might have been *deduced* from the *Lutheran* consubstantiation; but the Confession of *Wittemberg*⁶ (which I have presumed to be the work of Luther,) expressly disclaims the deduction. And all other reformed churches seem to oppose it.

6. The Necessary Doctrine is not reformed with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It says, that the cup is *not necessary to salvation*. That receiving in one or both 366 kinds rather concerns the *manner* or fashion of the Sacrament than the *essence*—that the main thing is *worthiness*. By “ancient custom,” I suppose it means the same as the Rhemists by “some” centuries. In a popular calculation, a custom of some hundred years' standing is an ancient one⁷. It contends, that “by natural *reason*” “the *lively* body cannot be without *blood*.”

Archbishop Cranmer is said to have been the author of this Necessary Doctrine⁸, &c. It must have gone hard with him to exclude the cup, in composing it; for in the first year of Edward VI. the administration in both kinds was voted, *nullo reclamante*, in a convocation where he had probably the chief weight⁹. This makes me wonder why our present Article was not amongst those of 1552. Neither do I see the subject in the *Reformatio Legum*. I cannot account for these omissions.

P.S. The *Article* of Edward VI. confirming his very recent *Liturgy*, made in 1552, takes in this particular;—this was to be subscribed.

⁴ Dr. Priestley (Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 55, from *Histoire des Papes*, vol. IV. p. 679,) says, that “Pius IV. granted the Communion in both kinds to those who should demand it, provided they professed to believe as the Church did in other respects. The Bohemians also were allowed, with the Pope's consent, to make use of the cup.”

⁵ As before. Third Appendix to Moshem. ⁶ *Synagma*, p. 160.

⁷ Sterne's simple and unscholastic Uncle

has no idea of any event having happened above 100 years ago.

⁸ Oxford Pamph. on 17th Art. p. 32, from Burnet. Hist. Ref. vol. II. Records, p. 238; where Henry VIII. calls it Cranmer's own book.

⁹ Wheatly, p. 25, from Strype's Cranmer, pp. 157, 158. It appears, p. 156, that Archbishop Cranmer introduced the proposal of having both kinds, at this Convocation, and that they were supported by Archdeacon Cranmer, his brother.

7. I do not see that this Article wants any *explanation*. IV. "Is not to be *denied*"—seems to answer to the expression of the Council of Trent, "*petentibus usum calicis*¹."

But if it was said, that the cup is not to be denied to those who *ask* it, would not that imply, that withholding the cup 367 from such as did *not* ask it is innocent?

8. We may proceed therefore to some *proof*.

I see but one proposition in the Article: namely—'By the Ordinance of Christ, both Bread and Wine are to be administered in the Lord's Supper.'

Matt. xxvi. 27: "Drink ye *all* of it."

Matt. xxvi. 28. *All* Christians are in the new *covenant*; and all stand in need of "remission of sins." These are assigned as reasons for all drinking of the cup: "*For this,*" &c.

1 Cor. xi. 26—28 is addressed to all the Church of Corinth.

1 Cor. xii. 13 puts *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* on one and the same footing; and for the Lord's Supper uses the term *drinking*²—that part for the whole. If the Romanists say *either* part is, according to them, sufficient, yet all objections to the cup in particular are here done away. Dr. Middleton observes, with a view to our present subject, that the absurdities into which the doctrine of transubstantiation leads, should make it to be distrusted³.

9. The Romanists offer so many arguments, that we must have some *indirect* proof. We may observe of them, in general, that they prove *too much*: and therefore nothing at all. Before we mention them, be it observed, that our Saviour, in the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, makes *no difference* between the Bread and the Wine—of any kind, that I see. Also, that the Romish doctrine is this:—the *priest* who consecrates must *consecrate* both bread and wine; and must *receive* both himself; though he must *administer* 368 only bread.

10. Christ at Emmaus⁴ only *broke bread*. Now if he gave the *Sacrament*, and bread does not imply wine, then the argument proves too much; it proves that the priest ought to *consecrate* only bread. And this applies to all arguments founded on the phrase, breaking of bread.

Though a *name* of anything consisting of parts, may be taken from either part, and though St. Paul takes his name

¹ Trent, p. 152, or sess. 22, at the end.

² Locke on 1 Cor. xii. 13.

³ Pref. to Letter from Rome, p. LXXX.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 30, 35.

IV. for the Sacrament, on one occasion, from *drinking* (1 Cor. xii. 13), yet whoever paints to himself the nature of the institution, must think that breaking of bread is another obvious and natural name for the whole ceremony; especially as it was a name for *any repast*.

The *Quakers*⁵ (and indeed many of our communion) hold, that breaking of bread does *not* mean the Sacrament. In some cases it may not, being the name for any meal, but in some cases I think it does; as where it is joined with *doctrine*⁶ and *prayer*; or mentioned as the employment *for which* the Apostles met on a *Lord's Day*⁷. *Barclay* argues against this, from *eating* being joined with breaking⁸ of bread, and from the company continuing till *midnight*⁹, or later; but why might not this *eating* be the *'Αγάπη*? which used to be (sometimes at least) held in the evening? I can conceive any conferences of Christian leaders in St. Paul's time, whether begun by an *'Αγάπη*, or not, to continue for a part of the night or the whole night. But to return.

11. The Romanists say, the *Apostles* indeed were to drink
369 of the wine, but they were made *priests*. This again proves *too much*. For granting the argument, it follows, that *wine* ought to be administered *to all priests*. And the laity are under no obligation to receive the bread; for there is *no difference* in our Saviour's appointment of bread and wine.

12. It is urged, Christ is received entire in his body; every *body* contains *blood*. We once spoke against *inferences* in unintelligible doctrines¹⁰. This goes to prove, that it was absurd in Christ to institute the cup, and that it is equally so in the consecrating priest to drink it. By the way, this argument is a consequence of transubstantiation; which we consider ourselves as having disproved.

13. But, say the Romanists, the *priest* receives the cup in order to "*express* lively the passion of Christ, and the separation of his blood from his body, in the same¹¹." But this goes to prove that *all* Christians ought to receive the cup; as they are all to shew the Lord's *death* till he come.

14. But giving the people the cup occasions *dishonour* to the blood of Christ—occasions its being *spilt*, &c.—another corollary from transubstantiation; but moreover it proves *too*

⁵ See Barclay's Apology, Prop. xiii. sect. 8.

⁶ Acts ii. 42.

⁷ Acts xx. 7.

⁸ Acts ii. 46.

⁹ Acts xx. 7, 11.

¹⁰ Art. i. sect. 18.

¹¹ Rhemists on John vi. 58.

much. It proves that Christ could not *foresee* these great IV. evils; he must have forborne to institute anything which true wisdom would *wholly* remove in order to avoid them. Nay, these evils were not peculiar to distant ages; they must be liable to happen *every time* the wine was consecrated in every age. Perhaps an heretic might be so profane as to say, what real harm could be done by a drop even of the *real blood* of Christ falling to the ground? or what real dishonour? his blood must have fallen to the ground when he was alive. Christ is honoured most by a faithful and pious heart;—a man 370 may have that with a *trembling hand*. And as to any corporeal *pain*, or suffering, on account of what fell, that must be out of the question: the *falling* of blood never occasions pain to the person by whom it is shed.

15. But giving the cup, or withholding it, is only *manner*, form, fashion; not the substance or *essence* of the Sacrament. This again proves *too much*. For as Christ made no difference, if the cup be not the essence, neither is the *bread*. Therefore, again, the people are under no obligation to receive the bread. But, indeed, the manner of instituting the cup has no appearance of mere variable mode and circumstance. And if any change is to be made in an ordinance on account of change of circumstances, it should be shewn that those new circumstances are not voluntary corruptions and abuses.

16. But enough. I will trouble you with *no more* arguments; neither does it seem necessary to make any *application* of our reasonings on the present Article. Bishop Porteus's chapter on this subject is well executed.

ARTICLE XXXI.

OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.

371

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; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

IV. 1. The subject of this Article is the Romish *Mass*.

We will begin, as usual, with a few *historical* observations; but as there may be some who have not attended so much to Romish doctrines as to have a clear idea of what is meant by the Romish Mass, it may be proper, previously, to give some account of it.

The Protestant notion of the Lord's Supper has been explained. All that some Protestants do, is to commemorate the death of Christ; others join in a ceremony which may represent a *feast* on a sacrifice; that is, those who consider the death of
372 Christ as a *sacrifice*. The farthest any Protestant goes, is to offer a symbolical *commemorative*¹ sacrifice. But *Romanists*, by consecrating bread, make it, in their opinion, the *real body* of Christ, and they use it in two different ways; they not only administer it as a *sacrament*, but they offer it up to God the Father as a real *sacrifice*: they have one form for offering up the bread, another for offering up the consecrated cup². The sacrifice here offered is not said to be symbolical; but a real, literal, *propitiatory* sacrifice. There is one form which requests Christ to³ deliver and assist the supplicant by *the body of Christ* just received.

What was said of some Romish Doctrines at the opening of the twenty-second Article, and since of others, seems fully applicable to the doctrine of the *mass*.

The Romanists have a *system* of notions to support this of offering the consecrated bread as the body of Christ. It seems intended to obviate *objections*. But this will appear when we look into their writings, by and by.

All those masses in which the congregation are *spectators*, and the priest *alone* receives the elements, may be called *solitary*, in some sense; but those, I think, are properly solitary masses at which no one but the priest is *present*⁴. *Several* of these may be going on in the same church, at different altars,
373 at the same time⁵. These are generally intended to deliver

¹ See Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 21. Bishop Cleaver's two Sermons, pp. 2, 18.

² *Présent Spirituel*, p. 35.

³ *Ibid.* p. 53.

⁴ Card. *Bona* seems to call *both sorts* private. "Sive enim dicatur *privata* ex eo quòd *solus* Sacerdos in eâ communicet; sive quia vel unus duntaxat vel pauci eî *intersint*," &c. *Bona, Rerum Liturgicarum*, l. 14. 1.

⁵ There are some which are called *dry masses*—mere outward shew, without consecration, &c.; but these and others being blamed by *Bona*, &c. as abuses, I do not mention them. *Nautical masses* are without wine, for fear the motion of the ship should shake it so much as to spill it. See these and others mentioned, *Bingham*, xv. iv. 5.

departed *souls* out of *purgatory*: and are *paid* for; insomuch IV. that some priests are said to get their *living* by offering up Christ a great number of times in a day. Indeed, in public masses there are some parts which are not audible, called in French *La Secrete*¹, and in all, or most, I suppose, there are some prayers for the *dead*.

This custom of saying mass prevails so much as to exclude², in a manner, all *other worship*.

This is the *state* of that Romish practice, of which we should now attempt to give some *historical* account.

2. The only *questions* are, when did this practice *begin*? and what *variations* has it been subject to? It may be difficult to assign for its commencement any period with precision. The mass, in the strictest sense, could not begin before the doctrine of transubstantiation existed, because it proceeds upon that doctrine. But something which *sounds* like it, and *approached* to it, and would in effect bring it on, may be found before. It is difficult to trace out facts nicely in dark and ignorant ages; but the name of *sacrifice* for different parts of divine *worship* has been long in use³.

The ancient Fathers expressed themselves warmly, and 374 nobly; the same feelings, which made them give dignity to every sacred ordinance by ceremonies and habits, made them clothe their expressions of things sacred with splendid metaphors. And if they called the evening *prayer* their evening sacrifice⁴, no wonder they gave the name of sacrifice to that ordinance⁵ which they considered as a representation of the sublime and affecting sacrifice of Christ himself. If one wanted to see a number of instances, one might consult the Rhemish Testament on 1 Cor. x. 21, and Dr. Fulke's answer; but I can select no better single passage than that which is attributed to Ambrose, on Heb. x. 11, though the same⁶ is found in Chrysostom. The phrase, *unbloody sacrifice*, has also been used by the Fathers for the Lord's Supper, and adopted by the

¹ Présent Spir. p. 38. *Oraison secrete*, or sometimes *La Secrete*, as a substantive. Dict. Acad.

² Rhemists on Luke xxii. 20.

³ In Scripture, *beneficence* is called a sacrifice, Heb. xiii. 16. We have also the sacrifice of *praise*, Heb. xiii. 15; the *body* of man is to be a living (sometimes in old English called *lively*) sacrifice, Rom. xii. 1. And when the captive Jews

could offer no sacrifices, their devotions were called the *calves* of their lips.

⁴ Psalm cxli. 2. Bingham, xiii. i. 5.

⁵ See Priestley's Hist. Corr. vol. 11. p. 6. Bingham, 11. xx. 8. *Sacrificii opus sine Presbytero esse non potuit*, from Hil. Fragm. p. 129. See Heylin's Laud, p. 21.

⁶ Rhem. Test. on Heb. x. 11; and Fulke.

IV. Romanists for their sacrifice of the mass. *Missa* is itself an ancient word⁷. *Oblations*, of one sort or other, are very ancient; and so is the custom of dedicating or offering them up to God at the *altar*. Now suppose a priest, in an age of ignorance and superstition, heated with zeal and piety, to get all things strongly into his mind, and to fancy he had Christ in his hand, may we not conceive that he might begin the custom of offering him up to God the Father?

To carry our attempts farther, in accounting for the mass, would not probably answer any good purpose;—only we may
375 add, that the idea of profiting particular people (and the priest of course) by particular offerings, made at the Lord's table, or altar, on their behalf, with the consecration used at the Communion, seems to have been carried into execution before⁸ the tenth century, the era of transubstantiation; though such offerings were more properly *sacraments* than *sacrifices*. They were accounted *abuses*, and *laws* were made against them. *Prayers* for the *dead* were in use in the time of *Chrysostom*, and were offered at the *time*⁹ of celebrating the Lord's Supper;—a weakness not unnatural, but, as it now seems to us, injudicious; yet there might be difficulty in seeing, at that time, that it could be attended with much harm.

It may be proper to remark here, that though the Fathers sometimes used expressions which *sounded* like those of the later Romanists, yet that such expressions were *declamatory*, and are not to be understood in a proper or literal sense. The very ancient Fathers, having occasion to speak against the heathen sacrifices, and speaking literally, declared, in their Apologies, that Christians had *none*. And in the most declamatory sentences, something always appears, from which it is evident that the expressions are not intended as plain or literal. *Gratian*, who lived about the middle of the twelfth century¹⁰, undertook to reconcile canons, &c. and expressions of Fathers seemingly discordant. On the words, *Hoc est*, he observes, “therefore as the heavenly bread, which is the Flesh of Christ, is *called*, after the proper manner thereof, the *Body* of Christ,
376 when in deed and *truth* it is the *Sacrament* of the Body of

⁷ See Art. xxviii. sect. 2. Fulke thinks that *Missa* is not so ancient as the time of *Ambrose*. On Rhem. Test. opp. p. 280. On 1 Cor. x. 21.

⁸ Bingham, xv. iv. 4. Mösheim, Cent.

viii. 2. 4.

⁹ Fulke on Rhem. Test. opp. 279, or on 1 Cor. x. 21. Priestley's Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 2, is near this purpose.

¹⁰ Cave places him A. D. 1131.

Christ," &c.; and afterwards, "not in the *truth* of the *thing*, IV. but in a *signifying mystery*," &c.

And the *unbloody sacrifice* of the ancients was only figurative: it meant, the representation of the real sacrifice of Christ, in which he shed his *blood* for mankind. Indeed, I do not see how the sacrifice of the Romish mass can be called *unbloody*, as the blood of Christ, or what they call so, is solemnly offered up.

3. When once the practice of sacrificing in the mass was settled, I do not know that there was much *variation* in it. Some abuses crept in, from avarice, irreverence and superstition. This we learn from the Council of Trent, which makes a decree for reforming them².

We may now see what the Acts and the Catechism of that Council tell us concerning our present subject. The *Council* held their twenty-second session September 22, 1562, ten years after King Edward's Articles were made; and therefore may well be supposed acquainted with their contents. They lay down, that Christ superseded the *Jewish* priesthood, which was to be temporary, by his own, which was to be perpetual. Yet though he was a priest for ever, he did not mean that *earthly* priesthood should cease; accordingly, the night before he was betrayed, he *offered up*, to his heavenly Father, *his body* and blood, under the *symbols* of bread and wine, and *ordained* his disciples *priests*, that they (and their successors) might afterwards *offer him up*. Still there was to be but *one priest*, the Apostles acting only for their Lord. The appointed sacrifice was to represent the original one; both being real, but the former *bloody*, the latter *unbloody*; yet the appointed was to be accounted *one* and *the same* with the original one, differing only in the *mode* of offering—strictly propitiatory, capable of gaining remission of even great sins; and therefore to be offered for the *dead* as well as the living. 377

The *Catechism* keeps pretty close to the Council. In describing the difference between a sacrament and a sacrifice, it says, "The sacred Eucharist whilst it is kept in the *pyx*³; or carried to the sick, has not the nature of a sacrifice, but of a *sacrament*;" but when it is *both*, "they that offer this sacrifice, wherein they communicate with us, do *satisfy* and

¹ *Gratian*, Concord: discord. Distinction 2. C. *Hoc est*.—For this *English*, see Fulke on Rhem. Test. 1 Cor. x. 20.

² Sess. 22d, first Decree (p. 145, Latin.)

³ Sect. 78.

IV. *merit* the fruits of our Lord's Passion." And afterwards it is said⁴, "*We sacrifice*"—that is, all communicants. Masses for the *dead* are built on *tradition*⁵; and no masses are to be called *private*, because all pertain to the salvation of all the faithful.

The Rhemists have a great deal to say, but nothing that I need trouble you with.

4. *Wickliffe* had not, probably, at once settled his principles, so as to appear perfectly *uniform* in his opinions, in all parts of his works; but a proposition condemned as his in the Council of Constance was the following⁶:—"The Gospel saith not that Christ instituted the mass."

The *Reformed Churches* seem all against the Romish mass. The Confession of *Augsburg* speaks favourably of the *term* Mass, and *exculpates* itself from the charge of having *abolished*⁷ that rite. The *Lutherans* departed the least from the Romish Church.

One of the *Six Articles* is, "That private masses ought to be continued, which as it is agreeable to God's law, so men receive great benefit from them."

The Necessary Doctrine gives instructions with regard to the *sacrament* of the altar, but I see nothing about *sacrifice*. It concludes with a short lecture on praying for the *dead*; in which it discourages every way of being *particular*, if I may so speak. It allows benevolent intercessions for departed Christians in general, on the principle of a "communion of saints," but opposes masses being said at particular *places* (at *Scala Cæli*), &c.—and rejects *purgatory*, blames all temerarious *judgment*, and would have all things, in which we have not clear knowledge, left to the disposal of God.

Perhaps Henry VIII. suffered Cranmer to undermine the *mass*, because the custom of saying masses had a tendency to support the power of the *Pope*.

In the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. masses were left much the same as before; only the communion was allowed to the people in *both kinds*⁸. But in 1550, the mass-books were called in, and the *altars* removed and changed into *tables*; the principal English Reformers judging, that the retaining of altars would give offence to the chief enemies of popery, and

⁴ Sect. 85.

⁵ Sect. 86.

⁶ See Baxter on Councils, chap. xiii. or p. 431. See also Fox's Acts, &c. (or Martyrol.) Index, *Wickliffe*.

⁷ Bishop *Andrews* was candid also: see Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 21.

⁸ Neal's *Hist. Pur.* vol. i. quarto, p. 36.

tend to keep up amongst the people, the idea of a propitiatory¹ IV. mass. Some bishops refused to part with their altars, and were deprived for contumacy; the *Lutherans* did retain theirs². There is a chapter against masses in the *Reformatio Legum*; and *Latimer*, in his Sermons³, speaks of them as they deserve. 379

Of men's notions of the mass under *Elizabeth*, we may judge from the second Book of Homilies; in which I do not recollect any laboured arguments, but only some short declamatory expressions. It is called "*dumb massing*,"—" *mum-mish massing*." We are cautioned to take heed lest the Lord's Supper "of the *memory*," "be made a *sacrifice*:" "lest applying it for the *dead*, we lose the fruit that be alive." We are told, that at it "every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers, feeding ourselves, not hiring others to feed for us," &c. The mass, I suppose, was so far unsettled by this time, that arguments were unnecessary, and eloquence sufficient. Yet it might be worth while for any curious person to compare some of the expressions in our Communion-office, about the body and blood of Christ, about Christ's being a sacrifice, &c., with the Romish Latin forms; as he would the more easily conceive how the same expressions might suit the different religions when taken in a literal and metaphorical sense⁴.

*Dupin*⁵ is unyielding as to our present Article; indeed, he could change nothing without bringing the whole *fabric* of Popish worship upon his head. He maintains "that the sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated, but *continued* in the Eucharist, and that every communicant offers him along with the priest."

*Cardinal Bona*⁶ seems to be the most able Romish writer 380 in defence of the mass that I have happened to consult.

5. We should say something of those who think that our Church did not recede far enough from the Church of Rome. We may call them collectively *Puritans*, or *Dissenters*. But we have already mentioned the modern custom of *sitting* at the Eucharist⁷, unknown in the ancient Church. To these an

¹ Neal, Hist. Pur. p. 44.

² On this subject, see Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 273, octavo. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 20.

³ Vol. i. octavo, p. 162. See also Index, Mass.

⁴ Art. xxviii. sect. 33. Art. xxix. sect.

4. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 21.

⁵ Mosheim, 3d Appendix.

⁶ *Rerum Liturgicarum Lib. and De Missâ.*

⁷ Art. xxviii. sect. 12.

IV. *altar* must be abomination⁸, especially the Romish sort, of *stone*⁹, set against a wall. *Lardner* says¹⁰, that near the primitive times the Eucharist was never said to be upon an altar. One may easily conceive the *Cross* to be called an altar. Some have thought¹¹ that the Apostles would not be in the usual familiar table-posture, at the last supper, when they received the bread and wine. Whatever might be the case, our *kneeling* at the Communion is justified by our being in a continued act of *devotion*; and by our considering the ordinance as totally emblematical, or symbolical. Our Church, by a rubric, guards against any suspicion of our *adoring* the consecrated elements. No English communicant has now ever any such idea in his mind. And farther, we never insist upon the posture of kneeling as necessary for all societies of Christians. We are satisfied with our common expression, *altar-table*, as it seems to suit our idea, that the Eucharist is most properly a representation of a *feast* upon a *sacrifice*.

381 6. We will now proceed to some *explanation*.

In the *title*, *oblation* means, I think, the same as *sacrifice*: all sacrifices were oblations, and all oblations were supposed to be accepted as sacrifices. Under the Law of Moses the poorer sort of men brought offerings who could not afford sacrifices. In our prayer of consecration, sacrifice and oblation come together, and seemingly as synonymous. *One* oblation is opposed to the continued sacrifices of the Romanists; *finished* is also opposed to perpetuated; and *on the Cross*, to, on the *Altar*.

7. "The offering"—in the Latin *oblatio*; so the English might have been again, *oblation*. But the first sentence of the Article is not our present concern: it is only introductory, except indeed as it may suggest proofs: but the subject, of Christ's death being a sacrifice, has been treated in the *Appendix* to the eleventh Article. I do not know that it was proved there that "there is none other," &c., but it is agreed that there can be no other, except what is afterwards mentioned in this Article.

8. "The sacrifice of masses," &c. "were," &c.—This does not seem good grammar; but the Latin has *sacrificia*, and the English, in Sparrow's collection, *sacrifices*. Bennet,

⁸ Secker's Sermons, vol. vi. p. 288.

⁹ Fulke's Rhem. Test. fol. 287, bottom.

¹⁰ Works, vol. iv. p. 337.

¹¹ See Secker's Lectures, Lect. 36, p. 243, "a serious and devout manner." More in Secker's Sermons, vol. vi. p. 288.

however, mentions *sacrifice*, as one reading. “Masses”—IV. *Missa* has occurred before¹: no distinction here between public and private masses. “It was commonly said,”—that is, before the Reformation. I think we have had a similar expression before.—“*Pain*,” in Latin *pœna*, which may signify *penalty*, or punishment. There is “*pœnis*” in Trent, session 22, canon 3, relating to the same thing.

“*Blasphemous fables,*” *figmenta*²—“*dangerous deceits,*” — 382
 “*perniciosæ imposturæ.*” Other Reformed Churches use expressions much the same, which are anathematized by the Council of Trent³. How the sacrifices of masses have been “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,” will best be mentioned under our proof.

9. In entering on our *proof*, we must settle what *propositions* our Article gives us to prove. I see only *two*.

1. Masses, according to the Romish practice, are “blasphemous fables,” or *figmenta*.

2. They are “dangerous deceits.”

10. Being *fables*, *figments*, and *deceits*, seems to mean only one thing, namely, that they are *contrary to Scripture*, or, at least, unsupported by it.

This might sufficiently appear from considering, that the doctrine of the Romish *mass* is founded upon that of *transubstantiation*, which we suppose ourselves to have removed out of the way. But there are some texts which are so strikingly opposed to the mass, that it must be worth while to cite them.

Those which were cited in the Appendix to the eleventh Article, to prove Christ’s death a sacrifice, would shew that such sacrifice was *completed*. But I will confine myself. First I will take Heb. ix. 24, and go to the end of that chapter. Is it possible to conceive that the Apostle could have reasoned thus, and have given no hint about the millions of sacrifices which the Romish priests profess to have performed? or is it possible to conceive that any part of worship should be meant to swallow up all other parts, and yet no injunction be given about it? Next read Heb. x. 26⁴. I do not see how it is any argument if there is any sacrifice after that of Christ. As to all the sacrifices of the mass and the sacrifice of Christ making but *one*, that seems quite a *gratis dictum*, and no argu- 383

¹ Art. xxviii. sect. 2. Art. xxxi. sect. 2.

² Terence has *Fabula!* for idle tales! stuff! Heauton; Act. II. scene iii. v. 95.

³ Sess. 22, Canons 4 and 5.

⁴ On this text the Rhemists remark, “Perilous reading of Scriptures.”

IV. ment. Heb. v. 3, compared with vii. 24—28, shews, that no man can be a priest in the room of Christ, to offer up the Christian sacrifice. Read 1 Pet. iii. 18. Whatever completes types makes a conclusion; that therefore did Christ. On 1 Pet. i. 20, we observe, that as Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, he must be the only propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of *all mankind*. According to Heb. x. 2, 3, whatever sacrifice is *repeated*, cannot take away sin. Either Christ *suffers* in the sacrifice of the mass, or he does not: if he suffers, he must be ever suffering (against Phil. ii. 9; Heb. ix. 26); if not, it is no real sacrifice; add Heb. ix. 22⁵. I will not detain you with producing more authorities in so plain a case. *Private* masses are against 1 Cor. x. 17; xii. 13, &c.

Masses may be called *blasphemous*, as degrading Christ, dragging him, as it were, down from heaven for a few *sous*:—merely to describe the thing, seems a sort of blasphemy. A poor priest *labouring*, with a *wafer*, in the *occupation* and craft of offering up our blessed Lord! treating a happy and glorious Being, “crowned with glory and honour,” (Heb. ii. 9), as wretched and despicable! nay, *numberless* priests doing this at the same time, and muttering at numberless altars! Books
384 of travels, which relate these facts, must be shocking to every serious reader.

11. Masses may be called *pernicious*, with regard to the evil consequences which they tend to produce. They tend to make religion a mere civility; to take Christians off from prayer, and preaching of the word of God; and to give them an easy method of evading all their duties⁶, moral and religious. Moreover, by presenting a *material* object, they hinder men from worshipping “*in spirit* and in truth⁷.” They tend to promote *infidelity* amongst men of improved understandings; and from such, inferior persons soon catch the infection.

12. And now shall I offer any *indirect proof*? The Romanists have urged many considerations in their own favour; but such as seem to be for the most part mere *hypothesis*, unfounded in reason and Scripture. The doctrine of the mass might do in the *dark* ages, but it will not bear the light. The

⁵ See Bishop Cleaver, p. 18.

⁶ At Reims, a reverend German marquis (an abbé) told me, one Sunday evening, that he had been *à la Messe* at five o'clock in the morning; after which he had gone *à la chasse* (a rabbit-shooting);

and that he was then ready to go *à la comédie*. This he said very innocently, as conscious of no fault. Indeed, at the play he was to make some little change in his dress, that every one might know he was *incognito*. ⁷ John iv. 24.

Romanists, where they are improved, resemble a man, who IV. because he has planned something in a fit of melancholy, rage, or intoxication, determines to carryⁿ it into execution at all hazards, when he is become perfectly sober and in his right mind, and to justify it the best he can. However, if any one chooses to make a business of examining the Popish pleas in favour of the mass, he may consult the Rhemish Testament¹; and if he reads the answers of Dr. Fulke, I think he will be 385 pleased; making an abatement for controversial language, which is seldom pleasing.

13. I fear it would not be to much purpose to detain you long on an *application*: a form of assent does not seem wanting; and any plan for mutual concessions is desperate². To the *interested* we can only offer 2 Cor. iv. 4; and observe, that it is as applicable to those who call themselves Christians, as to “them which believe not.” “The God of this world may blind the minds” of either³. But to those who are not affected by the immense sums which have been lavished away on the saying of masses, we may recommend the interests of rational piety. Let not any of them be afraid⁴ to embrace it, though it may subvert, for a time, the whole system of their national religion; neither let them be afraid that the common people, deprived of their present principles, may become wholly unprincipled. The common people amongst the Protestants have, many of them, much solid piety—of a better sort than the lower people in Popish countries; and as to men of letters and science, while the Romanists are chiefly infidels, the Protestants can reckon amongst true believers those for whose understandings they have the highest esteem on other accounts—an Addison, a Locke, and even a *Newton*. These have all laboured in the cause of revealed religion.

If the Romanists will not listen to our brotherly exhortations, let them hear our threats. The rage of paying for masses will not last for ever; as men improve, it will con- 386 tinually grow weaker, and weaker: as philosophy rises, masses will sink in price; and at length, superstition will pine away, because no one will be interested to maintain and support it. Even institutions formed by *legacies* will have their revenues

¹ Particularly on Luke xxii.; 1 Cor. x. and xi.; and on Heb. ix. and x.

² Halifax on Prophecy, p. 361.

³ See Comber's Advice, p. 39.

⁴ P. S. What we find in the second Appendix to Mosheim, suits this advice;—I had not read it. Octavo, vol. v. p. 110. Fenelon's notion.

IV. transferred to other uses. But *then*, the minds of all ranks of men will be in a far worse state than if they had lost their superstition in any other manner. Instead of having a religion which their reason makes them esteem, at the same time that it warms their hearts with devout affection and Christian benevolence, they will have acquired an habit of despising all religion, and of thinking those most degraded who shew the most attention to religious truth⁵.

ARTICLE XXXII.

387

OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

BISHOPS, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

1. If one could give the *natural principles* of any subject, they would connect all facts, and make the best *key* to the *history* of men's practice. For all practice is only the operation of natural principles in different circumstances. With a view to illustrating facts after this manner, I have sometimes prefixed to my historical observations some attempt at a description of nature; and the plan seems to suit our present subject.

In the Appendix to the First Book I have spoken something of monastic life—have endeavoured to describe it, and account for it. I now only observe, that the contemplative abstemious monk differs from the man of the world, very materially:—he differs as to the refinement of his passions, and particularly as to the more warm, rapturous, affectionate kind of piety. At the same time he has his peculiar faults. With regard to *Marriage*, which on this Article is our chief concern, 388 he is farther removed from it than one who maintains a constant intercourse with mixed companies.

But amongst men of the *world* there may be a great difference in respect of marriage, and of motives for engaging in

⁵ This Lecture was given Feb. 27, | sect. 11, and the last paragraph of sect. 1792; with the accidental omission of | 10.

it. One man may be so situated, that it would be a desirable IV. thing for him to marry merely on prudential motives¹—an alliance would enable him to accomplish the ends which he has chiefly in view. Another is much attracted to marriage; he esteems it a great good; but he is afraid of losing what he esteems a still greater good—he is afraid of losing a good *service*, a good fellowship, &c.; trusting besides (for that must always be supposed, in order to make single life rightly chosen) that he shall be able to resist all *temptations* peculiar to celibacy.

Now suppose these men all to fix their views solely on the *good* of promoting *religion*, at the time they have marriage in view. The *monk* would engage in single life with readiness, in order to promote it; would probably condemn marriage, or at least highly applaud continence, and would feel himself elated and purified. The man of the *world*, in the first situation, would perceive, that, in his own way, he could best promote religion by associating with himself a certain female partner, and following a certain plan. The other would tend forcibly towards a married state, but he would see, that, in his case, connections and incumbrances would impede him so much, that he could not freely exert himself—could not, on the whole, 389 do that good, in promoting religion, which he particularly meditated. We need proceed no farther in order to see how men might be situated, in respect of marriage, upon the first propagation of the Christian religion.

It has been before observed, that men could scarcely, at first, enter into Christianity, without being agitated: they must be under continual alarms; their views must be fixed on heavenly objects; their affections set on things above: where their treasure was, there would their *heart* be also. This is a disposition very unfavourable to marriage, or to allowing it its due share of praise; and the prevalence of the oriental philosophy would make it more unfavourable². Such a temper would regard the marriage of *priests* as a want of self-government, as a degradation of the sacred character. Now if we conceive this temper working forcibly through a number of

¹ It is reckoned prudent for a man-midwife, and a candidate for a chaplaincy of a society of females, as Magdalenes, Asylum, &c. to be a married man. Or prudence may be pleaded *against* marrying: Le mariage est une chose très

serieuse; on ne peut pas trop y penser: heureux celui qui y pense toute sa vie.

² Mosheim says, that *malignant spirits* were thought to have most influence over married people. Quarto, vol. 1. p. 137.

IV. ages, and always combated by the natural propensity to marriage, and by the more ordinary feelings of common sense and active life, we shall have a general sketch of the history before us.

2. Though the sacred writers themselves seem to me perfectly free from every thing flighty, yet in the *apostolic age* Christians began to find, or fancy, that attentions to their wives prevented their being such good Christians as they might be. And, in some cases, both partners were of the same mind: they separated at bed, though not at board, so that the wife became a sort of *sister*. *Hermas*, at the beginning of his first *vision*,
 390 speaks of a woman, whom he had begun to love *as a sister*; and he is afterwards³ told that his *wife* must be his *sister*.

Basilides is placed by Cave in the year 112. Many strange things have been said of him; but in Lardner's Book of Heresies they are compared, and a sober judgment formed out of them. That judgment is⁴, that *Basilides* valued continence, not on monastic principles, absolutely, in itself; but only with regard to the good effects it would produce in any particular juncture—on the ground of its utility in any particular circumstances. If it produced the greatest good, in any case, in *that* case it was to be commended and practised; otherwise it was not necessary or required. This fell so far short of the high notions of some sects of Christians, that it was accounted *heretical*.

The *Manicheans* only *tolerated* marriage even in what they called their *auditors*⁵; in their *elect* they did not even tolerate it. The *Manicheans* are placed as first flourishing about the end of the third century.

It seems clear that, however some might be *admired* for not marrying, some of the clergy *did* marry, or *were* married men, during the whole⁶ of the first three centuries. Yet I suppose that *attempts* were continually on foot to prevent their marrying, or to make them separate themselves from their wives.

391 During these first three centuries, there arose a custom for men to have women constantly with them, who were called *subintroduced* women—*mulieres subintroductæ*—in the Greek

³ Second Vision. See the note at the beginning of *Hermas's* first Vision. Edit. Russell.

⁴ Her. *Basilides*, sect. 12. Lardner's

Works, vol. ix. p. 235.

⁵ Vol. i. p. 249, or Append. to Book I. sect. 4. vii.

⁶ See Bingham, iv. v. 5.

churches, *συνείσακτοι*. Their employments and characters are IV. not entirely agreed about. *Lardner*¹ says they “were not wives, nor concubines; but persons maintained as objects of charity, or else for the sake of domestic affairs.” Bishops, and men of great eminence, entertained these women—some very innocently, I do not doubt; but it seems probable that the connection would be a snare for others, if any times of peace or quiet came on. This *mulier subintroducta* seems to have been a sort of continuation of the *sister-wife* of *Hermas*.

3. At the Council of Nice, in 325, it was proposed, that such ministers as had wives should put them away. The conduct of *Paphnutius*², an Egyptian bishop of some eminence, on the occasion, was spirited and liberal. Though bred up a monk himself, unmarried, and remarkable for his chaste conduct, he cried out in the assembly, that he would not agree to the putting of such “a yoke upon the neck of the disciples³,”—that cohabiting with a virtuous wife was chastity itself; and that he could by no means agree to anything more than that the unmarried clergy should continue single. He had weight 392 to stop the imposition of the restraint proposed.

At this famous Council, a *canon*⁴ was made against the *sub-introduced* women, which I will read.

The general *turn* of the religious was to celibacy; and fine eulogiums were written upon chastity, and other *ascetic* perfections, by Tertullian, Ambrose, and most of the Fathers; though Tertullian did write two books *ad Uxorem*, to his own wife.

4. The first check which this humour met with was from *Jovinian*, a monk of Milan, in the fourth century. We have mentioned his idea, that Satan has not power to seduce a true Christian, under the sixteenth Article⁵; but he was more

¹ *Lardner's Works*, vol. III. p. 82, note. The idea of marriage without cohabitation was not very uncommon in the times of which we are speaking. Nor was it wholly unknown to the heathens. See the *Life of Hypatia* in *Suidas*; or *Lardner's Works*, vol. IX. p. 83. Some Christians have run into the folly of performing what may be called *feats* of chastity or continence; that is, have exposed themselves voluntarily to very great temptations in order to boast of their power of overcoming them. See the ac-

counts of *D'Arbrissel*, founder of the abbey of *Fontevraud*, who died in the year 1117. *Bayle's Dict.* under *Fontevraud*. *Gibbon's Hist.* quarto, vol. I. chap. xv. p. 485.

² *Suidas* from *Socrates*, l. 11; and *Sozom.* l. 23. *Bingham*, IV. v. 7, from the same.

³ *Acts* xv. 10.

⁴ Councils, by *Labbé*, or others. In English, *Lardner's Works*, vol. III. p. 82, note.

⁵ Art. xvi. sect. 9.

IV. famous for holding, that wives may be as good Christians as virgins can be ⁶. Lardner considers him as having been of the same opinion with Basilides, as already described ⁷. *Vigilantius*, a presbyter of Gaul, in the fifth century, is spoken of with Jovinian; they both opposed several growing customs of Christians, which had arisen from a too great luxuriance of piety. *Jerom* is very indignant against *Vigilantius*; whom he describes as saying, that no clergyman ought to remain unmarried. This notion he amplifies and exaggerates thus: “et nisi (episcopi) prægñantes uxores viderint clericorum, infantesque de ulnis matrum vagientes, Christi Sacramenta non tribuunt”⁸ —(will not *ordain* them).

393 The Pope, by whom Jovinian and his followers were condemned, was *Siricius*, who died in the year 398: he is usually said to be the first who *forbade* the marriage of his clergy; but I suppose many of them were married after his time.

The *struggle* between lofty notions of religious purity, and ordinary ones of natural propensities, seems never to have intermitted⁹; but we must not attempt more than to mark its principal appearances.

5. *Gregory VII.*, called *Hildebrand*, who died in 1085, is spoken of, as having the most completely and universally effected the celibacy of the clergy¹⁰. Those before him are thought to have been *superstitious* in discouraging marriage; he to have done it from motives of *policy*. Yet it is owned, I suppose, that he was a man of strict purity in private life, and sincerely zealous for the reformation of manners¹¹.

6. In *England*, according to *Fox*, marriage of priests was first forbidden by *Anselm*, Archbishop of Canterbury, in a council at London. In another council, held in the year 1104,
394 five years before his death¹², at Winchester, there is a reference

⁶ Bower's Life of Siricius.

⁷ The opinion is Beausobre's, but adopted by Lardner; Works, vol. ix. p. 285.

⁸ Jerom adv. Vigilant. c. 1, last vol. but one, p. 281, 2d tome.

⁹ *Intermediate* decisions were made in the sixth general Council, held at Constantinople 580, called *Quinisextum*, or in *Trullo*, (or *Trulla*). *Cave*, vol. i. p. 605. *Dupin's Compendium*, vol. ii. p. 295.

¹⁰ Burnet on the Article. Bp. Hallifax on Prophecy, pp. 352—355. *Comber's*

Advice, pp. 15, 43. *Fox's Martyrol*. vol. ii. p. 463.

¹¹ The particular year when priests first gave a promise of celibacy, and bishops took an oath to ordain no married man, is said by *Fox* to have been 1067; but *Comber* mentions 1074: both speak from ancient historians.

¹² *Fox*, vol. ii. pp. 463, 483. The date of the former council I do not find in *Fox*;—of which *Henry Huntington* says, “In quo prohibuit Sacerdotibus Anglorum uxores antea non prohibitas.” Prohibiting is not preventing. But *Cave* does

to a former one held at London; but Henry I. connived at the priests marrying¹; and there has been much *connivance* at this offence, at different times. IV.

7. St. *Bernard*, called the last of the Fathers, died 1153; I was surprized to see how strongly he inveighs against depriving the priests of the liberty of marrying². He was perfectly *orthodox*; head of one great monastery (Clairvaux), and founder of 160 others.

8. The marriage of priests was, about the time we are speaking of, very unpopular in England. It occasioned *riots*, in which the sacred elements, consecrated by married priests, were thrown into the dirt, and trodden under foot. The priests who had wives were called by the opprobrious name of *Nicolaitans*³.

9. Pope Pius II., called *Æneas Sylvius* before he came to the popedom, died in 1464. He is famous for having said⁴, "Marriage was for great reasons forbidden priests, and for greater is to be restored to them⁵." By *greater*, intimating the danger not only of such incontinence as he himself had been guilty of, but also of unnatural vices.

10. In the *Greek Church* we are informed, by *Brerewood*,³⁹⁵ in one part of his book, that no marriage⁶ is allowed *after* ordination; and in another passage⁷, that the *Russians*, in particular, ordain only those who *are* married. Neither of these rules allows a clergyman to marry a *second* time. Indeed, *second marriages* have been declared against by many sects of Christians⁸; probably with a view to 1 Tim. iii. 2, "The husband of *one wife*."

does not not clear up these matters, so I leave them. He has no council at Winchester in 1134. And it appears that *Lanfranc* held a council against the marriage of priests in 1076.

Cave says, that in 1102 Anselm held a council at London, but he does not mention marriage of priests, in his account of it. There seems to have been a great deal of business undertaken at this council.

¹ See an original record to this purpose in John Fox, vol. i. p. 253. A proclamation of Anselm's.

² See Fox, vol. II. p. 483. Comber's Advice, p. 43.

³ Fox, vol. II. pp. 465, 479. Rev. ii. 6, 15.

⁴ Burnet on the Article. Comber, p. 42. Baxter on Councils, p. 448.—Fox, vol. II. p. 466. Bower's Lives of the Popes.

⁵ Baxter on Councils, p. 448.

⁶ Brerewood on Languages, p. 127.

⁷ P. 137.

⁸ See Dr. Redman's opinion in Strype's Cranmer, p. 157. John Fox, vol. I. p. 36. Dr. Thomas, Bishop of Lincoln in 1557, was said to be married to his fourth wife, and to have, as a motto of a ring, "*If I survive, I'll make it five*." The same story has been told of others; it is only mentioned here as proving that a succession of marriages was not disreputable even to a prelate.

IV₂ 11. In the twenty-fourth session of the Council of Trent, the marriage of priests was discussed; but there is only one canon against it (the ninth), which contains nothing remarkable. The next canon anathematizes all those who do not hold that single life is better and more happy (or more blessed, *melius et beatius*), than married life. In the Trent Catechism I see nothing on the subject; perhaps because the Catechism was only for the people; which reason will extend to the Necessary Doctrine.

12. At the time of the *Reformation* men stood disposed as is described by Bishop *Burnet* at the beginning of his Exposition of this Article. They were remarkably attentive to the mischiefs which might arise, either from a continuance of the clergy in that single state, to which many scandalous irregularities seemed to be owing; or from reducing persons of sacred characters to the level of ordinary men, and setting them 396 in the light of slaves to sensual appetites. It will appear probable, from what has been said, that men *should* stand so affected, in such a conjuncture.

Amongst the propositions of *Wickliffe* and *Huss* condemned at the Council of Constance⁹, I do not see any relating to the marriage of priests.

The *Reformed Churches* declare against forbidding priests to marry¹⁰. Some mix the marriage of priests with that of laymen; but the Confession of *Augsburg* has a separate chapter for the marriage of priests. Amongst other evils of the prohibition, it mentions, that some good men, by their conflicts with the weakness of their nature, have been reduced to a state of *desperation*. That writing of Bishop *Jewel's*, which is called part of the *English Confession*, I will read, as it contains much good matter in a small compass¹¹. The first page of that of *Augsburg* (on this subject) is worth reading. The *Helvetic* in one place says, that single men, supposing them virtuous and easy, are *more fit* for taking care of sacred things than those who are distracted by the cares of a *family*¹²;—and, a little after, condemns those who condemn second marriages.

⁹ Art. xxi. sect. 2.

¹⁰ In casting my eye over the Confessions in the *Syntagma*, I did not see the subject in the French, Dutch, or Scotch, nor in the Polish; but it may possibly be in any of them, though I believe it is not.

¹¹ *Syntagma*, p. 117.

¹² *Synt.* p. 84.—“*Aptiores autem hi sunt curandis rebus divinis, quam qui privatis familiarum negotiis distrahuntur.*” This must depend upon *circumstances*.

One of the *Six Articles* is, “Priests may not marry by the IV. Law of God.” *John Fox*, in his *Martyrology*, (or *Acts and Monuments*¹, &c.) has given a particular history, and a great deal of argument, on this and every other of these Six Articles 397 of Henry VIII.

King Edward VI., in 1552, *ratified* the marriages of the clergy; and made, by act of parliament, their children legal *inheritors*. And in the *Reformatio Legum* there is a chapter in favour of matrimony, which is warm in defence of the marriage of the clergy. Archbishop *Cranmer* was married; and in his life by *Strype* we find some good things on our present subject².

In the reign of Queen *Mary*, Popery was restored; and the queen gave injunctions to the bishops, amongst other things, “to remove all married clergymen from their wives³.” And, in consequence, “all the married clergy throughout the kingdom were deprived.”

Queen *Elizabeth* did restore the Protestant religion; but, in some things, she was not so forward about it as some of her subjects. It seemed a thing of course that the clergy should again be allowed to marry; but *Elizabeth* refused to authorize their marriage, openly, by *law*; she was indeed willing to *connive* at it, but that would not secure *legitimacy* of children⁴. Her backwardness caused the trouble of particular acts, as I understand, of *legitimation*. How desirous she was to clog and impede all clerical marriages, appears from her Injunctions in 1559⁵; in which she orders, that no priest shall marry any woman except he have the consent of his *bishop*, two neighbouring *justices*, and the woman’s *parents*:—if no parents, 398 the consent of relations; if no relations, of master or mistress; besides banns, &c. These impediments argue either a strong prejudice in the queen, or an opinion, that the marriage of the clergy was still *unpopular*.

13. *Dupin*⁶ is very tolerant about the marriage of priests: he allows “that priests may marry, where the laws of the Church do not prohibit it.”

Here ends our *history*.

¹ Vol. II.

² *Strype’s Life of Cranmer*. See Dr. Redman’s opinion, p. 157. *Cranmer’s*, p. 161.

³ *Neal*, vol. I. p. 60. *John Fox*, vol. I. p. 36.

⁴ *Strype’s Annals*, vol. I. p. 80. I think Archbishop *Parker* had a son legitimated by act of parliament. *Neal*, vol. I. p. 117.

⁵ *Sparrow’s Collection*, p. 76, cap. xxix.

⁶ Third Append. to *Mosheim*.

IV. 14. The *explanation* will be much shorter.

In the *title*, the word "*Priests*," I consider as a *generic* term, including all orders of ecclesiastical ministers. In the Article, all those orders are specified which subsist in our Church.

"Not *commanded*."—To see the force of this, we should examine with what it is *consistent*. Suppose any one should be of opinion that single life is *better* for priests than married life (*melius et beatius*); that it is *recommended* in Scripture, that it will be *rewarded*, &c. &c.; still he might agree, that it is not "*commanded*."

"*By God's Law*."—This is the expression of one of the *Six Articles* of Henry VIII. and may allude to them. Suppose any one thought celibacy of priests was commanded by the *canon* law, the law of the Church, or the law of *England*, or even the law of *nature*, still he might assent to this *Article*, except he thought it was commanded by *Scripture*. Only it should be understood, that if Scripture was found to refer to any other law, or ratify it, then its being commanded by that law would be the same as its being commanded by Scripture. Indeed, the law of nature is God's law; but the Scripture seems here to be meant.

399 "Either to *vow* the estate of single life, or to *abstain* from marriage;"—that is, either to abstain in consequence of a vow or without vowing. I suppose that the Romish clergy *do* take a vow of celibacy upon ordination; as our clergy used to do in the time of *Anselm*⁷, and ever since, probably, till the Reformation.

"As for all *other* Christian men."—Does this make it necessary for us to *prove* that it is lawful for Christians *in general* to marry? The title is only of *priests*; but if priests may marry, laymen may, *à fortiori*. And the scriptural expressions are common to all sorts and conditions of men. This clause beginning "*therefore*," was *added* in 1562, so means something against monastic life in general.

"As they shall *judge*," &c.—This does not seem properly a part of our Article: however, it is a good moral direction, and tends to shew the reasonableness of the liberty allowed, and that it is of an honourable, worthy sort. And does it not imply that our Church *prefers* *neither* single nor married life

⁷ John Fox, vol. II. p. 483.

absolutely? but either, which, in any particular case, is best IV. for a man's *morals*? in which he will be the *best man*?

15. Next comes the *proof*. I see but *one proposition*.

'Priests are allowed, by Scripture, to marry.'

Matt. viii. 14—shews that St. Peter was married.

Acts xxi. 9—implies that St. Philip was also married.

Acts xviii. 2—shews the same of *Aquila*¹. Also 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

I venture to add for the present,

400

1 Cor. ix. 5—It does not shew that Paul was married; but, according to our version, that he claimed a right to marry; and that those who were called our Lord's brothers were married; that is, James², Simon, &c. So much for precedents.

Matt. xix. 12—at the end, implies, that some are, in some sense, *unable* to live single: therefore there can be no *command* to do so. Priests are not excepted.

1 Cor. vii. 2, 9—implies, that to marry may *sometimes* be a *duty*; and no exception is made.

Eph. v. 32—and preceding, might be considered. I would submit, whether St. Paul would have used his *allegory* about Christ and the Church, his *Spouse*, if it was unlawful for St. Paul, or any other minister of the Church, to marry.

In 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, and Titus i. 6, it is plainly implied that ministers may be married. And from 1 Tim. iv. 3, it appears, that "*forbidding to marry*," was one of the marks of *evil times*.

Heb. xiii. 4, shews, that "marriage is honourable in *all*:" who shall presume to make an exception? Compare 1 Cor. vii. 2. Shall not a minister connect himself as those were connected who were fixed upon for ministers?

The *Jewish* priests did marry undoubtedly.

If it should appear, from any part of Scripture, that we are made *judges* of the evils of continuing single, it then becomes *scriptural* to apply every thing which history and experience have taught us.

401

¹ Aquila seems to have been accompanied by his wife Priscilla, while employed in teaching Christianity. He also seems, from Acts xviii. 26, to have been more than an ordinary teacher; especially

considering that *Apollos*, to whom he expounded the way of God more perfectly, was himself a teacher.

² See Art. vi. sect. 25.

IV. 16. This may suffice for direct proof: on this Article we must have some indirect. Not but some of the arguments of our adversaries are again *frivolous*. I shall content myself without proving, that St. *Peter* did cohabit with his wife³; or that there was such a thing in the Latin Church as a man's retaining a wife after his appointment to the ministry. Yet there are *some* difficulties which are worthy of a solution, if we can suggest one.

17. It is urged that ἀδελφήν γυναῖκα, in 1 Cor. ix. 5, is not rightly translated, *a sister, a wife*; it should be a *Christian woman*;—and so indeed Mr. *Locke* understands it:—one to *wait* upon an apostle, and provide those things for him which in modern times are provided at inns. The *context* is not about a right to marry, but about a right to have *accommodations* provided. Our marginal translation of γυναῖκα, is, *woman*. I feel diffident about two substantives put together; they seem to make an uncommon, or singular, expression; yet ἀδελφήν γυναῖκα should mean something more than ἀδελφήν singly: why is γυναῖκα added? If the expression had been used by St. *Peter*, instead of St. Paul, I should have understood it of his *wife*; and I should have taken the meaning of ἀδελφήν from what we said about *Hermas's sister-wife*⁴.

402 Peter is said to have *done* that which Paul *claimed* a right to do: whom could Peter lead about but his wife? Paul was single⁵, and did not do the thing which he claimed a right to do; certainly he might have led about a *Christian woman*. Is the meaning this?—‘Might I not, if I pleased, put the converts to the *expense* of maintaining not only me, but a female companion? For if I had a *wife*, as Peter has, I might take her with me, as he does; not for the sake of conjugal endearment, that would impede my proper business, but as a sort of *sister*.’ If it were quite sure that all the persons of whom Paul speaks in this passage were married⁶, I should be apt to conclude that he meant by γυναῖκα a *wife*.

³ Rhem. Test. on Matt. viii. 14, and on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

⁴ Sect. 2. Perhaps one should not omit observing, that *homines Christiani*, means the same as *Christiani* without *homines*; let the observation *apply* as it may. But Fulke on Rhem. Test. 1 Cor. ix. 5, makes a difference between γυναῖκα ἀδελφήν and ἀδελφήν γυναῖκα. And so, between *mulierem sororem*, which is the

expression of the Vulgate, and *sororem uxorem*, which he thinks right.

⁵ 1 Cor. vii. 7.

⁶ Some have said that *all* the apostles were married except Paul; but I fancy they use this verse as proof; taking for granted that γυνή here means *wife*. Clemens Alexandrinus says, that the apostles who led about with them a sister, a wife, might make them useful in *teaching* women

However, if 1 Cor. ix. 5, should not make *for* the marriage IV. of priests, it can make nothing *against* it.

18. But it may be urged, that Matt. xix. 11, 12 and 1 Cor. vii. seem to recommend celibacy as something *superior* to married life—as more pure and perfect. I answer, this has been thought¹, yet without reason, as far as I can judge. But, though that were the meaning of these scriptures, yet the 403 passages cannot be thought, by recommending, to *command* men to live single;—rather the contrary. A measure is recommended because it cannot be commanded; they make no difference between clergy and laity; and it is absurd to think that it is so much as recommended to all men to live single. But let us consider the sense of the two passages.

Matt. xix. 11, 12, and 1 Cor. vii. may be taken together. Difficulties and obstacles lie in the way to marriage: a man is alarmed with not being able to get a *divorce* (Matt. xix. 9, 10); or he is afraid, that if he marries he shall not be able (1 Cor. vii.) to execute the trust committed to him, of promoting a new religion of divine original. Or if he really, at bottom, wishes to marry, he proposes his difficulties as if he was led by them to *desire* a single life;—perhaps under some degree of self-deceit. He asks *advice*². His adviser replies, as supposing him sincere, Marriage is an affair about which I can give you no advice *upon the whole*; at least, upon the whole I dare not advise you *against* it. You must *judge for yourself*; the decision depends in a great measure upon your own *feelings*; and those it is impossible for me to enter into with such exactness as to direct you properly: all that the best adviser can do, is only to suggest *particular considerations*; you must afterwards complete the deliberation. So far I can suggest—that you need not make yourself *uneasy* as if it were an *indispensable* duty to marry; experience shews that it is not; for it shews that nature has³ disqualified some persons, in body, or in mind; and others, men of the best characters, have found it 404 the greatest good to give themselves up to promote the interests

men religion in private. And so, “the doctrine of the Lord might enter into the closet of women,” “without any reprehension or evil suspicion.” Fulke on Rhem. Test. 1 Cor. ix. 5, from Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. iii.

P. S. The notion of Clemens Alex. seems like my own; that the apostles led about wives, not “*as wives*, but *as sis-*

ters as assistants.”—Might not an apostle take with him sometimes a *real sister*? if particularly well qualified for instructing females?

¹ See John Fox, vol. i. p. 3.

² Matt. xix. 10. 1 Cor. vii. 1.

³ Lardner's Works, vol. ix. p. 284, from Beausobre's opinion of Basilides.

IV. of religion: these, by setting their affections on things above, may be said to have disqualified themselves. You may therefore be perfectly easy on that head: it is no more expected that all *men* should propagate their species, than that all *plants* or animals should. But perhaps you may *wish* to marry, and may really be afraid lest, by marrying, you should involve yourself in difficulties inextricable⁴; or lest you should encumber yourself, and divert your affections, so that you cannot exert yourself freely, in performing the works of virtue or *piety*⁵ which you meditate. I repeat, I cannot, I dare not advise you not to marry, on the whole; but I will mention any thing that occurs to me. Were you to marry, you might fall into some “*present distress*⁶,” I can see that things are so situated, that you might “have trouble in the *flesh*⁷,” if you had a family to conduct. I can also inform you, that I feel no dissatisfaction with my *own*⁸ situation as a single man; and as to the things of religion, certainly the fewer worldly and domestic cares⁹ you have, the less distracted will be your attention; and so I could go on suggesting particular motives; but, after all, you must *determine*. If you ask *why*? I answer, because you only can judge whether it is *safe* for your *morals*¹⁰ to live a single life; that is the principal thing to be considered, and you can only judge of your security by your *habits* and your feelings: every motive must be subservient to motives of *duty*. Were I to press you to live a single life, and you fell
 405 into *sin*, I should never be able to console myself for having “cast a *snare* upon you¹¹”—for having given you advice when you was not “*able to receive it*¹²,”—*able*, I mean, as every one must conceive me to mean, without its ruining your *principles*. No; whatever good there may be in avoiding marriage, in any circumstances, whatever evils marriage might occasion, they are not to be compared to evils of being perpetually tormented by *sinful passions*:—it must always be “better to marry than to burn¹³.” If you feel yourself weak, do not attempt arduous tasks. “Marriage is honourable in all¹⁴,” and yet men may in some situations rightly prefer a single state; and whatever virtue any man practises in any state, he should consider it as the *gift of God*¹⁵ (Matt. xix. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 7). But God forbid

⁴ Matt. xix. 9.⁵ 1 Cor. vii. 32, 34, 35.⁶ Verse 26.⁷ Verse 28.⁸ Verse 7, 8.⁹ Verse 33, 35.¹⁰ Verse 2.¹¹ Verse 35.¹² Matt. xix. 12.¹³ 1 Cor. vii. 9.¹⁴ Heb. xiii. 4.¹⁵ Why is virtue in single life here said to be the *gift of God*, and not virtue in married life? because that would not have

that any principle of *ambition*, though of the most laudable sort, IV. should ever induce you to avoid marriage, if you cannot conduct yourself rightly in a single condition—if you cannot fully resolve to do the duties of it, and keep yourself unspotted from 406 its corruptions.

Such is the meaning which the two passages objected (Matt. xix. 11, 12, and 1 Cor. vii.) convey to my mind. They do not seem to give any absolute preference, or ascribe any general perfection to a single state; but only to direct men how to *conduct* themselves *in case* they are thrown into any situations which seem to them to be favourable to celibacy. That abstinence from marriage is desirable in such particular situations, on some particular *accounts*, is a thing taken for granted, or *supposed*.

If any one examines 1 Cor. vii. on the ground here described, let him take notice when St. Paul speaks from authority, and when he speaks *of himself*. He speaks his private judgment in verses 6, 10, 25, 40. And it might be well to compare Col. ii. 20—23, according to the explanation of it before given¹. And to consider, that when St. Paul says, (ver. 1,) “It is good for a man not to touch a woman,” he must say it with a view to some particular situations; said *universally*, it could not be true; nor can it more be called universal than “let *every* man have his own wife,” ver. 2. We may add, that recommending occasional abstinence *after* marriage², presupposes marriage, and is no discouragement to marry—rather an encouragement to very pious people, as it shews them that conjugal duty and piety are not incompatible.

If my idea of Matt. xix. 11, 12³, and of 1 Cor. vii. be just,

been to the present *purpose*. The question probably is, may I live *single*, notwithstanding some dangers of single life? the answer is, yes, if you think you shall have the *virtues* of single life; but every man has not these particular virtues; which, when referred to God, is, it is not *given* to every man to live in single life. Suppose the question had been, may I *marry*, notwithstanding some dangers of a married life? (those of immoderate anxiety, worldly-mindedness, &c.) the answer would be just the same; yes, if you think you shall have the *virtues* of a married life; but every man has not those

particular virtues; or, it is not *given* to every man to live well in a married life. St. Paul seems to conceive, that one man may (from his temper, habits, &c.) be most virtuous in a single state, another in a married state:—“Every man hath his proper (peculiar) gift of God; one after this manner, and another after that” (ver. 7).

¹ Art. xiv. sect. 3. ² 1 Cor. vii. 5.

³ I might have made *two* cases of these, but the same reasons applying to both, there must have been some tautology. In both I can fancy some *self-deceit*, though answers are given on the same

IV. deliberations on marriage, as right or wrong, ought to turn
 407 upon principles of moral *utility*, in each person's particular
circumstances. We may therefore observe, that it may be
 much easier to "attend upon the Lord without distraction⁴,"
 in married life, *now*, than during the first propagation of the
 Gospel; that times of *danger* differ greatly from times of
security; that the former call generally for *single* ministers,
 the latter for *married*, as danger lessens the strength of the
 passions now under consideration, and security increases it;
 and that it may often happen, that a *single* state may be best
 adapted to the duties of *study* and contemplation, and a mar-
 ried state to the ordinary *pastoral* duties, in which a *wife* or a
 daughter may perform some of the offices of an ancient
deaconess. Such observations as these may be made, and may
 be of some use; yet they should always be understood as
 408 capable of variation and modification from the circumstances
 and dispositions of particular men.

In short, if some situations are best filled by ministers who
 are married, and others by the unmarried; and if a sense of
duty may rightly impel some ministers to marry, and others to
 remain single; neither a state of celibacy nor of marriage
 should be *forbidden*. And if anything whatsoever makes
restraints pernicious, that is enough for the purpose of our
 Article.

Let those marry who judge it best to do so; as many may
 still remain single as find that a single life will, in their
 peculiar circumstances, "serve better to godliness," either in
 preventing moral evil, or in promoting spiritual good.

footing as if the proposals to live single
 had been quite sincere: unless any one
 should allow something of a refined *rail-
 lery* in the answer given by Christ him-
 self.

In the first case, I can fancy a *peevish
 Jew*, (Art. vii. sect. 14, or vol. II. p. 23,) vexed that he cannot follow his caprice in
divorcing; and urging, with some petu-
 lance, one had better not marry at *all*
 than be fettered in this way! thinking this
 is a sufficient objection to our Saviour's
 strictness;—yet *speaking*, as a *disciple*
 (Matt. xix. 10), who would be *reckoned*
 to give up all for Christ, and persuading
 himself that he really would. His Lord
 answers, Do not be uneasy; you are not
obliged to marry if you do not approve it;

and so on, as before.

In the second case, I can fancy a con-
 vert, who would willingly persuade him-
 self that he is very zealous for the cause
 of Christianity, struck with the inter-
 ruption which it would give to his *do-
 mestic* enjoyments if he devoted himself
 wholly to promoting it. He hopes,
 (though he is scarce conscious of such an
 hope) that St. Paul will tell him to marry
 at all events; but he *expresses* his diffi-
 culty by proposing to live *single*. St.
 Paul treats his proposal candidly, but
 seriously; and takes the occasion of giving
 good advice, generally useful, but does
 not, as perhaps had been expected, wholly
 reject the proposal.

⁴ Verse 35.

19. Not to conclude without some *application*, I will IV. just observe, that *Dupin* is, on this Article, so tolerant, as to leave no room for dispute, or for reconciliation.

One might conclude with the end of the Homily against Adultery¹.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

409

OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO
BE AVOIDED.

THAT person, which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

1. When we were treating of the Romish sacraments², we divided *penance* into private and public. Public censure of a church, especially that ignominious *excision*, which seemed to degrade a man from the society of Christians to that of malignant spirits, has been always interesting—from the infinite importance of such a degradation, and its powerful influence on the mind.

This Article may be conceived as including the whole subject of *Church-discipline*;—as all penalties are submitted to, in a church properly so called, independent of all political *states*, through the dread of excommunication. In the twentieth Article we spoke of ceremonies, &c., but nothing of discipline.

2. *Imprecations* of a direful nature were in use amongst 410 the *heathens*³, and *exclusion* from sacred rites was also practised⁴. What *Cæsar* says of the religious discipline of the ancient *Druids*, bears a strong resemblance to that in later times⁵.

¹ Homilies, p. 104, octavo.

² Art. xxv. sect. 4.

³ Potter's Antiquities, vol. I. p. 245.

⁴ Wilson's Archæol. Dict. under *Ex-*

communication.

⁵ *Cæsar de Bello Gallico*, Lib. VI. cap. xiii. (or p. 209, Edit. Variorum 1651, Lugd. Bat.)

IV. The *Jews* had the punishment of *excision*, by the Law of *Moses*:—they were, for some offences, “cut off from the congregation⁶.” And the *Rabbins* have multiplied excisions greatly⁷. Their method of supplying the loss of their criminal jurisdiction, while they were in captivity at *Babylon*, was curious. They inflicted *imaginary* punishments, in the belief that they would be realized by *Jehovah*; as, for instance, if a man committed an offence which by the law was punished by *stoning*, they had a confidence that when he was sentenced he would providentially be killed by a stone.

Ezra x. 8, and Nehemiah xiii. 28, 29, give some notion of penal separation; but the exclusions or separations there spoken of seem to have been calm and quiet. Some of the separations, or anathemas, denoted by $\square \Gamma \Gamma$, were attended with *execrations*⁸. Avoiding an offender under sentence was usual. Degrees of excommunication, or excision, are differently described, but there seem to have been a *greater* and a *less*. In the time
411 of Christ some were cast out of the Jewish *synagogue*⁹: the word ἐξέβαλον, John ix. 34, is, in the margin, translated, “*excommunicated*.” I do not distinguish between ecclesiastical and *civil* expulsion amongst the Jews, as they were under a *theocracy*.

3. The first Christians carried on the expressions to which they had been accustomed as Jews; and in some degree followed the Jewish practices. We had occasion to say something of this in explaining the word “*accursed*”¹⁰ in the eighteenth Article. But what is contained in Scripture must not be enlarged upon here, as it belongs, properly, to our proof.

The discipline of the early churches was mild, without being remiss, or unequal—free from every idea of partiality, or interest. No offender was allowed to offer money, or other presents; and the dignity of religious society was not let down, when the greatest personages stood in need of reproof or correction¹¹.

A learned man¹² says, that excommunications *began* with Victor and Zephyrinus, bishops of Rome; and that private

⁶ Exod. xii. 19. There is a number of texts in the Concordance under *cut-off*.

⁷ See Wilson's Archæol. Dict. under *Excision*. Wotton's Misna, p. 155, vol. 1st. Seder Kodashim, title 7. Cere-thoth.

⁸ Forbes, XII. iii. 14. Limborch, VIII. viii. 12.

⁹ John ix. 22, 34; xii. 42; xvi. 2. Luke vi. 22.

¹⁰ Art. xviii. sect. 8.

¹¹ An instance or two might be read out of Bingham, (vol. II. p. 50, col. 2, being part of XVI. iii. 5):—that of *Valentinian*, and that of *Theodosius* the Great.

¹² Selden. See Neal, II. p. 194.

pique occasioned them. He was no friend to ecclesiastical IV. punishments. Tertullian¹ mentions the exclusion of *Valentine* and *Marcion*. Cave places Valentine in 120, Marcion in 130, and Victor in 192.

From the canons of the Council of Nice, in 325, we see, that offenders were excluded, as penitents indeed, for a long term, (that of *ten years* is mentioned once); but that the bishops, on perceiving strong marks of genuine remorse, had some discretionary power of shortening the penitence². One of 412 *our* excommunications is not supposed to continue so long as one of these. About this time, the penitents used to come to the churches, and within them as far as they were permitted, shedding tears, and shewing other signs of great contrition³.

The fault mentioned in our Article, of *encouraging* those who are under censure, is one which was always noticed. We find in *Cyprian's* time that the encourager shared the same fate with the first offender⁴.

Augustin seems to have had an idea, that a Christian who died obstinate, and refused to be reconciled to the Church, was guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost: that sin was sometimes thought to be final impenitence⁵. Dr. Fulke thinks that such obstinate person must have died an *heathen*⁶. Yet the ancient Church used sometimes to let offenders die under its displeasure, though it gave them hopes of forgiveness from God, and prayed for them. (Bingham, xvi. ii. 16, end.)

The distinction between a less and a greater excommunication, seems to suit the difference of offences, and to have prevailed at all times⁷: the *less* being exclusion from sacraments, &c. as a temporary punishment, intended to make an offender serious, humble, penitent, and alarmed about his eternal salvation, and at the same time to prevent his corrupting the good; 413 the *greater* being an unlimited exclusion from all *intercourse* with the regular and pious—the cutting off of one whose reformation seemed quite *desperate*; and that *in terrorem*, meant sometimes, perhaps, as a sort of foretaste of future con-

¹ See Bingham, xvi. ii. 13.

² First Council of Nice, canon eleventh.

³ This is mentioned in Dr. Priestley's Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 169.

⁴ See Forbes, XII. iii. 2. The same thing is said by Thomas a Becket, as

decreed by some eighth synod. See John Fox, vol. I. p. 286.

⁵ Art. xvi. sect. 4, note.

⁶ On Rhem. Test. Matt. xii. 31. Wheatly on Common Prayer, p. 465.

⁷ Forbes, XII. iii. 10. Bingham, xvi. ii. 7—, xvi. iii. 9. Blackstone and Burn.

IV. demnation. So that the less excommunication seems to have had chiefly in view the good of the offender; the greater, the good of the community.

In order to get an idea of Christian excommunication in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, it may be sufficient to keep in mind this distinction; and to read the form by which *Synesius*⁸ passes sentence of the greater excommunication on *Andronicus*. From which it appears,

1. That when an offender was excommunicated in one church, public notice was given to other churches.

2. That one excommunicated by *one church* was considered as excommunicated by *all*.

3. That if any church *received* the offender, it shared in its censure, so far as to be thought to *deserve* excommunication; though that punishment did not extend to bodies *corporate*⁹.

4. That the offender was not only excluded from the Sacrament, but from *private*, familiar, convivial intercourse—from *marriage* and Christian *burial*. Sometimes the pronouncing of such sentence seems to have been attended with *execrations*¹⁰.

Yet this expulsion was not considered as annulling *Bap-*
414 *tism*; so that a person, if received back into the church, need be *re-baptized*;—nor as taking away *natural* and *civil* rights¹¹. The offender was sometimes *prayed* for¹². His *children* were educated as Christians.

As ecclesiastical society has no coercive power, no power over person or property, when a sentence was passed before any *nation* was *Christian*, there was a difficulty in getting it *enforced*. Application was made in this case to *heathen* powers. The emperor *Aurelian*¹³ is mentioned as having lent his civil power to enforce the sentence of a Christian community¹⁴.

4. In the following centuries, as reason grew weaker, and superstition stronger, excommunication kept assuming a very terrible appearance; and as it was religiously *obeyed*, its effects were truly *tremendous*. But if men are too often threatened, though they may shrink for awhile, they will begin to look about for means of escaping the storm;—and those who are to *execute* threats will grow remiss. When excommunications

⁸ See Synes. Ep. 58. p. 199, translated in Bingham, xvi. ii. 3. Cave places him in 410.

⁹ Bingham, xvi. iii. 7. Burn's Eccles. Law.

¹⁰ Bingham, vol. II. p. 44, col. 2, part of xvi. ii. 17. ¹¹ Bingham, xvi. ii. 5.

¹² Forbes, XII. iii. 2.

¹³ A. D. 270—275.

¹⁴ Bingham, xvi. ii. 3.

came to be often repeated, they began to lose their terrors; and as it is human to run from one extreme to another, they at length came; perhaps, to be *too little* regarded. But this observation includes some length of *time*. IV.

Excommunication rose to a great height in the ninth century¹; but still higher in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth. Then it was reckoned a more terrible punishment than death itself. It dissolved all those *connections* and mutual obligations by which the world is generally kept from running into anarchy and disorder—the connections of consanguinity and affinity—the obligations of civil authority and subjection. The practice of issuing national *interdicts* is said to have begun 415 about the year 1160; but I will *read* to you Fox's account of the excommunication of the Emperor Henry IV. by Hildebrand, (or Gregory VII.) in the year 1076 or 1077, as the first instance of the kind; and Hume's account of the excommunication of King John of England, in the year 1206, as connected with ourselves².

Nor has there been greater extravagance in the effects of excommunication, than in the *manner* in which it has been conducted. *Ceremonies* have been used, more suitable to the orgies of the *Furies*, than to supporting the kingdom of the Prince of Peace. Torches, bells, trampling under foot³, execrations composed and recited in set forms, have served to express the rage of the superstitious zealots, and to annoy the wretched delinquents. The *dead* have not been suffered to rest in quiet; and *brute* animals, such as rats, flies, caterpillars, have had excommunication denounced against them. As these could not be ejected out of any Christian community, I should rather have called it *imprecation*. However, as a sentence was to be passed, it was right to give the *rei* fair play. It is said that an *advocate* was allowed these little intruding animals—an instance, if true, of wonderful candour and fair dealing!

Indeed, in more ancient times, when it was the custom to 416 recite aloud the *names* of all those departed Christians who

¹ Chambers's Dictionary.

² For the instances here mentioned, See Bingham, xvi. iii. 7. and xvi. ii. 5. Fox's Acts and Monuments, vol. i. p. 231, 234. And Hume's History of England, A. D. 1206.

³ Chambers's Dict. from *Fevret*, a law-

yer of Dijon, who died in 1661, and is said to have written a good treatise *de Abusu*. (Ladvoat). Of insult to the dead, the instance of Wickliffe has been mentioned, when we spoke of the Council of Constance, sess. VIII. art. xxi. sect. 2. Fox, i. 515. Bingham, xvi. iii. 12. Burnet, p. 460, octavo.

IV. had distinguished themselves, and who had been recorded in the *Diptychs*, or folding books, it was sometimes found, or thought, necessary to *correct the lists*⁴: sometimes a name was to be *inserted*, even though the person had been under censure, if unjustly; and so, sometimes, a name was to be *erased*, if any unknown offence appeared: such *erasing* would be a kind of *anathema*. But if posthumous praise be thought worth giving, it implies that posthumous blame is to be given also, when deserved.

The meaning of cursing *by bell, book, and candle*, may be guessed at from what has been said, but I will read Dr. Priestley's⁵ short account of it.

The *schoolmen* enter into nice questions concerning excommunication; and it is a subject not barren! They endeavour to investigate how far God will confirm an erroneous or oppressive sentence; how a good man is to behave under such a sentence⁶; what effect any sentence, just or unjust, is to have upon a man's friends or relations; with what limitations and restrictions he is to be *avoided*, &c. &c.

We are told by *Burn*, that the synod held at London in 1126 agreed to receive no unknown communicants at any church, for fear of receiving such as had been excommunicated.

5. I imagine we may conceive excommunication as in considerable force in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but that force rather decaying. *Wickliffe* was excommunicated by the Pope; and in the Council of *Constance* we find several
417 propositions condemned, in which he had asserted that he ought to account⁷ such excommunication for nothing.

By the time of the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent the *Romanists* began to adopt some moderation and caution on this subject; and even to assign *experience* as the ground of their moderation: "cùm experientia doceat si temerè aut levibus ex rebus incutiatur, magis contemni quam formidari, et perniciem potiùs parere quàm salutem." Still they retained the method of excommunication, in both degrees. "Excommunicatus verò quicumque, si post legitimas monitiones non resipuerit, non solùm ad *sacramenta* et communionem fidelium ac *familiaritatem* non recipiatur, &c." But at last he may be prosecuted for *heresy*; which offence would be punished by death.

⁴ Bingham, xvi. iii. 12.

⁵ Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 179.

⁶ Forbes, xii. iv. 41, &c.

⁷ Baxter on Councils, p. 432.

While on the subject of the Romanists, I will just add, IV. that their sacrament of penance, and particularly *confession*, supersedes¹, in modern times, other kinds of discipline;—and that *Dupin*² makes no objection to this Article.

Since the Romanists appear to have been so moderate at the time when the *Reformed* Churches compiled their confessions, we cannot expect to find in those confessions any great asperity against the Church of Rome. That of *Augsburg*³ refers to past grievances; but I do not perceive that any other does, except that of *Wittemberg*, in blaming the Romish theory. Several of them seem desirous to represent the Church of Christ as having more business with teaching, comforting, or kindly *rebuking*, than with excommunicating. His kingdom, 418 say they, is not of this world—the *πολίτευμα* of Christians is in heaven⁴. But I will mention a few particular remarks, which I made in running over the confessions of the reformed. The *Helvetic* Confession is very wary—cautions of plucking up corn with the *tares*. The *English* (by Bishop Jewell) is for removing *scandals*, for the sake of the good⁵; and understands, by the *Keys* (as the ancients did), the true sense of Scripture. The *Scotch* excludes from sacraments by making *examination* necessary for admission. The *Dutch* is for discipline, and for rebukes from the senate or *presbytery*;—but gets off by saying, that all *will* go well when good *elections* are made. The *Confessio Argentinensis* (Strasburg) declines severity. That of *Augsburg* enters fully into the difference between civil and ecclesiastical power and mixed—is mild, but allows of expulsion, “*sine vi humanâ, sed verbo:*” it is for warding off *heresy*. The *Saxon* holds the mild doctrine. And that of *Wittemberg* is more intent on denying the rectitude of the *papal* ecclesiastical government, than on defining a more perfect scheme⁶.

The *Socinians*, in their *Racovian Catechism*, speak as if they would *avoid* the *company* of an offender, and yet take some opportunity of admonishing him as a brother. Or if this does not reclaim him, then they would *banish* him from the Church of *Christ*, and no longer own him for a brother, but count him for an *alien*⁷.

¹ Burnet.

² Third Append. to Mosheim.

³ *Syntagma*, p. 59.

⁴ John xviii. 36. Phil. iii. 20.

⁵ *Syntagma*, pp. 63, 116.

⁶ For these passages, see *Syntagma*, pp. 156, 179, 235, 60, 93, 133 (the paging begins a second time).

⁷ *De Ecclesiâ Christi*, cap. iii. p. 346.

IV. I do not recollect any thing in the time of Henry VIII. 419 worth mentioning. Private discipline seems to have consisted in confession, and public, in burning heretics.

In the reign of Edward VI. the *Reformatio Legum* takes very great notice of excommunication; and gives forms⁸ of great length, considering the size of the whole Code of Laws. And there are two⁹ short chapters on the principal business of our Article, *encouraging* offenders under sentence of excommunication. The punishments seem very severe.

In one of the *canons*¹⁰ of James I. offenders are ordered to be denounced four times a year.

6. When we come lower, we should divide English Christians into three sorts: *Erastians*, *Puritans*, and *moderate Church-of-England men*.

Some were called *Erastians*, from following the notions of one *Erastus*, a German, who died in 1582. He was a physician, but wrote some treatises on Church-government—on excommunication, and the power of the *Keys*. He reduces all Church power to *persuasion*. No one, he holds, should be *kept* from the *sacrament*, but only *persuaded* that he ought not to receive it unworthily. Christianity is offered to all. As some provision must be made for ecclesiastical offences, he ranks them with *civil* ones; and holds that all offences of every kind are to be punished by the civil magistrate. This idea was favoured, in the disputes in the time of our Charles the First, by some men of great character and ability, both in parliament and in the Assembly of Divines held in 1645. *Selden*, *Whitelock*, and Dr. *Lightfoot*, are mentioned¹¹ as favouring it.

420 Opposite to these were the *Puritans*, or *Presbyterians*, who held, that excommunication ought to be only of a *spiritual* nature, and deprive a man only of spiritual comforts¹²; but that it was entirely in the hands of the *Church*, and wholly *independent* on the *civil* magistrate, and ought not to be administered by *laymen*. A party of these, in 1645, made a strong attempt to establish, as their right, a power of excluding any Christians from the Sacrament, subject to no control from the state; which they were to exercise *jure divino*. The assembly and the parliament saw the necessity of preventing

⁸ Page, or fol. 74, and 80.

⁹ Cap. vi. xi, opposite pp. 77. 83.

¹⁰ Canon 65.

¹¹ Neal, vol. II. p. 97.

¹² *Ibid.* vol. I. p. 354. See also p. 158.

such an *imperium in imperio*; and the Presbyterians were IV. disappointed.

The third, *moderate* sort of English Christians allowed, with the Erastians, that a society merely ecclesiastical had no power of touching persons or property; and, with the Presbyterians, that such a society is, in its nature, independent on the state; but affirmed, that it is wholly *impracticable* for an ecclesiastical society to be composed of the subjects of any state, and to exist within that state, without connecting itself with the civil power—without borrowing from it strength and force, and assisting it with good sentiments and principles, productive of obedience for conscience sake¹.

7. He who keeps these three sorts of English Christians in his mind will want very little farther information. It may not however be amiss to mention the modern *Baptists*. They seem² to follow our Saviour's directions given Matt. xviii. 15—17, exactly, and with very good effect. No wonder; it is an admirable plan³: it is applied to differences between individuals; and if any man is guilty of scandalous immorality he is excluded from the brotherhood. The dissenters complain of our want of strictness in church-discipline, and with reason. Dr. Wall laments it, yet makes as good an apology as the truth will allow⁴. 421

8. There has been something greatly *distressing* in the case of those who were excommunicated by a church, merely because they preached *doctrines* contrary to its own, when they thought themselves obliged in *conscience* to do so. To have such people suffer all the rigours of excommunication, is to perpetuate every corruption, and to preclude all improvement.

It is as much the nature of religion to approach gradually towards perfection, as of anything else. This was the distress of *Wickliffe*⁵ in the fourteenth century, and of the *Puritans*⁶ at the beginning of the seventeenth; and very cruel hardships they suffered. Some expedient should have been invented to make a difference between criminals and conscientious men. We now have one, *toleration*⁷; and nothing can shew its excel-

¹ This subject is treated Book III. chap. xiv.

² Wall, 4to, p. 453.

³ Dr. Priestley seems to speak of it with pleasure. Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 167.

⁴ Wall, 4to, p. 454.

⁵ Wickliffe died in 1384.

⁶ In 1604. Neal, 1. p. 429. See Warb. Alliance, p. 71. Book I. chap. v. sect. 2.

⁷ Book III. chap. xiv. sect. 15.

IV. Hence more clearly than the distresses now mentioned. The Scripture says, “come out of her⁸ ;” quit a church which really appears essentially corrupt. But there was no way to get out, with tolerable safety, when there was no toleration ; nor without making a party large enough to throw all things into confusion.

422 In Blackstone’s Commentaries⁹ we find that both the less and the greater excommunication still subsist in our own country ; the less excluding from sacraments, the greater from all society. The coercive power is lent by the common law, which excludes the excommunicated from all acts of *probus et legalis homo*—from the acts of juryman, witness, &c. Burn gives us good information on this matter.

I take Warburton’s Alliance to be the book which gives the best idea of the theory of civil, ecclesiastical, and mixed power, and consequently of excommunication¹⁰.

9. From history we deduce *explanation*.

In the *title*, “*excommunicate persons*,” may mean persons under either sort of excommunication, the less or the greater ; the greater growing out of the less.

“Open denunciation”—refers to the *practice* already mentioned : our sixty-fifth canon was made after our Article¹¹.

“Of the Church.”—What is meant by the Church appeared under the nineteenth and twentieth Articles—any particular church, considering itself as making a part of the universal Church. And the conduct of the ancient churches towards each other suits our former accounts very well, as given in those Articles.

423 “Rightly.”—What we have to do, then, is built upon the supposition that a person is *rightly* excommunicated : that may save us trouble. It would be a great hardship to be obliged to avoid any one whom we thought *injured* ;—and who, according to our Article, is to be *judge* but ourselves¹² ?

“Cut off”—is a scriptural expression : Rom. ix. 3 ; Gal. v. 12. It frequently occurs, as appears from the Concordance. *Excision* we have had before.

⁸ Rev. xviii. 4. 2 Cor. vi. 17.

⁹ Vol. III. p. 102, 4to.

¹⁰ See Index, and II. iii. 3.

¹¹ The ninth chapter of the *Reformatio Legum*. De Excommunicatione, is entitled, *Excommunicatorum denunciatio*.

¹² Suppose a man thought, with the Erastians, that *no man* was rightly cut off ; need he scruple to assent to this Article ? would it not, indeed, be to him a *dead letter* ? according to Book III. chap. ix. sect. 9 ?

“The unity of the Church.”—If a particular church is a constituent part of the universal Church, then cutting off from the *part* is cutting off from the *whole*—from whatever link an insect is driven, it is driven from the *chain*. Cyprian wrote *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*. Allusion is made to such texts as John xvii. 11, 21, 22; Eph. iv. 3, and 13.

“The *whole multitude* of the faithful”—means all particular churches, constituting together the *universal* Church. The denunciation used to be made to all churches within reach; as we have seen.

“As an heathen and publican.”—Regarding any one as an *heathen*, is regarding him as a *man*; which is leaving him all the rights of *humanity*. Regarding any one as a *publican*, is not what we are obliged to in the *literal* sense. We cannot be obliged to look upon an excommunicated person as a collector of taxes, as an *exciseman*, or custom-house officer; but only in that light in which a publican used to be regarded in our Saviour’s time¹. Our Article is very indulgent in not saying that we are to *avoid*² an excommunicated person, or refuse him our *company* on every occasion; or help to drive him from the Lord’s table. Our Saviour sat down at meat with publicans and sinners, when his business was to endeavour to reform them³. 424

“Until”—shews that the excision here spoken of is not *final*, unless the offender chooses to make it so: his continuance in his state of disgrace must be solely owing to his refusing to undergo the punishment, or penance, to which he is sentenced.

“Openly”—implies *notification*, such as was used when the sentence had passed;—the Article says, “by *open* denunciation.” The excommunicated are not to be suffered to insinuate themselves *gradually* into the Church: as they were excluded, so they are to be received, by *judicial* process.

10. Now proceed we to our *proof*. And what is to be proved? ‘Suppose a person rightly suspended from the use of Christian ordinances, every Christian ought to be cautious of frustrating such discipline.’ This must be clear enough in

¹ It is only fair to take the meaning of the word *heathen* in the same way; in that light in which the *Jews* considered it: still, from the story of the good Samaritan, an heathen is a *man*.

² The *title* mentions *avoiding*, but no precise degree of it; and we do not subscribe to the *titles* of the Articles.

³ Matt. ix. 10; xi. 19.

IV. itself; but still our business seems to be, to take a view of what the *Scripture* says on the subject—either on the business of *setting aside* those whose continuance in society is likely to do harm, or on the nature of our *behaviour towards* them when they *are* set aside. I will take some passages in the order in which they lie, without dividing them into two heads: Matt. xviii. 15—18. Rom. xvi. 17. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13; 425 xv. 33; xvi. 22. 2 Cor. ii. 10; vi. 17. 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14. 2 Tim. ii. 16—18. Titus iii. 10, 11. 2 John 10, 11.

11. I should think that these texts must satisfy any man that Christian churches have good reason for avoiding, in a considerable degree, those under sentence of excommunication, when there is no ground to suspect the sentence to be *unjust*. Some of the expressions want considering; but they are intelligible enough to be real *proofs*. Some of them were very sparingly used by the ancients⁴; probably because their meaning was too *indefinite* for them to be used without some comment, or doubt, and perhaps because they seemed too *terrible* to be used by man.

I will say frankly in what light some of them strike *me*.

As to Matt. xviii. 15—17, it seems at first to relate only to *private* wrongs. Your brother offends you; you are first to *expostulate* with him: if that does not succeed, you are to desire a few friends, men of good character, to be *witnesses* of your next *expostulation*; something may have been misunderstood: they are not prejudiced against the offender, as you may be supposed to be; nor he against them: he may not be *ashamed* to submit to *them*, though he may to *you*. If this fail, state the case to the *ἐκκλησία*, to some reputable society—perhaps to those with whom you commonly associate in religious worship⁵, and desire their *arbitration*. If they favour your opinion, you may have confidence in it; and having done every thing in your power towards a reconciliation, you may

⁴ Bingham, xvi. ii. 16.

⁵ *Selden* says, the *Ecclesiæ* were "courts of law which then sate at Jerusalem"—(he says this in the house of commons, in 1645; Neal, vol. II. quarto, p. 194.) But were they *Jewish* courts? then 1 Cor. vi. 1, or rather the same *principle*, would be *against* referring to them; and there could not be any *Christian* courts of law so soon. It does not seem

likely that Christ should send his new disciples to *Jewish* courts of law. Yet it may be said he *had* no disciples, or none formed into a *body*. But might not Christians, as soon as they acted socially, have something *corresponding* to Jewish courts? If they had, the term would be used for them. Compare Matt. v. 21, 22. Still recourse is to be had to *arbitration* of men in some sort of public capacity.

give it up as *desperate*, unless your adversary makes some submission. And you may avoid the society of him who was once your brother, in the same manner in which the strict Jews avoid the company of idolaters, and of those disreputable persons whom the Romans are compelled to employ in collecting their *tribute*. IV.

I used to think this direction belonged only to individuals; but the words which immediately follow give it a different appearance: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." These words must be a declaration to religious *society*. They had indeed been before addressed¹ to *Peter* only, but with some previous declarations; as, that the *Church* of Christ should be founded on a rock, that no powers should be able to "prevail against it;" and that Christ would give unto Peter "the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven;"—all which things shew that Peter was to bind and to loose as a ruler in the *Church*. It now therefore seems to me, that, though no plan can be better calculated for deciding differences amongst individuals than the one here proposed, yet an offence, when transferred from the judgment of a few friends to a *community*, might be changed from a private into a *public wrong*, and therefore when sentence had 427 been pronounced, *all men* might be equally obliged to treat the offender "as an heathen man and a publican." Moreover, a good Christian may not only be offended by wrongs done to *himself*, but by *any* bad actions which will bring disgrace upon the *Church* or upon *religion*. And the process laid down Matt. xviii. 15—17, would be equally applicable to all kinds of offences.

The terms *binding* and *loosing*, and "the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven," have occasioned many dissertations, and much controversy. It seems to me as if it would be no way necessary to have a precise idea of their meaning. For whom should it be wanted? not for the *governors* of the Church; they can but do their best in using their authority for the good of mankind: not for the *governed*; enough is intelligible to convince them that God will *ratify* the acts of those who do every thing faithfully and modestly as his *agents*. A short and *figurative* commission is not likely to *define* nicely the extent and nature of the authority which it confers; neither

¹ Matt. xvi. 19.

IV. does such defining seem to fall in with the usual methods of Scripture. Having the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven appears to me to mean, having a power to *baptize* and *admit* men into the Christian religion. But the Christian religion, though frequently called the kingdom of heaven, leads, of course, all things going on regularly, to the kingdom of heaven *above*. As to *binding* and *loosing*, let it signify what it will, if God binds in heaven what his Church binds on earth, and looses in heaven what his Church looses on earth, He *confirms the acts* of his Church; which is our principal concern. Let *binding* mean *tying*, or excommunicating, or *obliging* us to do a thing, 428 or let it mean *forbidding*², the whole sentence comes to the same thing. God *ratifies* what his ministers enact.

12. Of Rom. xvi. 17, we may remark, that if a Church were well constituted, it might with propriety take cognizance of *causing divisions*, as an offence or *crime*; and he who, by a jury or council, or other judges, should be found *guilty* of causing divisions, might justly be punished; and particularly, *avoided*³.

13. The next part of Scripture to which we come is the fifth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. In this the Apostle repeatedly orders an *offender* to be *cast out* of the Church: what kind of person he was, and what was the nature of his offence, Mr. Locke has sufficiently explained⁴. But I do not perceive that he has given any opinion with regard to the expression, *delivering the offender unto Satan*. Here the whole church of Corinth, including St. Paul's vote by proxy, as it were, are to deliver an offender to Satan, in the *name* and by the *power* of Christ. In 1 Tim. i. 20, St. Paul says that he himself delivered two offenders to Satan. The end and purpose, for which the church of Corinth were to deliver over their offender, was "for the destruction of the *flesh*, that the *spirit* [might] be *saved* in the day of the Lord Jesus." The end for which St. Paul delivered Hymenæus and Alexander to Satan, was, that they might learn "not to *blaspheme*." Now, how much evil should be referred to Satan is *arbitrary*: to 429 reject the general belief of the agency of spirits is narrow-minded, and philosophy falsely so called—to refer to them

² Wotton's Misna, vol. i. p. 309, &c.

³ It might be considered how far this offence of causing divisions would resemble promoting *sedition*—seducing mi-

litary persons from their allegiance, bringing a malicious prosecution, offering a frivolous petition to our house of commons, &c.

⁴ Locke on 1 Cor. v.

particular events, in a literal sense, is superstition; but the usual IV. indefinite manner of referring evil to them, meaning that they *may* cause evil, you know not how, depends upon custom, education, fancy. The *Jews*, religious at the same time and ignorant, referred, in their language, many events to them¹; and the Apostles had no reason to change their expressions. Indeed, *Wickliffe* refers as many things to the agency of *Sathanas* as any *Jews* ever did. The *fashion* now is, to take no notice of spirits as the promoters of evil or of good. Not that we differ from our predecessors as to any *facts*, but only as to modes of expression. St. Paul would speak to those who were accustomed to refer evil to Satan, and would therefore naturally use their language. Instances are numerous. It would be natural for him to call depriving any one of religion, *delivering him to Satan*². This may be illustrated by Acts xxvi. 18, and 1 Pet. v. 8. As converting any one to the Christian religion was turning him “from the power of Satan,” so suspending him from the use and exercise of that religion was delivering him back to the same power. And Satan being always, in men’s notions, like a fierce and hungry lion, prowling about, seeking whom he might devour, would be ready to seize upon the prey delivered to him. Yet this language about Satan was not used as if every thing said was known to be plain *fact*; but only in a way of *eloquence*, when some *sentimental* effect was to be produced—some good principle encouraged, some bad one discouraged³.

But why is such language used, as that a man was to be 430 delivered to Satan “for the destruction of the *flesh*?” or that he might learn not to *blaspheme*? “The *flesh*” is often used, in Scripture, for the *fleshly*⁴ *appetites*; and nothing could have a stronger tendency to break their force, than the mortification of being disgracefully banished from honourable society—from

¹ Art. x. sect. 50, and other places there mentioned.

² See Concordance, *Satan*.

³ Our reasoning here is only an exemplification of the elements laid down in the tenth and seventeenth Articles.

⁴ Rom. viii. 1—13, particularly ver. 5 & 6; and see Parkhurst’s fifth sense of *σάρξ*. The flesh sometimes signifies the *body*; and bodily ills are ascribed to *Satan*: Job i. and ii. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 7 (sore eyes). Ambrose makes *ὄλεθρον*

mean *castigatio*. See Forbes, XII. iii. 3.

Being in the *flesh* is being in *this life*. Phil. i. 24. Col. ii. 1, 5—(all flesh, means all *men*)—so 1 Cor. vii. 23, troubles *in the flesh*, Mr. Locke calls *worldly* troubles. I suppose melancholy or *despair* might be called troubles in the flesh. I do not think our interpretation of delivering to Satan, would be materially hurt by taking *flesh* in any of these senses. Something was said of *φρόνημα σαρκός*, Rom. viii. 6, under Art. ix. sect. 25.

IV. those who had shewn constant fidelity and affection—and consigned to ignominious solitude.

The offender, of whom the expression is used, is called the *fornicator*. The same kind of mortification would lower a man's spirits, so as to take from him all inclination to *blaspheme*: abusive language proceeds from an insolent and haughty spirit (2 Pet. ii. 18). Perhaps there is nothing which has a greater effect upon a feeling mind than a consciousness of having lost the esteem of the worthy and benevolent—than being an object of general aversion or contempt, even though softened by gentleness and goodness. Few men are so hardened as to
431 be able to bear being generally shunned⁵ and avoided. This mortification, if it took a right course, would put the *spirit* in the best way to “be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

14. On 1 Cor. xv. 33 I need make no remarks; it agrees with 1 Cor. v. 6, 7, which is part of St. Paul's argument for casting out the Corinthian fornicator.

And 1 Cor. xvi. 22 has been discussed under the eighteenth Article.

2 Cor. ii. 10 is an argument in favour of punishing in the name and by the authority of Christ, because it proves that *forgiveness* may be in his name; and forgiveness implies previous punishment.

2 Cor. vi. 17 is sometimes, I think, used for an argument; but it only orders Christians to separate themselves from *idolaters*⁶, not from disorderly Christians.

2 Thess. iii. 6, 14 seems intelligible, and may serve as a comment on 1 Tim. i. 20.

2 Tim. ii. 16—18 is not so much a proof in itself, as an auxiliary to 1 Tim. i. 20; *Hymenæus* being mentioned in both. The bad effects of religious error are strongly expressed.

Titus iii. 10, 11 serves to shew that mere false *doctrine* may be a sufficient reason for separation. *Unity of doctrine* was proved in the third Book to be necessary for obtaining the ends of *religious society*.

⁵ Our familiar language says, being shunned, &c. *is the Devil*. Suppose any one was to set on criticising that expression grammatically, as a literal one! Yet perhaps it would bear criticism as well as *delivering to Satan*. This brings to mind that other familiar phrase, of send-

ing to Coventry, the most severe of punishments to some dispositions.

⁶ This agrees with *Selden's* observation, Neal, vol. II. p. 194; only he would make *all* the separations enjoined to be of this kind. *Selden's* speech was mentioned before, sect. 11.

2 John, verses 10, 11, shews, that the separation for false IV. doctrine is to be extended to *domestic* familiarity: private *conferences* have perverted many: compare 2 Tim. iii. 6. Not that men are always to refuse their attention to religious 432 argument; but men are not to listen to supposed heresy *lightly*, without *caution* and *deliberation*. I mean not to make any caution for one religion more than another. The provision here made is for the *people*: they were distinguished from *philosophers* in our second Book.

15. As we have seen the authority on which Christian offenders are suspended from the use of the ordinances of religion, and avoided by their brethren, we should take some notice of those texts of Scripture which may dispose us to *restore* them to their former state, in case of their sincere repentance and humiliation;—as the restoration to favour seems to make an essential part of our Article.

Avoiding a person, with a right temper of mind, must fall very far short of depriving him of the rights of *humanity*. It ought to express no bitterness, or acrimony; but a kind *concern*, a benevolent solicitude, an earnestness to rectify every thing wrong, an anxious wish for the return of a truly Christian disposition. The prayers of *Cyprian*¹ would be, no doubt, expressive of all this. Detestation of a crime is always to be distinguished from hatred of the criminal. From 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13, it appears, that a Christian wife may live with an *heathen husband*; therefore taking a person as an *heathen*, does not extend to dissolving the several relations of human life. St. Paul, as before mentioned, ordered an offender to be excluded from the Church of Corinth; but in giving his order he said no more than what he thought *necessary* to make the Corinthians execute it. And when he found they *had* executed it, nothing can exceed the tenderness which he shewed, lest any *malevolent* severity should be used, or the offender “swallowed 433 up with *over-much sorrow*.” He became *diffident* of his own upright judgment, and extremely *cautious* lest he should be *tempted* (tempted by *Satan*) to indulge his well-grounded indignation so as to *delay* his forgiveness (as the minister of Christ) longer than necessity required. It is with this idea that he introduces the words, “if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it, in the person of Christ;

¹ Forbes, xii. iii. 2.

² 2 Cor. ii. 7.

IV. lest *Satan* should get an *advantage* of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices³.”

After citing 2 Thess. iii. 14, in order to enable us to punish, we should read the next verse, to prevent all needless severity of punishment, and all use of it on a wrong principle. As a general plan of punishing Christian brethren, we may, lastly, take Gal. vi. 1.

So much for direct proof.

16. In the way of indirect proof I will only propose *one objection*. Is it to be conceived, that when a man is cut off from the Church, he really becomes in all respects an *heathen*? That would be, according to what has been said under the thirteenth and eighteenth Articles, a thing greatly to be dreaded. To this question I answer, God must finally judge of that; there will be no wrong at his tribunal; yet as it is taken for granted that He confirms the acts of his ministers when they *admit* men into Christianity, is it to be conceived that he will make them void when they exclude? Their exclusion seems a thing which offenders have great *reason to*
 434 *fear*. Even supposing that they are excluded for what is in itself an indifferent action, yet destroying or weakening that *authority*, which has been constituted for the general good, is surely a fault, and one of great importance. Nay, I should say, that if a man was *bonâ fide* excommunicated for a *right* or *good action*, performed for conscience sake, yet if he did not do all in his *power* (so as not to violate *duty*) both to *avoid offending* the sacred magistrate, and to *reconcile* himself to those in authority, he would still, though unfortunate in this life, be punishable in the next.

17. In making an *application*, we may dispense with a new form of assent, and also with mutual concessions: but it is not easy to quit the Article without one word concerning *improvement*. I fear it is wanting both in *theory* and *practice*. Our ecclesiastical *laws* were formed at various *times*, and on various occasions; so that some of them cannot now be equitably enforced, in their full extent; and to adjust them to the present times, by a comparison of circumstances, would require uncommon ability. This gives room for too much severity in those who are inclined, or interested, to be severe; and for too much lenity in the timid and indolent. The mere

³ 2 Cor. ii. 10, 11. No one can doubt | sentiments who reads Mr. Locke on this
 the delicacy and kindness of St. Paul's | passage.

attempt to make a new code would be attended with good; as IV. it would make our spiritual interests to be better understood than they are at present, more worthily esteemed, and more effectually promoted.

With regard to *practice*, I believe every religious man will allow that the ecclesiastical magistrates, whose business it is to visit and correct the Church, frequently do not do it effectually. And what is the reason? Because they have imperfect laws, and because they have not the firm support of either the great or the small. What could *Hildebrand* himself do in such a situation? The *great* are labouring to have 435 all things work together, either for a secure majority in Parliament, or for personal influence, or command¹. Ecclesiastics are not to make the reformation of all men their sole purpose, because the great are their *patrons*; they must not be *ungrateful* to those who *gave* them the dignities they possess. Gave them? is that a *gift* which is conferred by *patronage*? is not patronage a *trust*, a power of *appointing*, for the sole end of promoting the *public* good?

But as the Great *mistake* the nature and consequences of their power, the *inferior orders* are *careless* and negligent about theirs; they think not of their own real value and importance. Have they not the power of *excommunication* in themselves, in a very great degree? and will even the *great* think it *prudent* to act against the united sense, if plainly rational and virtuous, of the generality of the people? It is not difficult to see how, in this way, one evil begets a number. However, in like manner, one good might beget a number, if we could once set the procreation a going. Might not our ecclesiastical judges imitate our civil ones? they have no appearance of any respect of persons: they hang the wealthy *peer*² as a common felon. But they are made, it will be urged, *independent*: by what power? could not the same give independence to judges ecclesiastical? But we must not lose ourselves in *Utopian* speculations.

I conclude with the testimony of Sir William Blackstone in 436 favour of the *highest* ecclesiastical judges, lest what I have said should direct any one's attention towards *them*. He

¹ I fear there are too many instances at present of patrons embezzling the property of the Church;—by making bargains to pay a stipulated sum instead of tithes; or by taking the church-lands

into their own occupation, and confounding them with their own; or by other unjustifiable measures.

² Earl Ferrers.

IV. acknowledges³, “to the honour of the spiritual courts,” that “justice is in general” “ably and impartially administered in those tribunals, especially of the superior kind⁴.”

437

ARTICLE XXXIV.

OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed, according to the diversities of countries, times, and mens manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word. Whosoever through his private judgement, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that other may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

1. On examining this Article, it seems as if our best plan would be to join the *history* and the *explanation* together:—especially considering what has been already said under the sixth and twentieth Articles.

438 2. In the *title* we find the word *tradition*:—it means here, traditional *practice*; in the sixth Article it meant traditional *doctrine*. A *system* of traditional practice seems to bear some analogy to what is called *common law*. In the Article, “*Traditions and Ceremonies*” come together: they mean something of the same kind of thing; and are *joined* here, as they are frequently, in order to shew what *sort* of tradition is meant. A *ceremony* enjoined by a *written law* would

³ Book III. chap. vii.

⁴ This last section was omitted at Lecture; chiefly for want of time. It did

not afterwards seem proper for the *beginning* of a lecture; and was not necessary for students.

not at first be called a tradition, yet what are called traditions IV.
are sometimes, perhaps, after having been neglected, enjoined
by written laws. Generally, they are of too little importance
to be written, and from that their name has come; yet their
name might nevertheless come to be the *common* name for
rites and ceremonies, and customs, and all *human* religious
ordinances. The last clause of our Article has the expression,
“ceremonies or rites.” The term *tradition* comes from
Scripture; as appears, not only from mention of *Jewish* tra-
ditions, but from 1 Cor. xi. 2, and 2 Thess. ii. 15, and iii. 6.

The Confession of *Augsburg* considers traditions as *loco-
rum ac temporum discrimina*; the *Saxon* calls them, “rites
instituted by *human* authority;” the *Bohemian* mentions *cus-
toms* as well as rites¹.

But though traditions and ceremonies may be of the same
kind, yet the word ceremony does not usually convey so exten-
sive an idea as tradition. If we even take ceremony so as to
include *Liturgies*, &c., it confines the attention to present
times, and generally it suggests only things visible; but the
word *tradition* carries the mind back to past times, and sug- 439
gests various institutions, which many do not distinguish from
such as are of *divine* authority. In order to see how many of
our religious institutions come under the idea of traditions, we
should imagine ourselves to abolish, one after another, all reli-
gious observances, which are not expressly *commanded* by
divine law. Some would disappear only in part, but others
totally. The Confessions of the reformed Churches reckon
the great *festivals* as traditions; such as Christmas, Easter,
&c., and even *Sundays*, and morning and evening *prayers*.
Fast-days are also mentioned in the number; and Barclay says,
that *Infant-baptism* is “a mere human tradition.” And all
psalmody, and what we call *choir-service*, is instanced in by the
Confession of *Augsburg*². But I only mention here what is
sufficient to *enlarge* our idea of traditions to its proper extent.
Varieties will come by and by.

¹ *Rites* seem to come nearer traditions
than ceremonies do. *Ritus*, quasi, *ratus*
mos (Ainsworth, from an old gramma-
rian), may include any *customs*—more
than ceremony does. See Lord King’s
Primitive Church, Part II. chap. x. or
p. 198.

² It is easy to give *instances*; but the
difficulty is, by *definition*, to distinguish

universally a mutable from an immutable
rite. Is the *water* in Baptism a mutable
rite as Socinus says? is the *cup* a mutable
rite, in the Lord’s Supper, as the Roman-
ists say? (Trent Cat. sect. 70, or rather,
Trent Council, sess. 21. cap. ii.) Bar-
clay’s expression is in his Apology, p.
355, Edit. Birm.

IV. The reformed Confessions lay down their doctrine about traditions with great care and solemnity. One may see that it must be an important matter to them to set aside a number of Romish observances; and that without weakening the reverence of the people for such as they thought it right to retain. They must do it in the face of their enemy's batteries; who would be attacking them with the canon-law, decretals of popes, and all the most powerful artillery of human authority. The Saxon Confession is so serious as to end with a solemn *prayer*.

440 3. "It is not *necessary* that traditions," &c.—This rather seems to imply that uniformity of traditions is *desirable*, whenever it becomes *practicable*; which seems farther to appear from the words *utterly alike*: they imply, I think, the more like, the better. The uniformity of ceremonies was mentioned in the third Book³.

"In all places"—at any one time.

4. "*For* at all times they *have been* diverse."

The *for* implies, that experience of the diversity of traditions, is an argument to prove that sameness is not necessary. And the argument is strong enough for the purpose; especially if we take a time near the first publication of Christianity. I do not think it is intended to compare different times, but only different places at the same time: indeed, we may first take any one time, and afterwards any other time, without limit. If this be a right idea, we cannot say *here* that the Jews had more traditions than the Christians; though that observation may have weight in another argument.

"They have been *diverse*."—Here a large field opens upon us. Traditions, or human institutions, auxiliary to divine, are congenial to human nature. A mere general principle of piety would be rude and sluggish—would want drawing out and exercising: good sentiments die away, if not frequently brought into action: human institutions are required to furnish occasions, some social, some solitary, some composed of both sorts.

Occasions must return periodically—must remind men of some events, which will move them. Social occasions of exercising religious sentiments must be furnished and filled up with employments of body and mind, suited to their end and
441 purpose: all our best and finest tastes and feelings are to be set in motion, and made subservient to religion—our love of truth, our relish of order; our taste for beauty, sublimity,

³ Book III. chap. v. sect. 2.

harmony, are to be solicited, engaged, interested: our passions IV. are to be thrown into a devout course, and to have objects presented which will excite and inflame them.

This will give some idea of the end and design of human religious institutions, as common to all men. But in what a variety of ways may this end be accomplished! to trace them out in the *heathen*, *Jewish*, and *Christian* religions, would be a work of time.

Heathens will be allowed, at any one time, to have had a great diversity of religious rites and institutions.

The *Jews* had a great number of ordinances prescribed by Jehovah, and by his ministers: these are not to our purpose. But they had what they called *traditions*—not properly of divine authority: their *Talmud* existed orally long before it was collected into a book; and about these traditions they had different and contending *parties*¹.

Christians had very few injunctions from divine authority, in comparison of the number required for carrying on a social, regular religion; for teaching, praying, nourishing and animating religious sentiments. They might have an outline, but each set or society of Christians supplied all the internal strokes according to its ruling genius and turn. No wonder they differed: the wonder would have been if they had *not* differed. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive that they should not. Every difference of judgment, education, habit, taste, situation, would produce a difference in what we call traditions. Nay, there would be so many openings for variation, that if 442 there had been only one disposition, the chances would have been infinite against a perfect sameness or uniformity.

But let us be more particular;—I mean, with regard to Christians.

5. I might read you the opening of Tertullian's book *de Coronâ militis*; but as his Latin is by no means perspicuous, I prefer giving you the translation from Wall's book on Infant-baptism². *Easter* has been celebrated according to different rules; and those who wanted to have Easter-day on the fourteenth day after the new moon, whether Sunday or not, were called *Quartodecimans*³.

¹ Art. vi. sect. 3.

² Wall, p. 480, quarto, or Part II. chap. ix. sect. 4.

³ See Epiphanius. *Har. Τέσσαρες καὶ*

δεκάτιται. Lardner's Works, vol. II. pp. 243, 244. Lardner, vol. IV. p. 306. *Aërians* did not keep Easter at all, nor any other festivals or fasts.

IV. The twentieth canon of the Council of *Nice* orders Christians to *stand* during prayer. Though perhaps *uniformity* was rather the end in view, than any particular posture, it might be more easy to make *all* stand than all kneel. There is something in the canon like this, “*ut omnia similiter fiant.*” Socrates is quoted, by the Helvetic Confession, as speaking of the diversity here meant; and Bishop Jewel says, that Augustin complained of the too great number of ceremonies in his time. We have two Epistles of Augustin to *Januarius*, on the subject of variety of ordinances, ceremonies, traditions; in which he shews his usual ingenuousness and liberality of sentiment. *Januarius* had wished to know what he should do about festivals and rites, in different *places* where different customs prevailed. Augustin’s answer seems much to our purpose⁴:—

443 “*Alia verò quæ per loca terrarum regionesque variantur, sicuti est quòd alii jejunant Sabbato, alii non: alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt: Alibi nullus dies prætermittitur quo non offeratur⁵, alibi sabbato tantùm et Dominico, alibi tantùm Dominico: Et si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus rerum liberam habet observationes: nec disciplina ulla est in his melior, gravi prudentique Christiano, quàm ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit Ecclesiam ad quam fortè devenerit. Quod enim neque contra fidem, neque contra bonos mores esse convincitur, indifferenter est habendum; et propter eorum inter quos vivitur Societatem, servandum est.*”

The *Eastern* and *Western* Churches have always differed in many observances, though both under the same Roman emperor. Under the twenty-fourth Article, we got a glimpse of Asiatic and African Christians: they differ much in rites and ceremonies, or in what our present Article calls *traditions*, from the Christians of Europe.

In later times, more *canons* have been made by councils for inferior institutions, than used to be made anciently; but some Romish canons have grown *obsolete* at Rome⁶; some (of di-

⁴ Augustin. *ad Januar. Epist.* (seu Lib.) I. cap. ii. Edit. Antv. 1700. Tom. II. (in vol. I.) p. (or column) 94.

⁵ I fancy this means making offerings for the *dead*. See Lardner under *Aërius*. A. D. 360. Works, vol. IV. p. 306. Μη δέειν, φησί, προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ προκεκοιμημένων. *Tertullian* confirms this: see the

passage just now referred to, Wall, p. 40.

“We give our oblations every year for the dead on the day of their martyrdom.”

⁶ The circumstances here mentioned appear from the confessions of reformed churches, particularly that of Augsburg. See also Burnet on the Article.

ferent ages) have been suspected as not *genuine*; and those IV. which are or have been received prove the diversity for which we are contending. Nay, Rome itself allows of diversity, so that it be not against the canon law. Of diversity of traditions 444 *since* the Reformation, I need say nothing at present¹.

Something was said under the twentieth Article.

6. "And may be changed."—It is not said *by whom*. There *may* be a competent authority; what it is, may be specified by and by: this is the *theory*. With regard to *practice*, Dr. Powell informs us, that "nothing is plainly wrong but change²;" but we must interpret him by his context. He is speaking of an ordinary state of things, in some one place; whereas we are, in our minds, comparing different places; and when change of traditions is recommended, or allowed, in any one place, it is supposed to be made on some extraordinary occasion.

Indeed, if we attend only to the expressions which follow, we must judge that the Article has in view *differing*, at any one time, rather than changing; that is, more than differing at different times. However, if it is intended to justify the changing of *Romish* ceremonies, as I suppose it may, its chief meaning is, that traditions, or human modes of executing divine laws, may, at the time when they are *instituted*, assume different forms according to different circumstances.

7. The different circumstances mentioned, are, "diversities of *countries, times, and mens manners*."

Countries—*regionum*: we should perhaps now commonly express the idea by *climates*; though climate in strictness, according to its etymology, makes only a difference of north 445 and south. The manner of *baptizing* may differ in hot and cold climates, or regions; immersion suits hot climates better, and sprinkling, cold. In the *Greek* church, a *fan* is presented to the deacon in the ceremony of ordination, because the deacon's business is to drive away from the Holy Elements those insects with which eastern countries are infested. Montesquieu says, to enjoin abstinence in general is reasonable; to enjoin particular sorts of abstinence is not so, in an extensive religion³.

One might look at the end of Queen Elizabeth's Preface to her Advertisements (or Articles) of 1564: Sparrow's Collection, p. 123. "Temporal orders *mee ecclesiastical*," means the same with the *traditiones ecclesiasticæ*, in the title

to our thirty-fourth Article. Indeed all the things enjoined in these Advertisements are *traditions*, in the sense of our Church. ² Sermons, p. 31.

³ *Esprit des Loix*, Liv. XXIV. chap. xxvi.

IV. “*Times*.”—This word is not in Bishop Sparrow’s copy, though *temporum* is in his Latin. Whereas Bennet, in his Collation, has no instance of *times* being wanting, but mentions a MS. where *temporum* is only in the margin, written with a red-lead pencil. Here the region is given, as we say, and the *times* are supposed to vary. Holland was once subject to the Spanish government: suppose a simple small republic to succeed a splendid monarchy, the same traditions would not suit both.

“*Manners*”—may vary, in a given region, and in given times. Montesquieu observes⁴, that there ought to be more festivals where less labour is required to produce plenty; and that Constantine ordered Sunday to be kept holy in cities, and not in villages; because though labour in cities is useful, in villages it is necessary⁵.

446 *Hats* are off in English Churches⁶, on in Dutch.

8. “So that nothing be ordained *against* God’s Word.”—The Puritans would not be contented with this; they would have all ordinances *derived from* the Word of God;—and so would the *Dutch* Confession. The thing is impracticable, as was observed under the twentieth Article; so they are obliged to allow little things, which overthrow their own notion. In the Dutch Confession they disclaim human ordinances thus: “Nos itaque *omnia humana inventa, omnesque leges* rejicimus quæ ad Dei cultum sunt introductæ—ut iis conscientiæ ullo modo illaqueantur, aut obstringantur.” And then they give the thing up by saying, that their presbyters must maintain and appoint *order*, and preserve society: indeed they add, that even their presbyters must not deviate from what Christ once appointed; yet they admit of *laws* when wanted for concord, or for retaining them in obedience to God. Who aims at more? The Confession of *Strasburg*, and some others, like our Article, allow any traditions which are *not repugnant* to the Word of God.

⁴ Esprit des Loix, Liv. XXIV. chap. xxiii.

⁵ Codex, de Feriis, Leg. 3. Montesquieu says, that this law must have been for the *pagans*; but it seems to me to have been for Christians. The day indeed is called *Dies Solis*, and in other laws *Dies Dominicus*, yet either name might denote Christian Sunday. The whole twelfth title seems addressed, as

one body of law, to Verinus; and several of its laws relate to *Easter*, Christmas, Epiphany, &c., and are therefore undoubtedly for Christians. Pagans might be obliged not to interrupt or disturb Christians. The *Dies Solis* is, in this law, called *venerabilis*.

⁶ Popish ceremonies would not suit our Presbyterians, were it for nothing else but difference of *manners*.

9. But though there *may* be an authority competent to IV. changing traditions, yet the next thing laid down is, that a *private* individual hath *not* that authority. There is an authority which may repeal a *civil law*, but yet the law must be obeyed by a private subject.

“Whosoever through his *private* judgment, willingly and purposely,” &c.—A man may violate human ordinances, *involuntarily*, or inadvertently, or through some urgent business, 447 as when watering cattle on a Sunday¹, or through a desire of not losing an opportunity of doing good²: in such cases our Article seems to excuse him. Another thing seems required in order to make him liable to the censure afterwards mentioned: that he break traditions *openly*. If he be induced to make free with human religious observances, there is a difference between transgressing discreetly, privately, with apologies to those who happen to know of his irregularity, and transgressing in a public, shameless manner, as if he gloried in it. The latter does much more harm than the former.

10. “Which be not repugnant to God’s Word.”—Who is to *judge* whether an human ordinance be, or not, repugnant to Scripture? It seems as if the man who breaks the ordinance was here understood to judge; and as if it would be taken as a sufficient excuse if he declared he could not obey such an ordinance without disobeying Scripture. Indeed, it seldom happens that this excuse is made³; though it has been objected to human ordinances, that they were not *taken from* Scripture. The only punishment, however, mentioned in the Article, is *rebuke*. One confession rejects *celibacy*⁴, as *repugnant* to God’s word.

11. “Ordained and approved.”—It is not of the nature of a tradition, according to its etymology, to be *ordained*, but yet that name extends to all human ordinances for the exercising of religious principles. *Approved* seems more suitable.

“By common authority.”—Common in Latin is *publicá*. Authority over *all* those who are called upon to comply;—not 448 confined to a family, or small district, but extending to the whole *community*.

12. “Ought to be *rebuked* openly,” &c.—is quotation, or

¹ Luke xiii. 15.

² John ix. 14.

³ Neal, A. D. 1566. chap. v. Powell,

p. 30. John Burges’s Answer rejoined, Pref. pp. 3, 4.

⁴ Shorter Confession of Augsburg.

IV. nearly so, from 1 Tim. v. 20. The Greek word is ἐλέγχω, and the Latin, *arguo*. Openly—*coram omnibus*.

13. *Three grounds* are mentioned on which it is wrong for a private man to violate even the human ordinances of religion.

14. He “offendeth against the common *order* of the Church.”—Every degree of disorder must check the formation and growth of religious sentiments, and must be hurtful to religious society. Order may particularly refer to religious *assemblies*: in them, every irregularity frustrates instruction, and checks devotion. Uniformity⁵ of *ceremonies* was mentioned in the third Book, as well as the nature of religious *sympathy*⁶.

15. “Hurteth the authority of the *Magistrate*⁷.”—The authority of a magistrate is not only maintained by fear of particular punishments, but by a general sense of duty, which never questions the foundations of magistracy, but takes it as a thing established: indeed, the dread of punishment is also, in the mind of obedient subjects, general, settled, and habitual. Now, whatever unsettles mens habitual regard to the magistrate’s authority, gives an opening to refractoriness in people, who never before had any idea of resisting. And that evil the conduct of him produces who openly violates what the magistrate has ordained, or undertaken to enforce.

449 16. “And woundeth the consciences of the *weak brethren*⁸.”—By weak brethren are meant those Christians who judge by general *rules*, and *prejudices*, without being able to see the foundation of such rules. It often happens that a rule may be a very good one for common occasions, and yet breaking through it, in some particular circumstances, may be no way wrong. If the weak brother cannot distinguish such circumstances, breaking the rule innocently may do as much harm to his morals as breaking it in a manner really wrong. And he who breaks a tradition may do nothing which has in it a moral turpitude, and yet his *example* may do as much harm as if he did. Suppose a man was persuaded, (which I am *not*) that travelling on a Sunday, and having cards or music in the

⁵ Book III. chap. iv. sect. 2.

⁶ Book III. chap. iii.

⁷ Civil or ecclesiastical magistrate? the argument holds as to either: the member of the Church is under obligation, both to his ecclesiastical and his temporal

governors, to comply with human ordinances.

⁸ There are a great many expressions in the Confessions of the reformed about *scandal*, or giving *offence*.

evening, were not wicked in themselves; yet he might abstain IV. from them for fear of corrupting *servants*.

St. Paul speaks of this mode of corrupting with the greatest earnestness;—as may be seen in the following passages; from which it will appear that the expression *wounding* is scriptural:—Rom. xiv. 13, 15, 20, 21. 1 Cor. viii. 9—13. 1 Cor. ix. 19, &c. Gal. v. 13.

17. This part, about private men breaking traditions, was aimed at the *Puritans*¹, I fancy; or some brethren of their way of thinking; as the Dutch were. There was a person called *Flacius Illyricus*, who seems to have been very uncomplying. Melancthon held a controversy with him. Indeed, the German contest about *Adiaphorists* was extended to merits, 450 justification, &c.; but with regard to traditions, Flacius Illyricus seems to have said, that it was better to give up any preferments than to comply². We have before had an account of Bishop *Hooper's* distresses about habits; and have observed, that the Puritans excluded the civil magistrate from all authority in spiritual matters. How was anything to be *enforced*? It was a pity they could not have formed a *separate* body peaceably; but of that enough under the last Article.

It may seem strange that the English did not contrive this, while they were separating from the Church of Rome themselves; but, I suppose, they never thought of such a thing. They had advanced so far as to think that the Pope had no right to domineer over all nations; that any *nation* might withdraw itself from his religious confederation; but that a set of Christians *in* a nation could rightly and regularly withdraw itself from the national Church, might never enter into their minds. In the Saxon Heptarchy there might be seven different churches. And Bishop Burnet thought that the different customs in our own Church, meaning those of Sarum, Lincoln, Bangor, Hereford, all reduced to one by the Acts of Uniformity, might have had their rise under the Saxon government.

18. The *Familists* complied with all ceremonies, and cared for none; as Rogers, on this Article, tells us from their founder Henry Nicholas.

¹ John a Lasco, the superintendent of the foreign Protestants in London, a Polish nobleman, seems to have been a Puritan, in 1550.

² Melancthon, Epist. Theol. p. 455, quoted by Rogers, p. 202. Rogers also

refers to Melancthon *ad Pastores in comitatu Mansfield*, for a proof of melancholy effects from non-compliance. And see Neal, vol. i. quarto, p. 97. And John Burges's Answer rejoined, Preface, p. 2. And Mosheim, by Index.

IV. 19. The last paragraph is additional: perhaps it might be
 451 thought useful, in order to state precisely what is the authority
 by which traditions may be changed. The first paragraph said
 they *may* be changed, but not by whom; the second (as I
 should understand it) that an *individual* cannot change them;
 then the third steps in, and says, that a *particular church*
 can—that is, for itself. This was a more explicit account than
 the former, of departing from the Church of *Rome*.

Before toleration was allowed, there could not well be a particular church which was not a *national* church; but now, I should think, there might.

“*Man’s authority*,”—means the authority of councils, emperors, fathers, decretals of popes, injunctions of princes and prelates.

“Edifying” is taken from Rom. xiv. 19. This is a duty of imperfect obligation; as in Art. xxxii. sect. 14.

20. It belongs to the history and explanation of the last paragraph to mention some of the *reasons* assigned for changing the Romish traditions. Those reasons will shew us the *faults* into which men may run in fixing upon religious ordinances. The Romish traditions, then, we are told³, were too *numerous*, so as to over-burthen the mind; so *intricate* as to perplex; and so nice, that the fear of not performing them all rightly, as not doing so was esteemed mortal sin, has driven
 452 some to despair, and even to *suicide*⁴. They are not suited to the simplicity of the Christian religion; which abolished a great number of ceremonies, without substituting others in their room. They have made men presume on their merits, and so have superseded the most important *principles* of the Christian life; as the study of them has superseded the study of the Scriptures. They were superstitious, childish⁵, ridiculous, unworthy of a sober man. Supposing each indifferent in itself, they became sinful by expressing wrong sentiments; as in the case mentioned 1 Cor. x. 27, 28.

21. Hence those traditions may be looked upon as *good* which are few, simple, pleasing; which exercise without fatiguing, which call into action the best principles of human

³ Confessions in the *Syntagma*.

⁴ This is cited, in the Augsburg Confession, from *Gerson*, a Romanist, who was at the Council of Constance: (of a village in the diocese of Reims called

Gerson; his name was really Jean *Charlier*: he died 1429, aged 66.)

⁵ Third part of Homily on Good Works. Bp. Jewel in *Syntagma*. King Edward’s Injunctions: Sparrow, p. 9.

nature, apply them to religion, and are subservient to them; IV. which pretend to no merit, and require little or no study; which are grave, rational, instructive, becoming, and clear from all superstition and fanaticism¹.

22. We have now finished history and explanation. Something must be said in the way of *proof*.

Three things might be proposed for proof.

1. Traditions need not be in all places precisely the same.
2. Each *individual* ought to *conform* to those settled by that authority to which he is subject.
3. Each particular or national *church* hath authority to 453 ordain its own rites.

23. For the first, a reason is given in the Article, drawn from the experience of all ages². The Confession of Augsburg cites Matt. xv. 3, 9, 11. Rom. xiv. 17. Col. ii. 16, &c. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Might not 1 Cor. viii. 8 be added?

24. That an *individual* ought to conform, is proved from the reason of the thing, and from Scripture; but to avoid mistakes, it should be again observed, that no set of Christians is understood to belong to that Church, though subsisting in their own country, which they would quit if they had a full and free toleration.

Confining ourselves to those who are real, willing members of the Church, we need only ask, on a foot of *reason*, can any end be obligatory, and not the means necessary for attaining that end? If every one says he will use his *own* means of promoting religion, that, from the nature of social religion, is the same thing as determining to use no means at all. All who associate must use the same means, or the end cannot be answered; and there is no way for men to use the same means but submitting to authority. Suppose a secretary is told to write a letter, (if I may again use the illustration), he omits to write it; he is blamed; would it not be thought very childish if he said in his excuse, that he never was ordered to take pen, ink, and paper? all that he neglected was what he had never been *ordered* to do.

¹ Here, or at the end of this Article, might be read the *Preface* to our Book of Common Prayer; a composition which has been deservedly recommended. In this place I read at Lecture a passage, which seemed interesting, from a collection of Essays called *Juvenile Excur-*

sions, by the Rev. Mr. Tindal, pp. 121—123. This gentleman is author of the *Antiquities of Evesham*, and of several musical compositions in the highest style of genius and expression.

² Sect. 4.

IV. If *scriptural* proof be wanted, in a case where Scripture might be supposed to be silent, we may allege the conduct of St. Paul as recorded in Acts xxi. 20, 21, 24, 26, and in Acts 454 xxviii. 17; on which may be read Dr. Wotton's³ remark. The first sixteen verses of 1 Cor. xi. relate to things of inferior moment, which had been taught *verbally*. The second verse contains praise for keeping *παράδοσεις*, translated in the text *ordinances*, in the margin, *traditions*; the sixteenth verse founds the observance of them on *custom*; and the last verse of the same chapter shews that St. Paul intended to give more verbal directions; such, seemingly, as he did not think it worth while to deliver in writing.

1 Cor. xiv. 40 shews that it is a scriptural duty to provide means for answering any end proposed.

2 Thess. ii. 15, and iii. 6, are about *παράδοσεις*, which might relate to either doctrine or practice.

25. Each particular or national church hath authority to ordain its own rites. This was, in effect, proved of every religious society before⁴. With regard to a *national* church, as distinguished from any other particular church, we might observe, that either it can settle or unsettle its own rites, or some external power can oblige it to attend *councils*; the contrary to which was shewn under the twenty-first Article.

26. As to *indirect* proof, I do not recollect any *objection* but one which seems of any weight—that is, Can a church oblige its members to observe all ordinances whatsoever? and this was answered under the twentieth Article.

27. Neither do I see that I need detain you by an *application*. A form of assent is not wanted. Mutual concessions 454 were considered under the twentieth Article. And improvements at the end of the third Book⁵.

³ Misna, Preface, p. xlvi. See also Lardner's Works, vol. II. pp. 346—353. In this Dissertation of Lardner there is a good account of St. Paul's compliances.

⁴ Art. xx. sect. 4.

⁵ The subject of eating *blood* might come under this Article. I did not enter into it farther than by giving the contents of Lardner's Dissertation on Acts xv. and of his remarks on Acts xxi. 20—26,

adding anything that occurred to my own mind. A comparison of these two passages of Scripture would be very useful to any governors of Christian societies, who were at a loss for rules of conduct when they were desirous of suiting men's *prejudices*. The Editor of Lardner's Works has given an Index of Texts explained, by which the two passages may be easily found.

ARTICLE XXXV.

OF THE HOMILIES.

THE second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Of the right Use of the Church. | God's Word. |
| 2. Against peril of Idolatry. | 11. Of Alms-doing. |
| 3. Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches. | 12. Of the Nativity of Christ. |
| 4. Of good Works; first of Fasting. | 13. Of the Passion of Christ. |
| 5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness. | 14. Of the Resurrection of Christ. |
| 6. Against Excess of Apparel. | 15. Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. |
| 7. Of Prayer. | 16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost. |
| 8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer. | 17. For the Rogation-days. |
| 9. That Common Prayer and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known Tongue. | 18. Of the state of Matrimony. |
| 10. Of the reverend estimation of | 19. Of Repentance. |
| | 20. Against Idleness. |
| | 21. Against Rebellion. |

1. Here again we begin with *history*.

457

The ancient Greek Fathers, Chrysostom, Basil, &c., used to preach plain discourses to the people; and the proper name for such a discourse was *ὁμιλία*. *Sermo* answers to it in Latin. Neither word implies anything refined or elaborate; but each rather denotes familiar and popular discourse. And such all *sermons ad populum* should be.

In later times, the word *homily* signifies a popular discourse, or sermon, regularly composed; but it includes the additional idea, of being publicly read, and professedly, by one who was not the author. Those of which we usually speak are supposed to have been published by *authority*.

Sparrow, in his *Rationale*, p. 223, says, that by a Council at *Vaison* (Conc. Vas.) in France, in case of the priest's sickness, &c. the *deacon* was ordered to read the homilies of the

IV. holy fathers. I see, by Cave, that one Conc. Vas. was in 442, another in 529;—I should imagine the latter to be meant by Sparrow.

We are told, that in the ninth century so large a number of what we should now call Homilies as 209 were composed by our countryman *Alcuin*, preceptor to Charlemagne, and used as ours were intended to be¹. That great emperor seems to have known how to improve mankind. I feel regret that they are lost; probably they would be plain, short, instructive.

But though in the ninth century preachers might want helps, yet at the time of the *Reformation* the need of them was inconceivably great. The country priests were extremely ignorant, if they had desired to instruct the people; but they
 458 were, a great many of them, given up to idleness and worldly pleasures. And from those who did employ themselves at all in instruction, little good was to be expected, either to individuals, or the community. The Papists taught in one extreme, the Puritans in another, and the proper English reformed ministers in a mean between the two; but a mean, though the most reasonable, is least likely to strike men, or to succeed. Nor were teachers only of these three sorts. All men's minds were afloat, all running wild, being set free after a long and slavish confinement; one might say, there were almost as many sects as teachers. What effects must this have on the minds of the people! how destructive must it be of every good *principle*! Dr. Balguy observes, "That the support of opposite religions tends to the destruction of *all* religion."² It happened moreover, unfortunately, that the Puritans were more able as well as more diligent than those teachers who were most supported by authority; so that those of the English Church, who wished to do *their best*, were not able to contend with their adversaries; nor were they able, generally speaking, to give a satisfactory account of the doctrine of *justification*, on which the Reformation turned, or to answer the long-established arguments of the *Romanists* in favour of their sacraments, celibacy, &c. In short, all was either neglect of religion, or confusion about it. No wonder that preaching was frequently *forbidden*. It was forbidden by Henry VIII., by Edward VI., by Queen Mary, and by Queen Elizabeth; nay, in the latter end of the reign of Elizabeth

¹ Wheatly, p. 283, from Sixtus Sinen-
 sis. Priestley, Hist. Corr. vol. II. p. 125.

² Dr. Balguy, Charge V. p. 256, and
 before and after this passage.

there were¹ still very few preachers. Neal speaks of eight IV. thousand parishes which had no preaching ministers². And in 459 Bishop Sparrow's Collection we may find many authentic expressions³ to confirm the account now given.

There was, in the time of Henry VIII. an intention⁴ of publishing a collection of Homilies: but it was never executed. Our first Book, which is mentioned in our Article, though the titles are not there given, was prepared in the first year of King Edward VI. in 1547, and copies of it were distributed throughout the nation. It is said to have been composed, for the most part, by Archbishop Cranmer, though some think that those eminent men who had assisted in reforming the Liturgy were joined with him in compiling the homilies—Ridley, Thirlby, &c.; and Heylin fancies he perceives in those compositions the popular style of Latimer. The method of distributing them was by a *royal visitation*;—a solemn affair! superseding all other visitations, not only of archdeacons, &c., but of bishops and archbishops. Not that the king went into any district in person; he was very young; but every thing was transacted in his name. The nation was divided into *six circuits*, and a committee of five was appointed to visit each, consisting of two gentlemen, and one civilian, with a divine, or chaplain, and a registrar: a copy of the first Book of the homilies was left, in this visitation, for every parish priest.

Our *second Book* of Homilies, the titles of which are mentioned in our Article, was published early in the reign of 460 Queen Elizabeth, in 1560. They had been prepared, or nearly so, before the death of king Edward; and they seem to be, in a manner, promised in his Injunctions. They were composed, in a good measure, by Bishop Jewel, author of the famous Apology for the Reformation⁵.

Fox speaks of some Homilies in Queen Mary's time.

After this, the Puritans were so diligent and powerful in preaching, and at the same time so regular and decent in their

¹ In 1578. See Neal, vol. i. pp. 114, 116. See also Neal, i. 245, and John Burges, Pref. p. 3. ² Neal, i. p. 320.

³ Sparrow's Collection, pp. 11, 75, 76, 123, 127. See also Heylin's Laud, p. 8; and Rutherford's Charges, p. 1.

⁴ Strype's Cranmer, p. 148. For the other things here mentioned, see p. 146. Neal, i. pp. 31, 32; and Heylin's *Hist.*

Quinq. p. 550.

⁵ See Sparrow's Collection, p. 11. Neal, vol. i. p. 103. Compare Burnet on the Articles, Preface, p. xii. octavo, with exposition of this Article, near the beginning. Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 283, says, the second Book of Homilies was published in 1563, the year of the Convocation.

IV. manners, that some of their adversaries, in the Church of England, wished for more homilies and less preaching—more homilies for the churchmen, less preaching from the Puritans. This was the case of Archbishop Bancroft⁶ at the Hampton-Court Conference in 1603, and afterwards of Heylin⁷. This looks as if the homilies had incidentally contributed towards a *remissness* about improvements in preaching: however, the number is very small for one to be read every Sunday and holiday. Alcuin's 209 would have been a more proper number.

The number of Sermons prescribed by law was small in the time of Elizabeth; and preaching ministers were distinguished from others, because none could preach without a licence from his bishop. But James I. made a canon ordering
461 a sermon to be preached *every Sunday*⁸; the Puritans, always attentive to their business, contrived to get *Sunday afternoons* to address the people in: they would not call their discourses *sermons*—they were *lectures*; and that was the origin of *Lectures*. These lectures would of course be in a degree hostile to the Church at first: now they are not so in the least. Puritans pleaded against⁹ anything but Scripture being *read* in Church: they were always enemies to the Apocrypha.

Dr. *John Burges* has been mentioned¹⁰ *before*: he refused to subscribe the Articles, unless his interpretation of some passages might be accepted by those in authority. Not being at first attended to, he was *deprived*, in course. But afterwards, James I., Archbishop Abbot, and his diocesan, accepted his sense as the *right* sense, and he was restored. One Article on which he offered his interpretation was this thirty-fifth. His book, in which this appears, was published by command of Charles I.¹¹

Dr. *Balguy*¹² says, “It seems, we are allowed, not required, to read the homilies of the Church, instead of our own private compositions; especially as those homilies are recommended to us with a particular reference to the *times* in which they were written.” Yet in many laws, &c., ministers are *ordered*¹³ to read the homilies unless they be licensed to preach. And the

⁶ Neal, i. 416.

⁷ Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 9.

⁸ Canon 45, that is, by a *licensed* preacher. If any one was not licensed, he could only, by canon 49, read an homily. ⁹ Rogers on the Article.

¹⁰ Book III. chap. vii. sect. 4; Book

IV. Introd. sect. 6; and in other places.

¹¹ X—4—10. Sid. Coll. entitled, *An answer rejoined*, &c. pp. 23—26. The Dedication is to Charles I.

¹² Dr. *Balguy*, Discourse VII. p. 118.

¹³ See *Burn's Ecclesiastical Law*, under *Public Worship*.

rubric which says, “then shall follow the sermon *or* one of the homilies,” &c. must mean a sermon by a person authorized to preach; a sermon, if the officiating minister be a licensed preacher, and choose to preach a sermon; otherwise an homily. Nevertheless, Dr. Balguy’s opinion appears to me to be just; for it is now the general *practice* to preach; and not checking practice is ratifying it. Then the form of ordaining a priest is, “Take thou authority to *preach* the word of God.” And old canons before the reformation¹ enjoin preaching. For a while there was a necessity for putting a stop to preaching without licence; that necessity is acknowledged, in our Article, to be the ground of publishing the homilies; but in all cases of necessity, when the difficulty which presses is over, things return into their former regular channel; therefore, in this case, when preaching is no longer dangerous, the obligation to use the homilies ceases.

I conclude this history with mentioning, that *Dupin*² suspends his judgment in regard to this Article, having never read the homilies which are the subject of it. Some things in them might possibly occasion difficulties.

2. Our next business is *explanation*.

Godly.—Sometimes *εὐσεβής* means *pious*, as opposed to *virtuous*³; and so, I think, it does here; though sometimes it means *good*, in a popular sense, without distinction of religion and virtue—as when it is opposed to *ἀδίκος*⁴. All religious doctrines are not worthy of this epithet. The doctrine of the mass has been called *blasphemous*.

“*Wholesome*” doctrine: we had in Art. xi. salutary, useful; —“full of mercy and good fruits,” according to St. James’s⁵ expression; or what we should more commonly call, of a good *moral* tendency. *Godly* relates to religion, and *wholesome* to virtue.

“*Doctrine*.”—The Latin word *doctrina* conveys a more just idea than the English word doctrine. The meaning seems to be, teaching, instruction.

Doctrine is sometimes⁶ opposed to *arguments*, illustrations, figures of speech, &c.

Saying that the homilies convey pious and moral instruction, or “good and wholesome doctrine,” seems to me to be opposed to any high pretensions; seems to say, they may not

¹ Burn, *ibidem*; and Sparrow’s *Rationale*, 12mo, p. 219.

² Third Appendix to Mosheim.

³ Tit. ii. 12.

⁴ 2 Pet. ii. 9.

⁵ James iii. 17.

⁶ Bennet’s *Directions*, on the Article.

IV. be *perfect*, they may not be above *criticism*, but they are good and *useful*. And who that has read them attentively, unprejudiced by the language being somewhat antiquated, is so perverse as not to allow this? who indeed does not allow it of any sermon he hears, if the fundamentals of it are not, to him, heretical? That cannot be the case while we conceive ourselves members of the Church of England; because the principles of the homilies must be the same with those of the Articles. Take the words literally, and it is enough if piety and virtue are inculcated in two pages, though all the rest be worthless and insipid, or even foolish. But in all interpretation we should aim at finding out the *true intent and meaning* of the author; and any person means to speak, or express himself, on any subject as it is *usually* spoken of.

Suppose then you had been hearing a sermon, might not you say of it naturally, ‘Our preacher gave us a very *good sermon* to-day, in a spirit of true *piety* and *virtue*; I hope his hearers will reflect upon it. That reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James, though a sensible one, was not the very best in
464 my judgment; but the sermon was a very *good* and *useful* sermon?’ Such seems to be the meaning of the account which our Article gives of our homilies. It cannot possibly mean that they are totally *perfect*, unexceptionable, such as can never be *improved* upon by the human understanding. Indeed, the character given of them shews great moderation; especially considering how very good they must appear when new.

“And *necessary* for these times;”—that is, for the beginning of Queen Elizabeth’s reign; as the Epistle to the Galatians was for the times in which it was written: but *necessary* seems opposed to godly and wholesome. The discourses are godly and wholesome in themselves, without considering any particular state of things; but for these times they are *necessary*—for times when all would be confusion and disorder without them; when that *unity of doctrine*, which is necessary to the very being of religious society, is unattainable in the common method of preaching. I would farther observe, on the word *necessary*, that it seems to imply what we ordinarily call a *case of necessity*; the nature of which is, to occasion certain measures for a time, and to have them left off when the necessity ceases⁷.

⁷ I never was more surprised by a piece of criticism than by one in the *Monthly Review* for September 1790, p. 110, persisted in, p. 360, of the same volume, in spite

“And therefore *we* judge them,” &c.—Who is meant by IV. the word *we*? Queen Elizabeth, I apprehend, not the sub- 465
 scriber. The words seem part of an injunction. I do not remember any thing like them in the Articles, except “we decree,” in Article xxxvi.

“By the Ministers”—seems to confirm this notion. It would be an odd thing for a candidate for deacon’s orders to say, I think it proper that such a particular set of discourses should be read by “*the Ministers.*”

“Ministers” are distinguished from *licensed preachers.*

“To be read.”—These words want no explanation; but yet they suggest the difference between preaching and reading. When a man *reads* anything he does not answer for its being *true*: a man may read what is ever so false, without the least impeachment of his veracity. In a court of justice, if a cryer reads a *deposition*, he has no concern with the truth of it. The honest chaplain of Sir Roger de Coverley¹ read to the family a sermon, first of one author and then of another; he gave their illustrations and arguments fairly; they might differ from each other; that was no concern of his. If the *statute law* of 466
 the land requires me to read several pages of a book in a certain assembly, it must be very bad indeed, or very erroneous, idolatrous, &c., before I should think myself obliged in honour and conscience to resist. In such a case might not the reader be allowed to suspect his *own* judgment?

Heylin wishes there had “been more reading of *homilies*, in which the reader speaks the sense of the Church; and not so much of *sermonizing*, in which the preacher many times speaks his own factious and erroneous sense².” I have sometimes

spite of the remonstrance of E. P.;—in which the words, “*these times*,” are supposed to be understood, by each subscriber, of his *own* times. The critic ridicules the notion of any ones understanding them of the times of the Reformation; and argues by way of *reductio ad absurdum*, that, if such were the case, any one who subscribed the Article, must understand *history*; nay, he might go on to *other* articles, and take *them* as declarations to be construed by some sort of reference to the *times* in which they were made. How much *history* any one must understand for our *present* Article has already appeared;

with regard to *others*, I have endeavoured, in the third Book (chap. ix.) to shew how far history is useful for ascertaining their sense: and on every Article I have thought it well worth while to make some historical observations. I believe the sense of “*these times*,” given by the Reviewers, is quite *new*. All other accounts which I have ever seen make the expression relate to the times of the *Reformation*. (Book III. chap. ix. sect. 6.)

There is an appearance, in the above criticism, of *despising* the subject, so as not even to *wish* to seem reasonable upon it.

¹ Spectator, No. 106.

² Heylin’s Laud, p. 9.

IV. thought, that even a preacher ought to preach the sense of the Church, and not his own sense; as I had once an occasion of mentioning before³.

Is then Bishop Burnet's observation just, that one should believe the Romanists to be *idolaters*, before one signs this Article? The *reader* need not form a judgment; he reads to the congregation the passages which are quoted in the homily from Romish writers, and the arguments which are there used; let every man judge for himself.

The *titles* of the homilies *vary*, in different places where they occur, more than might be wished. Of the Homily of Justification we spoke under the eleventh Article⁴. That called the tenth homily, in our present thirty-fifth Article, is entitled thus, "10. Of the reverent estimation of God's Word;" but in the Book of Homilies it is entitled, "An information for them which take offence at certain places of Scripture;" and one should be aware of the same irregularity in other instances. Sometimes a title is more full in one enumeration, sometimes in the other.

467 3. We should now proceed to *proof*; but it seems to me that our explanation has rendered proof unnecessary—at least direct proof: perhaps it may be thought that we ought to mention some *objections* to the homilies.

4. 1. It has been said, then, that when our homilies represent⁵ different *patriarchs* as desirous to have the Messiah for a descendant, they err; because it was well known that the Messiah was to be of the tribe of *Judah*. But the homily is speaking of Abraham and Jacob; who both would entertain such a wish before Judah was born.

2. It has been said that passages of the *Apocrypha* are ascribed to the teaching of the *Holy Ghost*⁶. But the compilers of the sixth Article would scarcely make an homily to contradict that Article in *sense*. On examination it appears that some passages of the *Apocrypha* are mixed and incorporated with others from the Book of *Proverbs*; and they, all *together*, are piously referred to the Holy Ghost. And why may we not refer *any* expression, as well as any action, which we think good, to divine influence?

³ Book III. chap. v. sect. 5. I am glad to see a Confirmation of this idea from authority: see Sparrow's *Rationale*, p. 219, duodecimo.

⁴ Art. xi. sect. 21.

⁵ Homilies, 8vo, p. 290. The objection is mentioned in Bingham, vol. II. p. 742, folio.

⁶ P. 303, octavo, On Alms, second Part.

Such a sentiment as is expressed in our homily by words IV. taken from the Apocrypha, if it occurred in a work of the imagination, in polished language, would by some be called an *heavenly* sentiment. Little more seems to have been meant, in former times, when some mention was made of the Holy Ghost;—only the view of the subject might be always *religious* when such an expression was used. For the ordinary manner of referring events to heaven, see Art. x. sect. 39.

Making such poor objections as these does in reality reflect 468 great *praise* upon our homilies. Some exceptions, I think, have been taken to the Homily on *Rebellion*¹. The reconciling of St. Paul and St. James has been thought not so good as some more modern. I have owned that I could not quite come up to some expressions about good works². But if we even *subscribed* to the homilies (which we do not), and many more *improvements* had been made since they were written, than these, or than have been made, I should think myself safe, on the principles laid down in the third Book³.

I have hitherto spoken, since I entered on this Article, as if our homilies were only *excusable*, and deserved no praise; but that was only for the sake of those who have a less favourable idea of them than myself. I have really a very high opinion of them, and I read them with much pleasure; they seem to me to shew strong intellects and fine feelings; a very great insight into the true meaning of Scripture, and a very nice and accurate knowledge of mankind. They abound with fine strokes of eloquence, and they contain some instances of the ridiculous, which may be imitations of *Elijah's* sarcasms on the prophets of Baal.

The authors of them have been also very conversant in the writings of the Fathers, and in church-history.

To mention one or two in particular: I have already quoted passages from the second, third, fourth, and fifth, sixteenth, twenty-first, and the twenty-seventh. I have also recommended that on *Matrimony*⁴. But I thought we received the most important service from those on what may be called, 469 in a large sense, *Justification*. Strype is of opinion⁵, that the Homily on *Salvation* was particularly the composition of Cran-

¹ Bennet, on the Article, (Directions).

² Art. xiii. sect. 5, Homily, Part 1st, On Good Works.

³ Book III. chap. vi., and chap. ix. sect. 10, 11.

⁴ Art. xxv.

⁵ Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 149.

IV. mer himself. And Bishop *Horsley* praises the set⁶ which we now speak of, and recommends them strongly to the perusal of the clergy⁷ of his diocese.

When we were treating of single life, I had intended to read the conclusion of the eleventh, as suggesting rules for making that state innocent.

If these compositions contain so many things worthy of notice in the present times, how valuable must they have been in such a dearth of doctrine as prevailed at the times when they were published! I before had occasion to observe⁸ that they throw great light upon our Articles; and therefore I will now only add, that I find them continually improve upon me; the more I read them, the more I find in them to approve and admire.

This opinion, being in reply to objections, is part of our indirect proof.

5. As the "times" are, in this Article, expressly taken into consideration, any *application*, arising from estimating the difference of times, seems to be unnecessary.

To enter into a discourse on the nature and benefits of *preaching*, would carry us too far out of our way; yet I may just observe, that our approbation of the homilies must not be understood as if they superseded the composition of sermons at this time. I said something of this before, in the third Book⁹.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

470 OF THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

THE Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or

⁶ See these spoken of collectively, Art. xi. sect. 21.

⁷ Charge, 1790, p. 36.

⁸ Introduction to Book IV. sect. 4.

⁹ Book III. chap. v. sect. 6, and chap. ix. sect. 6.

ordered according to the same Rites ; we decree all such to be IV. rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

1. The twenty-third Article was about the subject of ordaining in general ; this is about the *English* mode in particular. It will be difficult to avoid some repetition ; but I will endeavour to avoid it as far as may be, without maiming our present subject.

First, the *history*. And here, as in some former Articles, it appears to be our best plan to begin with what seems to be the general reason of the facts before us.

A religious teacher, commissioned immediately by Heaven, 471 has a system of religion to publish throughout the world. He must employ men under him as his instruments. He sends a small number on the business, he travels about to some places himself. He dies. His adherents are not dismayed. The same small number take a leading part ; they conceive themselves encouraged from above ; they set themselves upon fixing their new religion in different towns and cities ; they form *societies* at each place, which may subsist and increase after they have left it ;—that is, they leave some persons vested with *authority*. These must be steady, sober-minded persons, and of mature age and prudence. Sometimes they meet with one man much more fit for their purpose than the rest ; to him they give the more authority on that account ; sometimes they find several persons, equally qualified, or nearly so ; they divide authority amongst them, make them a council or senate. Yet, in order to proceed smoothly, some one must *preside* even in a council. And when one man has the chief authority lodged in him, he must ask advice, and consult with others ;—no fear of that, where a man has the good of society entirely at heart, and is unbiassed by interest, or ambition, or other indirect motives. Nor, in such a case, is there a necessity for defining exactly each man's powers, or forming what is called a *constitution* ; each man will know, or be taught, the place he is fit for, and in that he will act. Systems of relative powers, or constitutions, are only for those who, without them, would fall into dissension and anarchy.

In different places something is found to depend upon mens habitual notions and feelings ; that is, upon the kind of government to which they have been accustomed, in civil, 472 religious, or domestic society. But those who want to esta-

IV. blish religious societies must not only have proper persons to govern, but to perform the *offices* of religion. It seems a thing of course, that some of those offices should be performed by those who *preside*, or govern—even the most distinguished offices; but perhaps there may be a want of some persons to give themselves *wholly* to performing offices of religion, and therefore to have no part in the cares of government; if such want appear, such officers must be appointed. The things now mentioned are capable of a great variety of combinations, so as to produce a great variety of forms of religious society.

Now only use the common *names* for the persons here described, and we have a general view of our subject. For the one man, and the president, put *bishop*, or overseer; for the council or senate put *presbytery*; and for the senators, *elders* or *presbyters*; and for the officers of religion, put *διάκονοι*, ministers, *deacons*; and it is easy to conceive, that a bishop may be an elder, that elders may act as overseers; that a bishop may be a *διάκονος*, and that a *διάκονος* may be an elder; and yet that a bishop may be a superior to elders, and superior to *διάκονοι*. *Aldermen* are elders; a *mayor* is an alderman, and yet superior to aldermen; mayor and some aldermen may be ministers (*διάκονοι*) of justice; and a corporation may have some ministers of justice which are not aldermen¹.

473 2. Let us now turn to *history*; and as it does not appear to me that the Scriptures lay down any form of carrying on religious society, which is to be followed on scriptural authority, in all places, and at all times, I need not reserve scriptural facts for *proof*, but may make them a part of the *history*. Acts xi. 30, *elders* are mentioned (I mean *Christian* elders, the Jewish were members of the Sanhedrim), but their appointment is only *implied*. Acts xiv. 23, elders are solemnly appointed, and in every church: the sort of persons and the number, no doubt, suitable to each place. Acts xv. and xvi., *apostles and elders* are mentioned together; and Acts xv. 23, *apostles, elders and brethren*: the apostles were moveable; the elders and brethren, or commonalty, fixed; the elders govern-

¹ See Rom. xiii. 4, for ministers or deacons of justice, if I may so speak. The word *ministers* is the English for *ὑπέρταται*, Luke i. 2, and 1 Cor. iv. 1. Therefore I use the word *διάκονος* in

Greek, because if it is translated either *minister* or *deacon*, it seems to exclude the other. Might it not be always translated *minister*? For *alderman*, see Skinner's *Lexicon Etymologicum*.

ing the brethren (or commonalty) in the absence of the apostles. IV. Acts xx. 17, St. Paul at Miletus sends for the elders of Ephesus to come to him. 1 Tim. v. 17, elders who *rule* well are to have honour. 1 Tim. iv. 14, compared with 2 Tim. i. 6, seems to shew that the elders joined in the ceremony of ordination, even of Timothy himself. In 1 Tim. v. 22, Timothy is mentioned *alone*, as ordaining; but as it is in the way of exhortation or *advice* to Timothy, the elders might not be mentioned though they did join. Acts vi. 6, all the apostles lay on hands. Tit. i. 5, *Titus* is to ordain (*καθίστημι*) elders in every city:—an *hundred* cities in *Crete*¹, and no bishop but himself. James v. 14 speaks of elders as customary. 1 Pet. v. 1, Peter calls himself a *συμπρεσβύτερος*, a fellow-presbyter, or elder; and in the next verse speaks of elders as *επισκοποῦντες*, overlooking, and feeding the flock of Christ, the *Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*. St. John calls himself, at the opening of his second and third Epistles, *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, “*the elder*.” No epistle is addressed to the elders. That to the Philippians is addressed to the Christians at large, with the *ἐπισκόποις* and *διακόνους*. If there were “*elders in every city*,” there must be at Philippi: they might be included in the word *ἐπισκόποις*, as *επισκοποῦντες*; why else, for such a church as Philippi, is *ἐπίσκοποι* in the plural number²?

474

The name of *ἐπίσκοπος* has been thought to come from the LXX. Is. lx. 17. It signifies *overseer*. In the English Bible the word bishop occurs but three times, besides Phil. i. 1, already mentioned, and 1 Pet. ii. 25, which last is figurative: the words are, “the shepherd and bishop of your souls.” The idea of *shepherd* is more common than that of *overseer*; but they are joined Acts xx. 28, as well as here: the Greek word in Acts xx. 28, for *overseer*, is *ἐπίσκοπος*. *Timothy* may not be called a bishop, but he confers honours on the elders, proportioned to their deserts. He receives accusations against them; and Titus ordains them: these are acts of a *superior*. At first, apostles directed elders. Acts xx. 17, Paul, as before, sends for the elders from Ephesus to Miletus. Peter exhorts elders. And the expression, “apostles and elders,” occurs several times. Whatever is superior to presbyters we should call a bishop³.

¹ Powell's Thesis, p. 366.

² Lardner mentions a notion, not as his own, that there might be, early in the second century, two bishops of Antioch at one time, one over *Jewish*; the other

over *Gentile* Christians. Works, vol. II. p. 66. There might, at any time, be some *ἐπίσκοποι* superior to the *ordinary elders*.

³ For the ground of the observations here made, see Acts xv. 22; 1 Tim. v.

IV. The word *deacons* occurs but in *one chapter* (except Phil. 475 i. 1, before mentioned) namely, 1 Tim. iii.—*διάκονος* oftener; *ministers* about five times, but not as the name of an office; *servants*, or *instruments*, would have served the purpose as well. It is commonly said that *deacons* were appointed, Acts. vi.—the persons ordained to an economical office are not called so; nay, those who were *not* appointed are said to persevere in the *διακονία*—*τοῦ λόγου*, as the others in the *διακονία τῆ καθημερινῆ*. *Paul* was a *διάκονος* ⁴.

Such are the *scriptural* facts with regard to our three ranks of persons, *ἐπίσκοπος*, *πρεσβύτερος*, and *διάκονος*. I have meant to make a complete enumeration of them: they seem to confirm our notion, that *any one* may be *all three*; though the *ἐπίσκοπος* is superior to the two others. I have seen no mention of any authority in the *πρεσβύτερος* over the *διάκονος* ⁵; nor do I see *all three* mentioned *together*, in Scripture.

3. We come next to the *apostolic Fathers*:—first premising 476 from Bingham ⁶, that the *Grecian* and *Roman* custom in forming *civil* societies in towns and cities was not unlike what has been now mentioned. Each town or city was governed by a *senate*, and by a chief magistrate, who was, at the same time a *senator*, and *above* the senate. The council had the names of *Βουλή*, and *Senatus, Ordo, Curia*; and the magistrate was called *Dictator*, or *Defensor Civitatis*: his authority extended to a little *distance* round the city ⁷.

Now it seems as if the Apostles and their successors, in planting *churches*, had formed societies similar to these; lean-

1, 17, 19; Titus i. 5; 1 Pet. v. 1. 1 Tim. v. 1, seems at first as if Timothy had not a right to *rebuke* an elder; but when we compare that passage with the others, the meaning seems rather to be, that though in strictness he might rebuke an elder, yet on account of his youth, and the age of the elder, it might be advisable for him to soften his rebuke into an entreaty; nay, his youth might make it more becoming in him to use gentleness even towards younger Christians. Rebuke not, *but*, seems to have something of *comparison* in it, or a *preference* of one mode to another;—both in strictness allowable.

⁴ 1 Cor. iii. 5. 2 Cor. xi. 23.—On this

subject one might read Lardner, vol. II. of his works, Preface, pp. vii. ix. And one might ask, why St. Stephen and the persons ordained with him (Acts vi.) have been called *deacons*. Even the accurate Dr. Powell, p. 366, calls them *septem diaconos*.

⁵ That the *διάκονος* might be of dignified rank, appears from Bingham's account of archdeacons, i. xxi. 1, 3. An archdeacon was the head of the deacons, and was sometimes made a bishop. See also Bingham, II. x. 5.

⁶ Bingham, IX. i. 1.

⁷ The settlement now (1792) fixing at *Sierra Leone* is governed by a superintendent and council.

ing a little more or less to the monarchical or democratical IV. forms, according to the abilities and dispositions of the *persons*, and the *customs* of the place. So that, the combinations of power admitting of so great a variety of forms, it might happen that no two Christian Churches had precisely the same constitution of government.

Clemens Romanus, writing to, and therefore about, the church of *Corinth*, fixed in a Grecian mercantile city, speaks as St. Paul does writing about the church of *Philippi*: he mentions only *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι*¹. He laments a person's being deposed *τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*—from the superintendence; and then adds, happy are (not the *ἐπίσκοποι*, but) the *elders* who cannot be deposed—who are fixed immoveable in *heaven*². He also, according to Lord King, makes *ἡγούμενοι*, which was a name for *bishops*, equivalent to *πρεσβύτεροι*³. 477 He speaks of *subjection* to presbyters.

Polycarp also writes to the *Philippians*, and of course, of the church at *Philippi*, a town in Europe, of Grecian manners and customs, probably: I do not see that he mentions *bishops*; but he exhorts the *Philippians* to be submissive to the *presbyters and deacons*⁴. Yet he himself was Bishop of *Smyrna*, and writes from thence in his own name, and the name of the *presbyters* who were *with him*⁵. Compare his *presbyters and deacons*, with Paul's *bishops and deacons*, when addressing the *same church*, and they will seem to mean the *same officers*. I should conjecture that a *monarchical* form of church-government had *never* place at *Philippi*.

Ignatius was bishop of *Antioch* in *Syria*; and from thence he was dragged, even to *Rome*, to be torn in pieces by wild beasts: on his way, he was suffered to stop at *Smyrna*, with *Polycarp*, the bishop there. From thence he wrote to the

¹ *Clemens Rom. 1. Ep. ad Corinthios*, Edit. Russel, (*Patres Apostol.*) sect. 42, compared with 44. *Ἐπίσκοποι* in the plural, in one church, must, I should think, imply some kind of council: even if *Episcopi* were a few leaders they would consult together.

² *Ibid.* pp. 170, 171.

³ Lord King's *Primitive Church*, p. 89. *Clem. Ep.* sect. 57. p. 210, Russel, and p. 211, note;—*τῶν ἡγουμένων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων*.

But I find one or two places where *ἡγούμενοι* seems to me to mean *civil*

magistrates, and *πρεσβύτεροι* *old men*—the *aged*: see sect. 1, (p. 8,) and sect. 21, (p. 94.) And does not the last sentence in sect. 40 mean three *orders* of Christian ministers? *Levite* was not uncommon amongst Christians for a lower order of church-ministers, or clergymen; and the context here is about Christians. For subjection to presbyters, see chap. or sect. 57.

⁴ *Polycarp. ad Philipp.* sect. 5.

⁵ Inscription.—Could *σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι*, imply *συμπρεσβύτεροι*? *fellow-presbyters*?

IV. Romans, and to three churches near him—to the Ephesians, Magnesians, and Trallians. And afterwards, when he had proceeded farther on his journey, he wrote from Troas to Polycarp⁶; and also to Polycarp's church, the church of *Smyrna*; and to that of Philadelphia. In *all* the Epistles, except that to the Romans, which relates to himself and the sufferings which awaited him at Rome, he mentions distinctly our *three orders*, bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and says very strong things in favour of subjection to the two former, especially *bishops*. I may read to you, of the Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, chap. or sect. 8, 9, 12. Of that to *Polycarp*, (which changes from singular to plural number), chap. 6. Of that to the *Ephesians*, chap. 6, and chap. 2, where subjection is enjoined to *bishop and presbytery*, as it is in chap. 4. Of that to the *Magnesians*, chap. 2 and 6. The bishop at Magnesia was *young*, which gives Ignatius more opportunity of contending for his episcopal authority. He mentions the bishop as being in the *place* of God; and the presbytery as being in the place or situation *συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων*⁷; and the *deacons* as being entrusted with the *διακονία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; adorning this part with words, perhaps in order to make the want of power and authority less perceivable. Of the Epistle to the *Philadelphians* I might read the inscription. Of that to the *Trallians*, chap. 2, and 3, and 7, and 12, where the elders are to *ἀναψύχειν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*, *refocillare episcopum*; and 13, where the church is to be subject to the bishop and presbytery⁸.

From these passages I conclude, that the government of Christian churches was more *monarchical* in *Asia Minor* than in *Europe*; particularly than at *Philippi*, and that mart of commerce, *Corinth*. And if we suppose a greater disposition towards despotism in the Asiatics, and towards republicanism in the Europeans, allowing perhaps something for the great *personal* weight of Polycarp, Ignatius, and others, the difference may be sufficiently accounted for.

If there was any form of church-government which was properly Christian, how can one account for Polycarp's inculcating a kind of subjection to the Philippians, different from

⁶ *Ad Pol.* cap. xii.

⁷ Compare Ign. *ad Smyrnæos*, cap. viii. *ad Trall.* II.

⁸ Dr. Powell would not have objected to this plain enumeration of *facts*. See his Thesis, p. 364, in his volume. "Quis enim, post immensos," &c.

that which his own church (at Smyrna) was exhorted to pay, IV. by Ignatius? Polycarp also sends to the Philippians those Epistles of Ignatius which inculcate subjection to ἐπίσκοποι, not *because* they do that, but because they contain πίστιν καὶ ὑπομονὴν καὶ πᾶσαν οἰκοδομήν, &c. (Pol. *ad Phil.* sect. 13.) However, the difference of language as to subjection would thus be generally understood; the exhortations to submit to bishops would be known to churches of the most republican form, and *vice versâ*.

We must not let our prejudices lead us to imagine that a primitive bishop of Smyrna was anything like a modern bishop of Durham, any more than that *King* Romulus was like Louis Quatorze, or a Persian monarch.

4. We have now gone through the most significant part of our history. As Christianity spread, it filled whole provinces; these were divided with some sort of analogy to the civil divisions found actually subsisting¹. And it must generally be most convenient to have the place of public *resort* for civil affairs to be the same with that for ecclesiastical business. People can most easily get to it; and the circumstances, which made it most convenient for the one, will generally make it most so for the other. The more complex public worship 480 grew, the more officers would be wanted, and orders would become more *distant*: bishops would become higher officers, deacons lower. At the Council of *Nice*, Paphnutius spoke² of three orders as we should; and so spoke Augustin³. The *Aërians*⁴ considered bishops and presbyters as the same; but they seem to have been singular in this; at least our notion was by far the most common⁵.

It has been before observed that the *Waldenses* had something like our three orders. (Art. xxiii. sect. 4.)

5. I am not aware⁶ of anything farther worth mentioning till the time of the *Reformation*. Then that great change took

¹ Bingham, Book IX. chap. i.

² See Council of Nice, in Socrates, l. 2; and Suidas.

³ Ep. 21 repeatedly. Aug. is *anxious* about not being *fit* to be a priest; he would study, &c. and writes for a *bishop's* advice.

⁴ See Lardner's Works, vol. iv. p. 306.

⁵ See Baxter on Councils, p. 81, the 22d canon of the Council of Milevis, A. D. 416. And several instances from Clem.

Alex. Origen, and Tertullian, in Nicholls on Common Prayer, on the Preface to the forms of Ordination. And that expression of apostolic canon 2, 'Let a presbyter be ordained by *one* bishop,' shews that presbyter and bishop could not always be synonymous.

⁶ Art. xxiii. sect. 4. Neal says, that *Wickliffe* held only two orders, bishops or presbyters, and deacons, l. p. 3. *Wickliffe* seems to have had some Puritanical authority.

IV. place of ordaining wholly, in some churches, by *elders*. And at that time there was an idea of contracting *dioceses*⁷, or making many more; and therefore many more bishops, in a given space.

We mentioned under the twenty-third Article, sect. 6, the Lutheran superintendents; and the ideas of ordaining amongst Presbyterians and the Independent congregations. But we
481 did not mention, that the English forms of ordaining bishops and priests were, at the time of the Reformation, less plainly distinct from each other than they are now. However, the Act of *Uniformity*, made upon the Restoration, requires us to assent to our present Article according to the forms now in use⁸, which were only composed in 1661, or 1662. Bishop Burnet mentions a scruple in the time of Queen Elizabeth, which occasioned Parliament, and the compilers of our Article, to look back, and to declare all ordinations valid since the end of the second year of Edward VI. which had been performed according to the Book composed and published in the third year of King Edward, though not ratified by Parliament till his fifth year.

Anciently, all bishops were appointed by *election*⁹. But elections grew too tumultuous, and the appointment got into the hands of a *few*. It occasioned great disputes between the
482 *popes* and the sovereigns of Europe; but our Henry VIII. settled the matter in England, as it now is; giving a *Congé d'élire* to a chapter, but punishing them if they did not elect the person whom he nominated¹⁰. Bishop Warburton considers such patronage as a compensation made by the Church to the state for protection¹¹, and for the use of a compulsive force.

⁷ Bingham's Works, i. 409, folio.

⁸ See the end of the Act of Uniformity in the fourteenth year of Charles II. And Bennet's Directions. See also Mosheim, 8vo, vol. iv. p. 91; add Neal, i. p. 43. I do not seem to understand Neal in this passage; he seems to speak as if in King Edward's time, in 1549, our forms of ordaining, or consecrating, had been the same for bishops and priests; whereas they are only the same in things *common* to both ranks: as about studying the Scripture, and opposing heresy. In other things they differ. And the principal difference between King Edward's forms and those made at the Restoration of

Charles II. consists in this: in the old ones, words of *Scripture* were used, addressed to Timothy as bishop, (2 Tim. i. 6, 7,) and in the new ones the word Bishop was used, and so of *Priest*.

⁹ Bingham, Book IV. chap. ii. Stillfleet, Unreas. of Separ. Part III. Clem. Rom. Ep. sect. 44, p. 168, Edit. Russel. For elections growing tumultuous, see Bingham, iv. ii. 6. Baxter on Councils, p. 66, (and, I think, pp. 99, 101.) Nicholls on the words, "The elected Bishop," &c., and Dr. Powell's Thesis, in his volume, p. 365.

¹⁰ Blackstone, Index, *Congé d'élire*.

¹¹ Warburton's Alliance.

6. Mosheim says¹, that the *Socinians* (the early ones, I IV. suppose) have *four* sacred orders; to our three they add that of *widows*; why not *deaconesses* also, like the Puritans? or those mentioned 1 Cor. xii.? I do not see widows mentioned in the Racovian Catechism.

7. If we wish to see what the Council of Trent says on our present subject, we may read the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh canons of the twenty-third session². With regard to uninterrupted succession of bishops, we have said enough before; as well as upon the subject of re-ordaining; and upon the Puritanical notion, that all rules are to be derived from Scripture. In Strype's Annals, we have an account of a Puritan professor at Cambridge, *Cartwright*, who was complained of to the chancellor of the University for having held, that "*officia et nomina impietatis*," are introduced into our Church, meaning archbishops, &c. Cambridge was then "a nest of Puritans." According to the Article of 1552, people, in subscribing to it, subscribed to the *Liturgy*; but in 1562 assent to the *Liturgy* became unnecessary. How the Church 483 was again driven into requiring it, Dr. John Burges shews in very few words; and at the same time that he accounts for our subscription to the *Liturgy* in general, he declares, that he only assents to the *use* of it, and the same of the *rites* of our Church.

But it is time to put an end to our history: I will only mention then one or two things briefly. *Bingham* expresses, in 1726, a wish³ that *dioceses* could be *contracted*, according to the idea of our Reformers. Mr. *Granville Sharp's* notion of a right appointment of a minister is, that he should be appointed as *Matthias* was⁴, by *lot*, out of *two* fixed upon by the suffrages of the Church.

Dr. Powell's Thesis is to be much recommended, in which he proves that neither the church-government of England, nor that of Scotland, is repugnant to the law of nature, or to the word of God. It contains all the elements of religious society, expressed in the best manner.

¹ Mosheim, octavo, vol. iv. p. 185, note.

² For the things mentioned in these sixth and seventh sections, see Art. xxiii. sect. 7, 11. John Burges, pp. 3, 26, 42. Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 583, A. D. 1570. Neal, vol. i. pp. 190, 428, where

is our 7th Canon of 1604. Dr. Powell, p. 28.

³ Bingham, i. p. 409, folio.

⁴ Acts i. 26. This is what Mr. Granville Sharp has mentioned to me, in conversation. I hope I have rightly understood him.

IV. Dr. John *Burges*⁵ told King James, (&c. as before), that with regard to our present subject, he did not mean to express approbation of every phrase, &c. in the ordinations; but only to declare, that our *calling* and ordination was, on the whole, such as not to be deemed unlawful, or contrary to the word of God. His sense was accepted as the right one.

The *Romanists* seem to make the same three orders which we make. See Council of Trent, the sixth canon of the twenty-third session. As to Nicholl's saying, that they make bishop
484 and priest equal, *because* the priest can make his God, and the bishop can do no more—that is charging *consequences* of opinions, contrary to our sixth canon of controversy. (Book II. chap v. sect. 6.)

Dupin disputes the validity of some English ordinations in *theory*, but would allow them in practice, if an union took place⁶.

8. We now come to *explanation*.

In the title, "Ministers" includes priests and deacons.

"In the time of Edward VI." there were two reviews of the Liturgy; one in the second, and the other in the fifth of Edward VI. but only⁷ one form of ordination. We have no concern with this matter now, as we subscribe to the forms made at the Restoration.

"Doth contain all things *necessary*."—This is modest: it is not saying that our forms are the *most rational* and scriptural that ever were or could be made; nor even that they are not defective; but only, that they have no such capital defect as to destroy the *essence* of an ordination.

Neither have our forms anything in them that "is *superstitious* and *ungodly*:" they may be inelegant, unbecoming, injudicious; but they cannot be called superstitious or *impious*,—in Latin, *impium*; which reminds one of Cartwright's "officia et nomina *impietatis*." "*We decree*," is the same style of *injunction* that was remarked in Art. xxxv.

The expressions amount only to this, that our forms have no defect or fault so great as to annul our ordinations.

485 9. And now with regard to *proof*, what shall we say? All that we have to prove is, that 'the English ordinations are valid, or not invalid.' If every church can settle its own rites, the thing is proved; and that this is the truth, must appear

⁵ Burges, p. 26.

⁶ Appendix Third to Maclaine's Mo-
sheim.

⁷ So I gather from Burnet on the Ar-

ticle, and Neal under Edward VI. Yet *Nicholls* mentions something which was different in the first and second books o.
Edward VI.—the Ordination Oath.

from the history now given, and from what has gone before IV. in the twenty-third Article. From these we are led to conclude, that it is our business, and our duty, if governors, to adopt that form of church-government which falls in best with our circumstances and habitual notions; that it would be wrong therefore to have a monarchical church-government in a small republic, or a republican one in a large monarchy.

Indeed we might go through our forms, and defend the several expressions we meet with; but that would be unnecessary labour: a better plan would be, to see what *objections* have been made to them, or what *difficulties* they have occasioned; if these admit of solution, we may take for granted that the rest is unexceptionable.

10. Thus we are led to indirect proof;—and the objections are such, that we may propose them *together*, and so answer them without interruption. That orders is no sacrament, has been shewn under the twenty-fifth Article; and the word “*called*” has been explained at large. Nor need we take farther notice of the Romish arguments against our ordinations.

1. Is it right to have officers in the Church whose very *names*¹ are not found in Scripture, as *archbishops*, *archdeacons*, &c.?

2. We meet with *three names*, indeed, *ἐπίσκοπος*, *πρεσβύτερος*, and *διάκονος*; but we have no right to conclude from thence that there were *three distinct ranks*. 486

3. And supposing there were, *bishops* ought not to be men of worldly *dignity*;

4. Nor presbyters, now called *priests*, so far inferior to bishops as they are made in the Church of England.

5. Nor ought deacons, appointed originally for purposes of *economy*, to be so much of spiritual and *clerical* persons as the English make them.

6. Then, making ecclesiastical ordinations, or trusts, to have any *dependence* on *temporal* powers, in the way of *patronage*, or otherwise, is contrary to the nature of Christ’s

¹ This was the notion of Professor Cartwright before mentioned. Some of the other notions might be found in *Strype’s Annals*, in the years 1570 and 1573, in the affairs of Cartwright, Dering &c. *Dering* is mentioned, vol. II. p. 270.

He writes to Lord Burghley for relief. I think Lord Burghley was both minister of state and chancellor of the University of Cambridge. “Of collectors for the poor, or *deacons*”—is a synodical title of the Puritans, in 1576. Neal, I. 232.

IV. spiritual kingdom. Such ordinations must want completing² by scriptural *presbyteries*.—These six objections are all of the puritanical cast.

7. But it has also occasioned *difficulty*, that candidates for deacon's orders are asked whether they trust that they "are inwardly moved by the *Holy Ghost* to take upon" them the office of deacon.

8. And, that the ordaining ministers undertake to convey the *Holy Ghost* to those whom they ordain. Now in effect we have already replied to most of these objections and difficulties; but a word or two directly opposed to them may have its use.

11. When bishops become numerous they must have some *subordination* settled amongst them, else they could not act jointly, or with unity. That subordination might sometimes be tacit, through general respect to some great and good prelate; but ordinarily it must be by means of authority expressly given. And such authority requires an official *name*³ to denote it, and make it instantly felt. There is nothing more in giving such names than providing that all things "be done decently and in order." If there are many *overseers*, how can order be maintained without an *head-overseer*? But it must not be thought that the names of *archbishop* and *archdeacon* were invented by the Church of England: they have existed ever since they were wanted. Metropolitans and archdeacons have been known in the Church these fourteen hundred years. Nay, we might have Jerom's authority for adding *archpresbyters*⁴.

12. Supposing it were allowed that there were only two orders in the church of *Philippi*, or *Corinth*; (though to me it seems probable that the *ἐπίσκοποι* might be superior to the ordinary presbyters;) yet there can be no doubt but the *Asiatics* had *three orders*, and only *one* bishop in each church. Let then the Presbyterians have a *council* to govern them, I see no harm; but let us not be *blamed* for having bishops. If all are to go by *Scripture*, why do not separatists imitate the orders, or ranks, mentioned 1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 11? Our opinion is, that we are to have what, in our circumstances, best answers, according to our judgment, the ends of religious

² See Bingham, French Church, Book IV. chap. v. Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. 1. p. 233. Gawton's Letter to the Bishop of Norwich after deprivation.

³ See the reason for giving the un-

scriptural name *Sacrament*, Art. xxv. sect. 11. Christ is ἀρχιεπίμην, 1 Pet. v. 4.

⁴ Bingham, Book II. chap. xvi. and xxi.

society. We conceive that Christ no more insisted on a pres- IV.
bytery without bishop, than on aldermen without mayor; or
than on the newly appointed council of Sierra Leone without 488
superintendent.

13. Why bishops should have worldly *dignity*, some reasons have been given in the third Book¹. “Let no man *despise* thee,” says St. Paul to Titus², speaking of the exertion of spiritual authority: if the injunction be not for Titus, but his flock, still it lays an obligation on them, and on *all*, to prevent the *contempt of the clergy*. We have no good reason to think that Christ had any objection to kings being *nursing-fathers* to his Church; or that if St. Paul were now alive, he would say that Christian bishops should not “stand before kings³,” and in such a form as would help to promote the right spirit of courtly assemblies. At first, Christians could only *pray* for kings and for all that were in authority⁴; but other means of promoting the good ends of civil government they never seem to have avoided, as things not belonging to them. The revenues of the Church have been sometimes applied too much to purposes of luxury; but suppose a well-chosen bishop to consider them as a *trust*, and to dispense them in promoting virtue, piety, and learning—in furnishing libraries, &c. &c. (which is the only right idea of them), they would be of immense value to the public. The Gospel was to be preached to all *nations*;—a nation, as such, might become Christian, of whatever ranks and orders it consisted.

14. *Presbyters*⁵ or *priests* may not be, in all respects, what they originally⁶ were; all things must yield, must dilate, 489
contract, and suit themselves to utility, in different circumstances. As the Church increased, and more nations came into it, bishops grew higher, deacons lower, priests were *inter-mediate*; though even then the three ranks were only such as *Clemens* describes. The civil magistrate found himself induced, and called upon, to interfere; this might take off from the *ruling*⁷ of the presbyters, and turn them more to teaching and ministerial officers. Only let us not have two different ideas of the same word, and dispute as if we had the same. Such contention must be endless.

¹ Book III. chap. xiv. sect. 8.

² Titus ii. 15. ³ Prov. xxii. 29.

⁴ 1 Tim. ii. 2.

⁵ Presbyter, Prestre, Prêtre, Priest.
(Nicholls).

⁶ Lardner, who seems to hold but two ranks, says presbyters were to preach, reprove, rebuke, &c. Works, vol. 11. Intro. p. ix.

⁷ 1 Tim. v. 17.

IV. 15. It seems right that we should have such *inferior ministers* as we want; as to their official name being *deacon*, it is of no consequence. I do not know that, according to Scripture, *Stephen* was a deacon more than *St. Paul*⁸. Nor do I see that *Eusebius*⁹ calls *Stephen* a deacon. But if he had been called deacon, he certainly did spiritual offices. *Philip* baptized the Ethiopian; *Stephen* worked miracles, and harangued the Jews. He would not have been *stoned* for serving tables.

16. Unless civil power supports religious society, the maintaining of it seems quite *impracticable*; as we have before observed. Suppose a company of *players* chose to profane the *Lord's Day* at *Edinburgh*, where it is kept with great strictness, how would the church of Scotland prevent the profanation by any power merely ecclesiastical? Those who maintain that
490 "Christ was the only Lawgiver in his Church¹⁰," must give up in *practice* what they hold in *theory*¹¹. But of this enough before. The nature of *patronage* was mentioned just now.

After all, the general designs of the Puritans, to strengthen religious *discipline*, to make it pervade every order of men, and notice every immoral act, seem to me very laudable¹². Nay, it is no way necessary, for our present business, even to determine which mode of church-government is best—theirs or ours; perhaps neither may be good absolutely, in all circumstances; nor either bad in certain situations: our Article only asserts, that ours is not radically faulty, so as to have no efficacy—so as not to retain the essence of a Church¹³. The remaining difficulties may be more amongst ourselves.

17. As to the question, "Do you trust that you are inwardly *moved by the Holy Ghost* to take upon you this office?" &c., it cannot occasion much difficulty to any one who has accustomed himself to observe the manner in which every good action or purpose, is, in Scripture, *referred* to the Holy Spirit. This was our *subject* in Art. x. and has been several times mentioned since. Phil. ii. 13, James i. 17, might revive

⁸ 1 Cor. iii. 5, as before, sect. 2. Rom. xv. 8, Christ was διάκονος περιτομῆς.

⁹ Beginning of his Ecclesiastical History. *Ignatius* seems to consider deacons (that is, διάκονοι reckoned with ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι) in a spiritual light. Οὐ γὰρ βρωμάτων καὶ ποτῶν εἰσὶν διάκονοι, ἀλλ' ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ὑπηρέ-

ται. *Ad Trall.* sect. 2.

¹⁰ Neal, I. p. 233, as before.

¹¹ See Dr. Powell's Thesis, p. 369, top.

¹² Neal, I. p. 232. Classes.

¹³ See Archbishop Wake to Père Courayer, July 9, 1724. Mosh. Cent. xviii. sect. 23, 3vo, vol. v. p. 94, note.

former ideas. These things considered, the question amounts IV. to no more than this, Are you *conscious of good intentions* in your present undertaking? are you “in all things *willing to live honestly*,” in the situation to which you aspire? Besides, a candidate is only asked whether he *trusts* that he is moved: this implies uncertainty, and entirely excludes enthusiastic 491 presumption. Indeed, as the Reformers were no enthusiasts, a man might assure himself beforehand that they had no enthusiastic meaning.

Similar inquiries might be made of one entering into any other profession, where he might possibly have an end in view distinct from the good of that profession. Do you really mean to make a good *soldier*, or only to wear a gay uniform? are you *inspired* by a true martial *spirit*? So, do you really mean to make a good *minister*, or only a tithe-gatherer, or a loungeur? But if this be the meaning, you will say, why not remove all difficulties by asking the question in the words which now explain its meaning? I suppose the reason is, because the phrase used is most *scriptural*; especially for *deacons*; (indeed the question is not proposed to priests, or bishops). To see this, one need only read Acts vi. 3, 5, (which is transferred into our question,) and consider circumstances. *Seven* men are chosen to make a fair distribution of what bounty has thrown into a common stock: a qualification for this *temporary* office was that all *seven* must be “*full of the Holy Ghost*,” as well as have a good character, and prudence, that is, knowledge of accounts, market-prices, &c. We can immediately see the propriety of such men having a good character, and being prudent. Being full of the Holy Ghost is a phrase not now familiar; we must consider with what it is *joined*: it must mean some requisite for managing the *temporal* concerns of religious society; might it mean, full of an holy temper? interested about religion? a good temper or intention is to be *referred* to the Holy Ghost. But there are many other texts which tend the same way, and would serve to confirm those who framed the question, in their purpose:— Luke i. 15. Acts vii. 55; ix. 17; xi. 24; xiii. 52; xx. 28. 492 2 Pet. i. 21.—These and others would serve also to make the phrase more familiar to us, and thereby remove our greatest difficulty in the use of it.

¹ Heb. xiii. 18.

IV. 18. When our ordaining minister says, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office²," &c., there can be no doubt of his using those words of Scripture, John xx. 22; In the office for priests he goes on to ver. 23; in that for bishops he proceeds to 2 Tim. i. 6, 7. John xx. 23 is an ordination, or consecration.

This might be of an higher kind at first, than since, in the ordinary state of the Church, as we have seen of several things; but what could be a more proper way of giving a commission to preach, absolve, &c. than repeating the words which our Lord used when he gave the *same* commission—understanding them in a *lower sense*? Suppose you had to compose a form for the purpose, would you not say, This must not be expressed like a *secular* and civil appointment; it should be expressed in some words of *Scripture*. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord³;" we are not disciples of Paul, or of Apollos, but of Christ: that commission which Christ *gave* we *hand down* from generation to generation; how can we more strongly mark it for his than by expressing it in his words? As the Holy Ghost is to guide us into all truth, and as Christ is to be with his Church to the end of the world, it is not to be imagined that any appointment of a sacred minister can take place without some blessed heavenly *influence*; but it is not *man* who causes that influence, but Christ himself. Man only repeats a form as *agent* for him who instituted it. If man could convey any spiritual blessing by his own power, he would use his own words. The words used by an *herald* when he proclaims war or peace may sound presumptuous, as if he pretended to give one or the other; but they are not his own words; they are always understood to be the words of his *sovereign*; and nothing but some great *abuse* can prevent their being effectual.

This form seems to have been quite established in the time of Augustin⁴, in the *Latin* Church; and in the *Greek* Church there has been in ordinations some mention of the Holy Ghost. Yet, in general, it is said that the Greek forms have been more indicative, the Latin ones more optative or precatory⁵. As, 'mayest thou receive the Holy Ghost.' Some have thought

² This is not the office of *deacon*; he trusts he is *moved* by the Holy Ghost, and does *not* receive it; priest and bishop think in their hearts that they are truly called, and *do* receive the Holy Ghost.

Is anything particular meant by this?]

³ 2 Cor. iv. 5.

⁴ Aug. *de Trin.* 15. 26. (Nicholls).

⁵ See a like distinction in the form of *absolution*, Art. xxv. sect. 4.

that *our* expressions might bear that sense; like, 'Every good IV. attend you.' 'Be *you* happy, whatever becomes of *me*,' &c.

19. As we do not seem to have occasion for an *application*, in this Article, I will close my remarks upon it by a sort of paraphrase, of the words, "*Receive the Holy Ghost*," &c.

'As Jesus Christ, when he sent his Apostles to preach the Gospel in all the world, gave them his commission, and promised a ratification of their authority; and as it is his will that a commission, in kind the same, though of a lower degree, should be perpetually conferred for the benefit of his Church; 494 I, heretofore regularly appointed, do confer the same on you; using the words of our Lord, as best conveying the nature of the *trust*; and leaving it to his unbounded wisdom to fulfil them in that degree which shall seem to him, in any state of his Church, most suitable and expedient.'

ARTICLE XXXVII.

495

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.

THE King's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain; and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the King's Majesty the chief government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments; the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; But that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

IV. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

496 1. The *history* of this Article may consist of *two* separate histories; and the second of them may include the history of the two following Articles, the thirty-eighth and the thirtieth.—The first history should be of the *Pope's Supremacy*; the second, of the notions of those, who, aiming at *perfection*, reject some practices which are ordinarily reckoned useful or necessary in human life—such as governing by *civil magistrates*, inflicting *capital punishments*, carrying on *war*, possessing *property*, and taking *oaths* on solemn occasions. That these may go *together*, will appear hereafter.

2. First, we take the *Pope's Supremacy*. A great deal has been written on this subject; but it is now less interesting than it was in the time of our Henry VIII.

Historians tell us that Christianity was planted in our island so soon as the apostolic age¹; though it is not known what persons first taught it to our ancestors. At the great Council of Nice in 325, it was understood that the British Christians were not brought under any foreign patriarch or metropolitan, but were an independent Church². The island was invaded by *Saxons*, who were then idolaters; and Gregory the First (or the Great) sent a monk called *Augustin*, very early in the seventh century, to convert them. He required the British Christians to be in some subjection to the see of Rome, but
497 they refused. The Saxons shewed more respect to those by whom they had been converted, but kept clear of subjection. At that time it appears that the Bishop of Rome, (who, like other bishops, was sometimes called *Papa*, a respectful appellation,) was subject to the *emperor*, and considered the emperor as governing *sacred persons*³. Indeed the emperors had always, till the time of Gregory VII., in some degree conferred the popedom: he was the last pope whose election was confirmed by the emperor. The early Christian emperors had always

¹ Collier's Eccles. History, from Gildas, &c. Comber's Advice, p. 111.

² Can. 6, Dionys. Exig. referred to by Comber. This Dionysius, called the *Little* from his stature, was a Scythian by birth, but resided at Rome; lived to near the middle of the sixth century; was

famous for making a good collection of canons, &c.; and is said to have been the beginner of our custom of reckoning time from the birth of Christ. (*Ladvoat.*)

³ See Bower's Lives of Popes, vol. II. p. 500, where Gregory I. says, that God gave the emperor *dominari sacerdotibus*.

ordered *councils*, and presided at them: how much authority IV. they exercised over the Church appears from a great many Roman laws now extant in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. Though the popes, in the day of their greatness, assumed unbounded authority, yet in the early times of Christianity they had only that *precedence* which naturally arose from Rome being the seat of the empire. Under the nineteenth Article, we had occasion to compare the see of Rome with those of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch¹. Pope Victor, who died in 201, shewed a good deal of arrogance in the dispute about Easter; and excommunicated some worthy² men who differed from him; but even those of the *Latin* Church did not think it a duty to submit. The mild and good *Irenæus*³ opposed him, and wrote to him a letter, from himself and the brethren in Gaul, still extant in Eusebius. About the year 372 *Valentinian*⁴ published a law, by which, in order to avoid going to profane 498 tribunals, bishops were obliged to refer their disputes to the see of Rome: this might be one reason why the papal pretensions kept rising till the Council of *Chalcedon*, in 450. At that council it was held, that, as there were two seats of empire, the two prelates who presided at them should be upon the *same rank*. This continued till 580, when Constantinople claimed universal church-supremacy. But *Phocas*, an emperor of flagitious character, being rather checked for his enormities by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and strongly flattered by the Pope⁵, declared the latter the supreme Governor of the Catholic Church.

In the ninth century the Eastern and Western Churches separated. The pope became a secular prince, by the revolt of the exarchate of Italy, in the contentions about images, which must help the growth of his spiritual dominion. He involved, at one time or other, most European nations in great troubles; of which there seemed likely to be no end, so long as he could make religious terror, and other passions, operate on the minds of the ordinary subjects, and maintain a strong feeling for the sanctity of religious orders. In *England* he gained an influence about the time of the Conquest, by assisting

¹ Art. xix. sect. 2.

² See Lardner under *Polycrates*; Works, vol. II. p. 243.

³ Lardner, vol. II. p. 157. Euseb. cap. xxiv. Bower's life of Victor.

⁴ Bishop Hallifax on Prophecy, p. 336, from Mosheim.

⁵ Gregory I.: see his *Life* by Bower. Phocas died 610. See Nicholls on the Ordination-oath. Gregory's *Letters* to Phocas are a great disgrace to him.

IV. the Conqueror; and from that time to the reign of Henry VIII. there was a perpetual conflict between the see of Rome and the rational part of the English nation.

The law, in theory, was against the see of Rome; and during the reigns of Henry II. Edward I. and III. and
499 Richard II. several statutes were made, declaring the rites of England, and enforcing them. The statutes of the Parliament at Clarendon, those against *Provisors*, and those decreeing what is called a *præmunire*, are so well explained in Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries, a book to which every one has access, that I need not dwell upon them: it is enough to mention them to the student.

Civil wars kept the nation, for a long time, from exerting itself unanimously to regain its rights; and the popes were always ready to take advantage of all divisions. Henry VIII. at first acted and wrote in defence of popery, against Luther, from whence he got the title of *Defender of the Faith*; but quarrelling with the pope about a divorce, he set himself earnestly, with all the vehemence of a warm temper, and of princely loftiness, to throw off the papal supremacy. The occasion might not be equally creditable with a pure sense of rectitude, and a love of law and liberty; but yet the manner of conducting the emancipation of our Church and state⁶ seems to have been regular, legal, constitutional; and to have implied the recovery or declaration of an *old right*, detained for a while by mere violence. The supremacy of the pope was rejected by English Papists: all the powers of the nation united in rejecting it.

The *Necessary Doctrine*, on the sacrament of *Order*, contains a good account of this matter—plain and clear, as for the *people*; the work of *Cranmer*, most probably—who was raised to eminence by his efforts to redeem the kingdom. Thus Henry VIII. assumed the title of head of the Church,
500 in spite of bulls discharged against him from Rome; and his successors have retained the title, though Elizabeth thought fit to give an explanation of it in her *Injunctions* mentioned in the Article, similar to the explanation in the paragraph which refers to them.

Several attempts have been made, since the time of Elizabeth, to restore the papal power; a short and clear account of

⁶ Heylin, in his life of Archbishop Laud, p. 1, has a short account of this. Neal's account is not long.

which may be found in Bishop *Gibson's* Postscript to his fifth IV. Pastoral Letter.

Of late years, the pope's power over the English Papists seems to have been much weakened. We have had about seventeen hundred of them avow this by signing their names : they call themselves *Protesting Catholics*. Parliament has past an act for their relief, taking place June 24, 1791. Yet even over these the pope has some *spiritual* authority : their oath only imports that they allow him "no *temporal* or *civil* jurisdiction" "within this realm." And even this oath great numbers of English Papists cannot take. Indeed, I believe the notion, that there ought to be *one head* of the Church, and that the Bishop of *Rome* has good pretensions to that pre-eminence, is deeply rooted in the minds of many. We are told, that even "many men of learning and piety," in the church of Rome, are sensible of its errors, but do not choose to separate themselves from what they esteem the true Universal Church of Christ¹.

3. Having finished our first history, let us proceed to our second. Declining, through scruple, the use of those expedients which the generality of ordinary men have adopted for the purposes of human life, has arisen from a desire of attaining to *perfection*. Such desire is sometimes a part of a mild, gentle, refined temper ; sometimes of an harsh and austere one. The former, intent upon the good always likely to result from improvement ; the latter dwelling on the faults and failures which seem to obstruct it. 501

It must be owned, that magistracy, capital punishments, war, property, and oaths, all imply great *imperfection*. If we were as we ought to be, and had amongst us no "stubborn and evil-doers," we should have no need of magistrates (much less of *capital* punishments and war), nor even of riches, which occasion so many dissensions, so much anxiety, and so many vicious acts. If our veracity were to be relied on, oaths would be needless. These are real *evils* ; though, as they prevent greater evils, they are considered as benefits. Every scruple proceeds upon something in *Scripture*.

1. The prohibition of magistracy, on Matt. v. 5 ; xx. 25. Gal. v. 1.

2. Of capital punishments, on Matt. v. 21 ; vi. 15.

¹ See second Appendix to Mosheim's History—about Dr. *Cowayer*, p. 110. | Comber, too, presses this point most of any. Advice, sect. 6, pp. 110—136.

- IV. 3. War, on Matt. v. 39—44.
 4. Riches, on Matt. vi. 19; xix. 21—24. Luke xvi. 19, &c. 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.
 5. Oaths, on Matt. v. 34, and James v. 12.

It does not happen that every one, who declines one or two of the things we are speaking of, declines them all. Some do not allow of oaths, or of war, who do allow of property; but the *turn* and temper seems to be much the same in all who decline any: variations are most likely to happen where there is the least solid reasoning and plain sense. A particular taste, connection, interest, &c., may set some persons, though of this
 502 temper, upon justifying to themselves some one of the things in question²; and, in such case, their arguments will rarely fail of success.

4. The *Pythagoreans* seem to have had a disposition to decline some things, which common men make use of. Their leader persuaded the Sicilian dames to strip off their more splendid ornaments, and make an offering of them to a local deity. He made his followers sell their patrimony, lay the produce at his feet, and live in common, without *property*. He held, that *war* was only lawful on five occasions, such as against the passions, and so on; meaning, that it was never to be carried on with fire and sword. He would not kill even brute animals³. The necessity of laws he saw too clearly to be misled; he therefore endeavoured to improve, not annihilate, legislation.

5. Some of the Christian Fathers may be next mentioned. *Lactantius* seems to make the commandment, “Thou shalt not *kill*,” to be universal—to admit of no exception whatsoever: he is even against killing by word, as he calls it, that is, accusing of a capital crime. God wills man to be *sanctum*⁴ *animal*. He would not have a man fight, as a soldier, in the justest cause. What he says against fights of gladiators, and the exposing of children, appears to me to be very good—whatever the rest may seem.

The *Manicheans* seem to have been against *war*⁵. *Augustin*⁶, in opposing them, is clearly for just war; and argues well in excuse for it, calling soldiers *non homicidas sed minis-*

² Fielding describes Col. Bath well, talking as a *Christian* about *duelling*.

³ *Ladvoct*; collected from various lives.

⁴ *Lactantius de vero cultu*, cap. xx. A. D. 306.

⁵ *Lardner*, vol. III. p. 476.

⁶ *Aug. contra Faustum*, 22. 74.

tros legis,—salutis publicæ defensores. Faustus had been IV. arguing against the Old Testament, and had instanced in the wars of Moses. Augustin says, *quid culpatur in bello?*

The *Pelagians* were against *oaths*;—and against *riches*¹. They held, that a man ought not to *swear at all*; and that *rich* converts must give up their whole substance, or Baptism would not profit them. Augustin opposed them in both these points, though he himself had given up his property, and had persuaded some to do the same; as appears from his Letter to *Hilarius*, who had written from Sicily to inform Augustin of the Pelagian notions spreading there². But several *Fathers* seem to have been against oaths; thinking them allowed to *Jews*, but wholly forbidden to Christians;—as Basil and Chrysostom. Jerom also and Gregory of Nazianzum might lean that way. Cyprian however seems to have been on our side; but, in early times, swearing was confounded with swearing by *heathen deities*; that would be reckoned wrong by *all*. *Vegetius* gives an account of the oaths taken by *Christian soldiers*³: so that Christians did enlist, and had a *sacramentum*: they also professed to honour the emperor next after God.

6. The *Waldenses* seem to have been very likely to take the turn of which we are speaking. Accordingly, Mosheim 504 informs us⁴, that “Their rules of practice were extremely austere; for they adopted as the model of their moral discipline, the sermon of Christ on the Mount, which they interpreted and explained in the most rigorous and literal manner; and, of consequence, prohibited and condemned in their society all *wars*, and suits of *law*, all attempts towards the acquisition of *wealth*, the inflicting of *capital* punishments, self-defence against unjust violence, and *oaths* of all kinds.”

Maclaine, in his note on this passage, observes, that these persons only meant to revive *piety*, and oppose *abuses*.

Wickliffe had such a mass of corruption to remove, that he might not at once discern what was *practicable*. He seems to have had a tendency to decline some of the usages of which we are speaking. At the Council of *Constance* one of his con-

¹ See the passages in Vossius's *Hist. Pelag.* pp. 723, 727. Wall on Baptism, pp. 179, 183.

² See Wall, i. xix. 21, p. 182, quarto. The Pelagians had sold their property, and condemned every one who did not. Augustin had sold his, and had persuaded

some to sell theirs, but censured none who did not.

³ Quoted by Vossius, *ibid.* p. 727. See also Lardner, end of 8th Volume.

⁴ Mosheim, *Cent.* xii. 2. 5. 12. 8vo. Vol. 11. p. 454.

IV. demned propositions was, “*Oaths* made to strengthen human contracts and civil commerce are unlawful⁵.” And *Gilpin* tells us, he was against capital punishments, and thought war “utterly unlawful⁶.”

Vows of *poverty* may be mentioned; especially as they are generally attended with meekness, and set men at a distance from war and bloodshed. In France, about twenty years ago, the convents of monks living in poverty filled very slowly; they fell far short of their complement.

505 The German *Anabaptists* are mentioned in our thirty-eighth Article. I gave an account of them formerly⁷. *Luther*, who knew them well, describes them in a few words, as far as concerns our present purpose: “*Docentes Christiano⁸ nihil esse possidendum, non jurandum, nullos magistratus habendos, non exercenda judicia, neminem tuendum aut defendendum, uxores et liberos deserendos, atque id genus portenta quam plurima.*” In *Sleidan’s History*⁹, *John Matthew* orders all goods to be in common, and people bring their goods to the common stock; partly, perhaps, through fear of two *prophesying virgins*, who discovered all embezzling. The landgrave tells them they mean to overturn all government¹⁰. *Cheynell* says, “the *Anabaptists* go to sea without any ordnance in their ships,”—travel without any “sword,”—one of them does “not think it lawful to be a *cutler*¹¹.”

The first *Socinians* have been thought to originate from the *Anabaptists*¹². In a note on *Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History*¹³

⁵ Baxter on Councils, p. 433.

⁶ *Gilpin’s Reformers*, pp. 79, 80. *Collier’s Eccles. Hist.* i. 631, mentions four books of his on the Sermon on the Mount, and three books of Civil Government.

⁷ Art. vii. sect. 3. There are some Acts of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. against them. See Burn, under *Dis-senters*.

⁸ Pref. to *Enarrations on Matt. v. vi.* vii. fol. 1, p. 2. Works, vol. vii. fol. a paraphrase on Christ’s Sermon on the Mount.

⁹ The Latin title is, *Commentaria de Statu Religionis et Reipublicæ, Carolo V. Cæsare*. In 26 Books. It is translated into English by Bohun. See also Wall, pp. 414, 419, 425.

¹⁰ The *Anabaptists* resisted government by virtue of their *Christian liberty*; Art.

vii. sect. 3. And because magistrates imply *imperfection*; *Rogers*, p. 224. *Confess. Augsb.* 1. cap. 17, The godly shall rule and possess the earth, at last; ergo begin directly. See *Mosheim*, Cent. xvi. 3. 2. 3. 16, 8vo. vol. iv. p. 153.

¹¹ *Cheynell on Socinianism*, p. 51. (in T—5—38. Sid. Coll.)

¹² *Mosheim*, 8vo. vol. iv. p. 178, Cent. xvi. 3. 2. 4. 8.

¹³ *Ibid.* sect. 10, p. 185, 8vo. See also *Cheynell on Socinianism*, pp. 51, 52, for connection between *Anabaptists* and old *Socinians*. He is speaking of some sort of *Socinians* when he says, page 52, “God hath not given his people any earthly goods or possessions under the Gospel.” There is more of it: printed 1643.

it is said, "there is this peculiarity in their moral injunctions, IV. that they prohibit the taking of *oaths* and the repelling of 506 *injuries*." The modern Socinians have not this peculiarity.

7. The *reformed* churches would be all earnest to clear themselves of the imputation of being seditious, and of favouring the Anabaptists. The Helvetic confession condemns them expressly. The French mentions the error about a community of goods, as then subsisting. The Scotch allows the magistrates to purge religion: would it allow a *popish* magistrate? The Dutch much the same; and it speaks of the Anabaptists, like our thirty-eighth Article, as to holding a community of goods. The Bohemian is strongly against the magistrate's interfering in religious matters¹. The Augustan condemns the Anabaptists warmly; and mentions magistracy, war, oaths, and the belief of the actual final dominion of the saints.

8. I rather suspect our Article of aiming at the *Puritans*². Blaming the Anabaptists for any puritanical error, would be a way of throwing odium upon the Puritans. In the *play* called the *Puritan* one says, "We (Puritans) must not *swear*, I can 507 tell you:"—"we may lie, but we must not swear:"—and, "no *rich* thing shall enter into heaven, you know." The character of *Corporal Oath* is probably intended to heighten the puritanical character, by contrast³.

9. In or near 1573 there were a set of Christians in the Isle of *Ely*⁴, who are said to have mixed the notions of Gnostics, Arians, and Anabaptists. They deduced from Matt. v. that they ought not to take any *oaths*; from the commandment, "thou shalt not *kill*," that all *capital* punishments are unlawful; and from Acts ii. 44, 45, that riches are unchristian. And they held other notions not connected with our present subject. They were thought worth denouncing to government.

¹ It might be inquired, whether those who were for the magistrate's interfering in affairs of religion, had not the magistrate on their side? and those who were against the magistrate's interfering, had him not for an adversary?

² Rogers refers to a passage in the Preface to Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, in which it is said, that Puritans made a practice of declining *oaths* in courts of law, when their brethren were under *prosecution*, and if they were sworn they would then be *silent*. But this seems

nothing to a *doctrine of unlawfulness* of oaths; only as it would *put* the Puritans upon making what *objections* they could, in their own defence.

³ See the play amongst Shakspeare's, Act i. scene 2 and 3, and Act iii. scene 6. "*Peace* has more hidden oppressions and violent heady sins (though looking of a gentle nature) than a professed *war*." This is said with a *view* to Puritans.

⁴ See Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. II. p. 545.

IV. 10. *The Family of Love* seem likely, from what has been already said of them, to have run into the errors of which we are treating; and in the Proclamation of Elizabeth⁵ against them, it is mentioned, that they would take an *oath* before a magistrate, and not scruple to *deceive* him if he was not one of their own sect. However, Rogers on this Article refers to H. N.'s work, Spirit. Land. 6. 5, as railing at magistracy, and to another work as encouraging men to accomplish the dominion of the saints;—and also to passages condemning all *wars*, and prohibiting the use of all *weapons*.

The *Quakers* take up some notions which the Anabaptists⁶ laid down: they hold all *war* to be unlawful, and all *oaths*; but they expressly allow of *property*, and difference of *ranks*. They speak feelingly of the civil *magistrate's* interfering about *opinions*; but they seem to take for granted the lawfulness of his temporal authority⁷; and indeed their addresses to our king have been always loyal. They ground their opinions on Scripture. One might read an expression or two of Warburton, in his Alliance⁸.

At the Restoration there was a very severe act against the Quakers⁹, the tendency of which was, to compel them to take oaths; but at the Revolution their scruples found relief;—and I hope a sufficient one.

The *Moravians*, who style themselves “*Unitas Fratrum*,” or “United Brethren” are called by *Limborch*¹⁰, *Communistæ*, as having goods in common; but I have known persons of fortune members of that community. Perhaps they might at first have one common stock. In 22 of George II. they had an act of Parliament to relieve them from taking oaths; yet they make declarations “in the *presence of God*¹¹,”—considering God as a “*witness*.” I observe they are called a “Protestant *Episcopal Church*¹².”

11. We may now proceed to *explanation*.

Some, I think, have scrupled to sign our Articles, because it was originally, in the Articles of 1562, “the *Queen's Majesty*,” and not, “the *King's Majesty*.” Such a scruple requires a constant succession of female sovereigns.

⁵ Bishop Sparrow's Collection, p. 171.

⁶ Burn, under *Dissenters*.

⁷ Barclay's Apol. Prop. 14.

⁸ Pp. 91, 121.

⁹ Burn, under *Dissenters*, 13 & 14. chap. ii. c. 1.

¹⁰ Limborch on Acts ii.

¹¹ Augustin would tell them that they do not know what swearing is. See Wall, 4to, p. 185. Aug. *ad Hilarium*.

¹² Burn, under *Dissenters*, 4to, p. 525.

“The *chief* power”—in Latin, “*summam habet potestatem*,” which is sometimes called the *supreme* or *sovereign* power. IV. 509

“Foreign jurisdiction”—can only allude to the see of Rome: however, the general terms convey something of reasoning. The first paragraph is against the *Papists*, the second against the *Puritans*.

“*By which titles*”—supreme in ecclesiastical causes, supreme in civil causes. This seems to be the meaning; but the grammar seems scarcely accurate. This Article is made out of one of 1552; and there is more grammatical danger in alteration, than in original composition¹.

“Slanderos folks”—are in Latin, *calumniatores*: the Puritans are meant. The *Injunctions* spoken of are in Sparrow’s Collection²: we may look at them. “*Lately*”—in 1559.

“To all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures”—the act of a wicked pagan prince might not have made a good precedent. But some scriptural precedents should be mentioned. Exod. xxxii. 22, Aaron submits to the lay-lawgiver, Moses. Deut. xiii. 5, a prophet enticing to idolatry is to be put to death. 1 Kings iii. 26, Solomon judges Abiathar. 2 Chron. xix. 5—9, Jehoshaphat gives judicial powers to sacred persons: xxix. 4, &c., Hezekiah gives orders to the Levites. See also ver. 11. Ver. 21, he commands the sons of Aaron: see also ver. 31. 2 Chron. xxx. 1, Hezekiah orders a passover; xxxi. 2, he orders the courses of Levites. David and Josiah are also mentioned as instances³.

These things are mentioned in the *explanation*, lest the precedents of the Old Testament should not be now thought sufficiently binding upon us Christians, to make a part of our proof. 510

The “*civil sword*,” &c. seems an allusion to Rom. xiii. 4: “no jurisdiction”—temporal or spiritual.

The words “*Christian men*” occur both in the paragraph about capital punishments, and in that about war; which shews that our authorities are to come from the Scriptures of the New Testament. “*Wear weapons*”—is the expression, probably, of Anabaptists, and the Family of Love.

¹ I should like to know, if it were possible, whether the Queen herself had any hand in transplanting her injunction into this Article. One can conceive that her

Majesty’s grammatical inaccuracy might remain uncorrected.

² Sparrow’s Collection, p. 82.

³ Scotch Confession. *Syntagma*, p. 156.

- IV. 12. Let us now go on to our *proof*.
1. The king of our realm, and not the pope, is the head of our Church.
 2. The king is not a *minister* of the Church.
 3. Christians owe obedience to the civil magistrate.
 4. Capital punishments are not always unlawful in a Christian country.
 5. It is not always unlawful for a Christian to engage in war.

Though we have now had the *history* relating to property and oaths, yet the lawfulness of them had best be proved under the subsequent Articles.

13. The king of our realm, and not the pope, is the head of our Church. In the third Book the principles of *alliance*⁴ between Church and state were briefly laid down and defended. There it appeared, that when a church is composed of the subjects of a state, there must be one head of both, in order to effect unity of government; and that it is much more useful to both that the king (or civil magistrate) should preside, under
 511 regulations arising from the nature of the alliance, than the spiritual head of the ecclesiastical society. So far all lies within the nation.

As to any foreign spiritual power interfering, there seems no good foundation for it, either in the law of nature, or in the Gospel⁵. And till the middle of the second century we are told that all Christian churches were independent of each other, and without any common head⁶. But is not the Church *universal*? Christ did mean to form all his disciples into one body; but never obliged a small part of his disciples to continue in communion with a large body, contrary⁷ to all the dictates of reason and conscience. Each particular church, as has been frequently observed, ought to consider itself as part of the Catholic Church; and treat the members of all the other churches as brethren, from whom human weakness causes a present separation. This is the most likely method of forming finally a solid union.

But if it were allowed that the Catholic Church of Christ ought to have one visible head, what pretensions has the Bishop of Rome to be that head? none which can be considered as

⁴ Book III. chap. xiv. sect. 5.

⁵ Powell, p. 355.

⁶ See Art. xxi. Bingham hath some-

thing on the subject, Book II. chap. iv. and vi.

⁷ Rev. xviii. 4. Art. xix.

established by general consent. Rome was once a seat of IV. empire; if Christian churches, in or near that empire, had *then* occasion to consult together, some precedence would be proper and convenient, for the sake of maintaining order, and unity of action;—reasons of convenience, and analogy, might make a determination to fall, when a determination *must* be made, on the Bishop of Rome. But such reasons are now all *against* a Bishop of Rome.

Besides, if the whole Church of Christ is to have one head, 512 would it not now be best to fix upon one in some other situation? America must now be considered, and the state of Christianity in Africa and in Asia: in the East Indies possibly Christianity may make some progress. Nay, would it not be right to have an head of the Church, if one be necessary, in *different* places, at different times, according to the actual state of the Christian world? We must not for a moment suppose worldly *ambition* or interest to throw any difficulties in the way. Certainly the Bishop of Rome never was in the office, if such an office there be, of head of the universal Church of Christ.

It may however be said, that the Bishop of Rome has exercised spiritual power in *England*. He has; but it was one founded in no *right*, nor ever *submitted* to, more than as the plundering of a robber is submitted to whilst his pistol is at your breast. Whenever this nation has been free enough to be capable of making a contract, it has declared against papal usurpations. A contract ought always, in order to be valid, to promote the mutual benefit of the contracting parties; the spiritual power of Rome has been exercised merely for the benefit of Rome.

All Christians ought, no doubt, to act for the good of Christianity; but nothing would be more contrary to the general interests of Christianity than for the Pope to have authority over the Church of England. We have left the Church of Rome from the fullest conviction of its errors and corruptions: in what way could the head of that Church now exercise authority over us, but in the way of controversy and persecution? We should *resist*; and the *event* must be, that Roman and English Churches would hurt each other's religious principles materially.

No; if a *Courayer*, or if other learned and pious men, 513 anxiously wish to have a Catholic church in *fact*, as well as in

IV. theory, let them encourage general toleration, and quiet separation, of those who cannot conscientiously hold communion together. Let the bishops of Rome give up all ambitious and lucrative projects; let the Romish clergy enlighten their *people*, as much as they are themselves enlightened:—this done, the Church of Rome is no longer an object of our jealousy; we have no longer occasion to be upon our guard. Intercourse will generate confidence and mutual good opinion; these will generate benevolence; mutual benevolence is mutual attraction; attraction produces *unity*. So that the first approach to unity is complete independence and separation.

Should such unity prevail as to give a reasonable prospect of benefit from *councils*, some *precedence* may again be wanted. In that case let him preside who shall appear to be the best situated and qualified for presiding. Our island will scarcely aspire to the honour. But whoever presides let him be aware of arrogance and oppression!

I should hope our first proposition may now be considered as proved.

14. The king is not a *minister* of the Church.

The reasons given why the king should be head of the Church, his compulsive and protecting power, his ability to maintain the ministers, shew, that, in the alliance of Church and state, there is no view of his having any employ that is not of a *temporal* nature. For priestly offices he is unqualified, and his time is occupied in others. Our reasoning on this head in the third Book was general; and there is nothing in the English Church or state to be the ground of an exception.

514 But all parties being of one mind on this proposition, an elaborate proof of it is unnecessary.

15. Christians owe obedience to the *civil magistrate*.

Here we quit the Bishop of Rome, and come to those *scruples* or prohibitions, the history of which we have given collectively. Let us observe of them all together, that the error of them turns upon not distinguishing between what is *desirable*, and what is *practicable*. However desirable any end may be, if we adopt any impracticable measures, we only get farther from it; whereas if we begin with practical measures, we make some progress, however small; and we may, by perseverance, attain our end at last. To content ourselves with what is practicable, is the most likely way to attain what is ultimately desirable.

For proof that Christians owe obedience to civil magistrates, IV. we may refer to Matt. xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 1—7; Titus iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13. But the cogency of these proofs will be best understood by reading Bishop *Sherlock's* Discourse¹ on Rom. xiii. 1, which I would earnestly recommend.

16. *Capital punishments* are not always unlawful in a Christian country. In the Gospel it is taken for granted, not ordered, that an offender may be punished with death. Acts xxv. 11. Rom. xiii. 4.

The *Jewish* capital punishments prove that such punishments are not so essentially wrong as never to be right in any case. And nothing of the Jewish law, relating to punishment, is repealed under the Gospel.

17. *War* is not always unlawful to Christians.

Here again we say, In the Gospel war is not ordered, but taken for granted. See Matt. viii. 9; Luke iii. 14; Acts x. 1, 515 2; 2 Tim. ii. 4. Each of which texts should be considered with this question, What *would have been said* had war been universally to be prohibited? Would not our Saviour, or St. John Baptist², have thrown in some exhortations to *quit* the military profession?

Under the *old Law* we find many wars; and the Psalmist blesses God for teaching his hands to war and his fingers to fight³. To which no blame is annexed in the Gospel⁴.

18. We have given a direct proof of our propositions, but some indirect seems wanting; especially for the last two⁵.

It may be asked, in the first place, are not capital punishments inconsistent with the benevolent spirit of the Gospel? I would answer, first, that every right punishment is a species of benevolence; and is inflicted simply with a desire of doing

¹ Bishop *Sherlock's* Discourses, vol. iv. Disc. xiii.

² I was glad to find Augustin putting a speech into the mouth of John Baptist, in the way here mentioned. *Contra Faustum*, 22. 74, quoted in sect. 5.

³ Psalm cxliv. 1.

⁴ Would Christ have been called the *Captain* of our salvation if all military offices had been held in utter abomination?

⁵ The Papists are apt to urge, that the pope has a right to supremacy, as suc-

cessor of St. *Peter*. The claim seems to me so weak, that I am unwilling to detain you upon it. Limborch, in his *System of Theology*, (l. vii. c. ix. & x.) enters into the subject. And Macknight takes notice, (sect. 70, end, on Matt. xvi. 17—23,) of the worldly turn of St. Peter's mind, at the time when he is said to have received his commission. Limborch shews both that St. Peter was not the *head* of the disciples, so as to have any authority over them, and that the Bishop of Rome was not successor to St. Peter. See also *J. Hales's Tracts*, p. 251.

IV. good. A man by punishing may sometimes do more good than by forgiving.

But "*thou shalt not kill*:" I would here borrow the words of St. Paul, "it is manifest that he is excepted" who does not commit *murder*; and the Jewish *practice* (for this was part of the Jewish Law), makes this still more evident. This is a short command; but if it were as long as a modern act of parliament, it would still be liable to limitations taken from its true intent and meaning. For instance, if a man attacks my life, I am surely to prevent him from taking it, though by taking his;—one life must be lost either way: and if he attacks my property, I may *defend* that, otherwise my right is nothing; and if I cannot defend it but by taking his life, then I should say, he destroys *himself*; it is the same thing as if I hold out my sword, and he runs upon it.

A *nation*, however, you will say, is safe; they may *secure* the offender, and therefore need not *kill* him. This may not be practicable in all cases. Suppose, in any case, it is; yet, in strictness, what right has the criminal to force the community to maintain and watch him? If they are not obliged to maintain and watch him, then they have a right to defend themselves against such attacks as he may be expected to make if they do not maintain and watch him. Yet it must be owned, that, though some may perhaps, even by man, be given over to a reprobate mind⁶, it is a rational exercise of *mercy* and benevolence, to secure others, even such as had no strict right to be spared. The possibility of repentance is worth attending to: reformation would be so great a good, that a light evil might be borne for the chance of it.

But we are only concerned with *Scripture*. Scripture might not reveal moral philosophy supernaturally, any more than natural philosophy. A time may come when capital
517 punishments may be spared; and yet they might not be *forbidden in Scripture*⁷; which is all our concern.

19. In the next place it may be asked, with regard to *war*, is it not contrary to Matt. v. 38—41⁸? Bishop Burnet

⁶ Rom. i. 28.

⁷ I think I said here, in giving this Lecture, that some nations might be so barbarous, or so circumstanced, after the publication of the Gospel, that rights could not be safe if no criminals were put

to death; and therefore that Scripture could not well prohibit generally capital punishments, whatever it might have done if published in times very much improved.

⁸ Barclay's Apology, Prop. 15.

says, this is "a very great difficulty." Suppose there was a sense in which this passage prohibited *all* war, (as it certainly does all forwardness in going to war); that sense could not be right, because one part of Scripture is to be interpreted so as to be *consistent* with other parts.

The Sermon on the Mount is to be interpreted as being in some measure the language of *reproof*; the language of reproof is a part of *eloquence*. What is intended to mortify and correct self-sufficiency, is not to be interpreted exactly in the same manner as what is delivered to the ingenuous and modest inquirer. In what our Saviour delivers, each Christian precept is contrasted to some fault prevailing amongst the higher part of the Jews; so that one should keep the self-sufficiency and the malevolence of such Jews continually before one's eyes. The Jewish character seems to have been malevolent, the Christian benevolent. The Christian precept now in question is opposed to the practice of *retaliation*—to malevolent rancour, flying instantly, on the receipt of an imagined injury, to seize eye for eye and tooth for tooth. This must not be *Christian* conduct, says our Saviour; it is not *right* conduct; nay, it was never *intended* to be Jewish. But why is it not *right*? because it is not the most effectual way to banish all injuries from the world, and to perfect human happiness. It is a natural movement, on the receipt of an injury, to fly to revenge; but this must be *checked*. It should be a *rule*, to *yield*, to bear, to give way a little, as we do to a bodily *stroke*, when it would otherwise be painful. Great good would arise from the practice of this rule: we should find the imagined injury no real one, or we should soften the offender, or we should bind to us by ties of gratitude one of an hasty but generous temper. It is not, however, to be understood, that this rule is invariable, or universal, any more than another. When punishment will clearly answer a better end, and can be inflicted in the genuine spirit of *benevolence*, it must be applied; else there is a voluntary neglect of the *greater good*. But, *commonly*, men want much more persuading to yield, than to punish. The mistake with which we are now concerned is this: if a *rule* is given, it is taken as an only, or *single* rule; whereas, though each rule is *given* singly, it is not meant to exclude other rules. One rule is, to let our light shine before men; another, not to let our left hand know what our right doeth;—both excellent rules! on different occasions; but

IV. neither of them can be followed singly, on all occasions¹. These limit each other; but every rule, if not limited expressly, is to be understood to be so tacitly, by considerations of the greatest good. The very next words to our difficult passage are, “Give
519 to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away;”—another excellent rule, in its place. No one has ever followed this without limitation; and yet it would be difficult to assign any reason why it is more variable, or liable to limitations, than that which immediately precedes it.

This may suffice to solve our difficulty; but I cannot quit it without observing, how irksome it is to be obliged to urge anything which can have any tendency to lessen the force of that divine rule, yield to evil, “give place unto wrath;”—a rule dictated by that wisdom which is from above, delivered from the mouth of him who knew what was in man—a rule so much wanted, and so replete with good, that one would not soon find one’s self weary of expatiating on its complicated benefits to mankind².

This is all the indirect proof I will give. Any one might consult Grotius *de Jure*, &c. 1. ii. 6, &c.

20. If any *application* were wanted, we might observe, with a view to *mutual concession*, that *war* is generally, or always, owing to some defect in wisdom or in virtue—to mistaking rights, to ambitious restlessness; though we cannot own, as a consequence, that no nation can lawfully *defend* itself. To give up self-defence is impracticable. I have wished to impress the distinction between what is desirable, and what is *practicable*: and therefore I will conclude with the following incident. We are told that the *Pennsylvanians*, after high professions of suffering anything rather than fight, deter-
520 mined to retake by force a sloop from a pirate.

The excuse they made was³, that they did it as *magistrates*, not as *Quakers*. The account is taken from a printed book of *Trials*—of George *Keith*, and others.

¹ Matt. xii. 37 makes our final sentence to depend upon our *words*; Rom. ii. 6, &c. on our *actions*. I need scarce say that reference is here made to Matt. v. 16, and vi. 3.

² Reference is here made to John ii. 25, Rom. xii. 19, and James iii. 17.

³ Leslie’s *Snake in the Grass*, sect. 18.

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

OF CHRISTIAN MENS GOODS, WHICH ARE NOT COMMON.

THE Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

1. Having taken the *history* of this Article into the history of the preceding, we may begin with *explanation*.

2. The *title* is in the same *form* with those of the twenty-sixth and twenty-ninth, on which we have had some remarks.

The *Latin* title seems obscure: *De illicitâ bonorum communicatione*. May it be translated, Of the unlawfulness of acting as if all goods were common? that seems likely to be the *meaning*.

“Christians.”—This word shews, as before, that our concern is only with the *Scriptures* of the New Testament; the true meaning of which we suppose some of our Christian brethren to have mistaken.

Our Article consists of two sentences: the first of which expresses rights and duties of *perfect* obligation; the second, those of *imperfect* obligation. At first sight, it seems odd to insert in an Article a duty, of the practice of which the agent is to be the sole judge; such a duty seems only matter of exhortation; yet we have had similar instances in the thirty-second and thirty-fourth Articles. And where the mistake of our brethren, who differ from us, depends very much upon taking indeterminate duties of Scripture for determinate, there it is immediately necessary to mark out the difference. But it is proper also to do it, when a strict duty of perfect obligation would seem harsh, and contrary to Christian benevolence, if its defects were not supplied by a free voluntary duty. In Article xxxii. it seemed proper to set marriage in an honourable light, by observing, that to some persons it might be the state productive of the greatest virtue; so here, it seems proper to set strict justice in an honourable light, by shewing that

IV. it is the ground of all that voluntary benevolence which is contrasted with it, and which cannot be reduced to determinate rules without more harm than good. The institution of property thus appears in its true light, and is seen as greatly beneficial to mankind.

3. I see nothing more for explanation.

And for *proof*, I see but one proposition: 'The institution of *property* is not contrary to the Gospel.'

For as to *beneficence*, that is not mentioned as a matter in dispute; but only as completing the idea of moral and Christian duty, with regard to property, and as shewing property to be useful.

The direct proofs of our proposition, to be found in Scripture, are very numerous: I will only aim at mentioning a number which may be sufficient. In Matt. v. 42, *giving* and *lending*, both imply property; so in Matt. vi. 3, *do alms*.
 523 Those of whose mistake we are now treating ground their notions very much on our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount. From John xix. 27, it appears that St. John had an home, which afforded a residence to the blessed Virgin Mary. We may read also Rom. xii. 13, as marking (like the texts from St. Matthew) both the duties mentioned in our Article, determinate and indeterminate. 2 Cor. viii. answers the same purpose, and shews (ver. 13) that Christians had in St. Paul's time unequal shares of property. Eph. iv. 28 forbids *stealing*, and advises industry for the purpose of raising a fund for beneficence. 1 Tim. v. 8 shews an use of property prior even to beneficence itself. 1 Tim. vi. 17 presupposes not only property, but even riches. James iv. 13 presupposes traffic, or *commerce*. And particular persons who were possessed of property are spoken of with commendation—Cornelius, Philemon, Gaius. Not to mention Zacchæus¹, or Joseph of Arimathæa.

4. This direct proof must be surely sufficient; but the *indirect* seems to require the greater attention on the present Article. Yet it may be here observed, of every text which is brought against the institution of property, that no sense of it can be admitted, which is not consistent² with some sense of the texts already quoted. I imagine we need not examine, as seeming to favour our adversaries, more passages of Scripture than Matt. vi. 19; Matt. xix. 16, &c., about the wealthy young

¹ Luke xix. 2, &c.

² As before, Art. xxxvii. sect. 19.

man to whom Christ proposed selling all he had ; Luke xvi. IV. 19, &c., about the rich man and Lazarus ; Acts. ii. 44, 45, about the first Christians having all things in common ; and 1 Tim. 524 vi. 9, 10, or some passage of like import, expressing the mischiefs attending riches.

5. Matt. vi. 19, is only a *comparative* expression, though it has, no doubt, been sometimes understood absolutely. Its meaning only is, that men ought to *prefer* heavenly treasures to earthly. We have had instances of this *negative* mode of comparison before¹.

6. With regard to Matt. xix. 16, &c., the proposal made by Christ to the wealthy young man, is certainly one intended for extraordinary emergencies. It cannot be made a ground of action in *ordinary* life, without the kind of proportion mentioned in the eleventh chapter of the first Book. If the rich young man was, in *his* circumstances, to act in such a manner, how am I to act in *my* circumstances ?

This might suffice ; but even take the transaction as it was in our Saviour's time, and it is no annulling of the institution of property. A very great act of beneficence is held forth, or proposed, on a very great occasion ; such as might be proposed on some few other great occasions ; such as the captivity of a parent, an invasion of one's country, a struggle for civil liberty, &c. ; but I see no hint of any disapprobation of the institution of *property*. It does not appear that the refusal was blamed ; it does not appear to *me* that the donation would have been *accepted*.

This might suffice as an answer to our objection ; but it may be useful to reflect a little more on a case which has had very important effects².

When the young man began to confer with our Lord, no one present had any idea of riches ; nor indeed till the very end 525 of the conference ; and then the mention of them was incidental. A worthy and amiable youth, of a wealthy family, had an ambition, turned, as I hope many others have, towards religious *perfection* : he seems to have been persuaded that he had *pretty nearly* attained his end. Jesus having become known and celebrated, this young man comes to *confer* with him. He hopes to be told that he is very *near perfection* : " what lack I yet ? " — " Jesus beholding him, *loved* him." He loved this worthy youth, how *sanguine* soever he might

¹ Objections to Art. xxvii.

² Aug. *ad Hilarium*. Wall, p. 183, quarto.

IV. be; and loved him too well to flatter him. Perfection! alas! *man* has not attained to that; it may be an object of *pursuit*, a mark to look forward to; but that man is very imperfect³ indeed who thinks he has already attained perfection. “What *lack* I yet?” you say: see here *my disciples*; is there nothing for you to aim at? what think you of becoming one of them? we have a religion to publish, which will be as great a blessing to mankind as they choose to let it be—the religion of the *Messiah*. Is there now nothing to do for one who aims at religious perfection? He who publishes this religion must be my disciple; and I have not where to lay my head! he must call the *poor* his brethren; he himself must be poor in spirit. You are alarmed; and well you may; for being my disciple might be the ruin of your fortune; nay, it might cost you more than fortune; you might have to take up your cross, if you followed me. The young man’s sanguine hopes are all blasted. He had been flattered into an expectation of better things: he retires, mortified and dejected. Our Lord, without blaming him, takes occasion to observe, that the rich will with difficulty (δυσκόλως) be made useful in spreading his religion: though there is no natural impossibility of their becoming converts, it is not to be *expected*. On some accounts, the poor will be more eligible⁴, at first: yet whoever does sacrifice worldly advantages for the sake of Christianity shall be amply rewarded.

526

This is the *idea* which the passage conveys to *me*. Yet it is not to be expected that we should see all the reasons which our Saviour had for any measure that he took⁵. And it is possible he might, on many occasions, especially at first, avoid a language perfectly clear and explicit; and intend only to set men on thinking for themselves. I can conceive it possible that he had no thoughts of engaging the young man to be his disciple. Why should he have a *youth* to follow him? why should he incur the scandal of inveigling pious young men of fortune from their parents?

As to the expressions, “*go and sell that thou hast*”—“*come and follow me*”—they seem to amount to no more than a *proposal*: they make that proposal in a clear and lively way; but only to the purpose which we have mentioned. We may con-

³ See Phil. iii. 12.

⁴ 1 Cor. i. 26, 28. James ii. 5.

⁵ Art. xiv. this case was mentioned, sect. 4, in the way of objection; to which the answer was given, sect. 5.

sider the case of this young man as an instance of what is delivered Luke xiv. 26—33; and that passage as illustrating this. On the whole, the account of the rich young man shews no *absolute* perfection in parting with one's fortune: great occasions may happen, when we may be called upon to make great sacrifices. Ordinarily, perfection may be plain *frugality*. IV.

7. The parable of the rich man and *Lazarus*, Luke xvi. 19, &c., is calculated to have a very good effect in producing a right *use* of riches; but does not seem to have been intended to terrify men out of the possession of them. It represents two extremes in human life, splendour and indigence: death intervenes, and then there is a reverse: he who had been high in this world is in a state of torment; he who had been low and wretched is in a state of bliss: the rich man intreats him who had been poor to administer some relief; but all intercourse is cut off. 527

It is not to be inferred that *every* rich man must be in such a state of inferiority to him on whom he had looked down in this world; but only that he *may* be; that is, if he be wicked, and the poor virtuous and good. How little do the generality of rich men attend to what so plainly follows from the belief of a future state of rewards and punishments! How do they suffer imagination and habit to represent to them the scenes of this life as continued into another!

That representation, then, which will awaken men from such dreams of prejudice, wants nothing more to make it of the utmost importance. It prompts every rich man to say, of every poor wretch with whom he has had any intercourse, 'great and luxurious as I am, and mean and destitute as this miserable creature is, it may happen, through my folly and his goodness, that he may be exalted to rejoice in the society of angels, whilst I am abased to undergo the torments of hell, and the taunts and insults of devils; nay, I may one day be glad to be a suppliant, for relief and assistance, to him who now intreats my help in vain.'

This being the thing particularly wanted, we may allow it to be the thing particularly meant. And therefore we need not trouble ourselves to investigate what the crime of the rich man was: he was condemned, *therefore* he had been wicked: the poor man was rewarded, therefore he had been good;—though certainly a rich man *may* be good, and a poor man wicked. That the good in every station will be happy, and the bad miserable, 528

IV. is proved in all parts of Scripture; so that when we are told, that a man is happy after death, we may take his goodness for granted, as we may the wickedness of the damned. The *end* of the parable then was, to *impress* upon the minds of the rich, that those whom they now despised, or oppressed, *might* hereafter, whilst they were cast down beneath all earthly meanness, be soaring far above all earthly grandeur. Suppose a rich man, by meditation on this parable, to acquire a *habit* of feeling this, and of representing it to himself whenever he has any business or conversation with any poor person; though it need not make him throw his wealth into the sea, yet what an heavenly disposition it must generate in him! what mildness and humility! what condescension, humanity, and even *respect* for the poor and needy!

8. Much has been said of Acts ii. 44, 45, (and iv. 32, 34,) but it does not appear to me, that *property* amongst Christians was ever abolished. They were called upon, by the exigencies of the times, to offer large contributions for the support of the poorer converts; so large, that they were obliged to *sell* some possessions in order to make them. But all was *voluntary beneficence*. Indeed, *after* the sales were made, and the produce thrown into a common stock, that stock was possessed by Christians in common. And popularly speaking, *before* such sales, the generosity of the richer converts was so great, that all might be said to be welcome to every thing that any possessed. But the expostulation in Acts v. 4 clearly implies the continuance of *property*; and Acts ii. 46 shews that disciples kept their *houses*. Nay, if Christians had, strictly speaking, given up their property at first, we could only infer any rule for ourselves by that proportion, or comparison of circumstances, of which we just now spoke. *Lucian* mentions Christians as having things in common, and in the same popular sense in which I understand the two passages in the Acts of the Apostles¹.

9. Such passages as 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10, only express *facts*; not any general *doctrine*, or theory. Many evils, no doubt, arise from the abuse of riches; and the description of an abuse is sometimes apt to make well-meaning men so eager to avoid it, that they go much farther than was intended. Breaking a bad habit requires sometimes, at first, almost as much resolution as parting with a *limb*; and therefore the Scripture tells

¹ See Lardner's Works, vol. VIII. p. 71, bottom; or Lucian's *Peregrinus*.

us we must be ready to part with a limb if it *offend* us, or be IV. the occasion of our sinning. But advice, to correct an *abuse*, is not to be mistaken for advice to throw away the *use* of anything¹; we are advised to reform the abuse of anything in order that we may afterwards have all the advantages from it which it is capable of producing. Spiritual power has been abused by the bishops of Rome; that is a good reason for a reform, but not for laying aside all ordinances.

Here we close our proof, direct and indirect.

10. An *application* might lead us to consider the rules of 530 voluntary beneficence; and to inquire whether any restraints might be laid on the accumulation of property? But these things not being our immediate concern, I forbear to enter upon them.

ARTICLE XXXIX.

531

OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.

As we confess, that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done, according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgement, and truth.

1. The *History* of this as well as of the foregoing Article having been given under the thirty-seventh, we immediately look whether we have anything before us which requires *explanation*.

2. "*Vain and rash swearing*"—is opposed to that which is *important*, and *deliberate*, or done upon principle: it arises from habit, and is introduced for no good purpose; it must have some motives, but they are some kind of wrong sentiments—often parts and kinds of vanity.

"Forbidden *Christian men*."—Here again our concern is only with Christian *Scripture*: the passages referred to, when

¹ See Matt. v. 29, 30. Origen's mutilation was remedying an abuse by taking away the use, and that by parting with a limb. Matt. xix. 12.

IV. Christ and St. James are mentioned, are Matt. v. 34, &c., and James v. 12.

“*We judge*”—*censemus*.—This is not dogmatical.

532 “*Doth not prohibit*.”—Suppose a man thought that Scripture *discouraged* swearing, even in evidence, and that it was most *safe* to avoid it; still he might allow that Scripture did not *prohibit* it.

“*When the Magistrate requireth*.”—This is opposed to the vain and rash swearing. Therefore, though a man might use vain and rash swearing before a magistrate, yet that is not the thing meant here. The vain and rash swearing here meant the magistrate is supposed to have no concern with; it is supposed to be in private life.

533 “*In a cause of faith and charity*”—“*in causâ fidei et charitatis*”—that is, from motives of ascertaining the *truth*, that justice may be done, and of doing *good*. *Fidem facere* is to create *confidence*, or make one's self *believed*; *causa* seems to be used by Cicero where we should now use the word *case*;—in a cause of faith and charity, may therefore mean, in a *case* which requires *credit* to be established for the sake of knowing the real state of it, as a step to doing justice; or in a case in which, by taking an oath, you may do an act of *charity* or *benevolence*. Dr. Ogden seems to have had our expression in his mind when he uses the expressions, “*in causes of importance, for the sake of truth, in support of justice, at the call of charity*.” Luther³ says, we may swear if commanded by the magistrate, or if not commanded, yet from motives of *charity*, as we may do other things not quite regular. But in our Article, seemingly, both in the cause of faith and the cause of charity the magistrate commands our evidence. If so, it may be said, we cannot make ourselves perfect judges what kind of cause or case it is. It seems as if we could not; but an Article is not for *practice*; it only lays down what is *right*: every man must avoid oaths, in cases not of faith and charity, as much as he can⁴. The concluding part of our Article does also point out what is right; adopting the words of the Prophet *Jere-*

² Fifth Sermon on the Commandments, vol. II. p. 63, 12mo.

³ Works, vol. VII. Enarrations on the Sermon on the Mount, on Matt. v. 34, or thereabouts.

⁴ After all, the expression, “*in a cause*

of *faith and charity*,” may allude to something which I have not seen. Or it may be taken from Luther, and made less clear by alteration. Luther gives, to my mind, a more distinct conception than our Article. But Dr. Ogden is perfectly clear.

*miah*¹; which seem also to be used in other places, and to IV. denote swearing honestly and sincerely.

3. We will now come to *proof*.

‘Solemn oaths, taken in obedience to authority, and from benevolent motives, are not forbidden by the Gospel.’

First we will take some direct proofs of this proposition.

Under the *Old Law*, swearing by Jehovah was considered as a mode of professing to serve him, in preference to *idols*. As *Goliath* cursed David by his Gods, so a Jew swore by Jehovah. In this light we are to see Deut. vi. 13; Psalm lxiii. 11. Did this idea want confirming, any one might consult Isaiah lxv. 16; and the passages referred to in the margin of that text which is introduced into our Article.

In the *New Testament*, we may look at Matt. xxvi. 63, observing, that whatever was said in answer to *adjuration* was said upon oath. And we should read Mark viii. 12, for the sake of the *ei* (in English *verily*) which is sometimes a particle of swearing, answering to אֵין in Hebrew². The Helvetic confession says, “Christus et Apostoli jurarunt³ ;” the instances 534 of Christ we have just mentioned; St. Paul several times uses expressions which may with propriety be called oaths. As in Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 31, where the particle *νη* denotes an oath. 2 Cor. i. 23, is too strong to need any remark; and the same may be said of 2 Cor. xi. 31. Gal. i. 20 is very plain; as well as Phil. i. 8. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Deity is mentioned as swearing, Heb. iii. 11, (where *ei* again occurs), and Heb. vi. 16, 17.

4. But, as in the preceding Article so here, it is the *indirect* proof which requires the greatest attention. The *Quakers*⁴ are very peremptory in objecting the two passages already mentioned, Matt. v. 33—37, and James v. 12; but they do not, that I perceive, use Matt. xxiii. 16—22: these *three* passages should be in view together. And from them, taken together, I think the truth of our proposition cannot be disproved.

I do not perceive that the Quakers, or others, have made their supposed prohibition of solemn oaths *consistent* with our direct proof: till they do that they cannot be allowed to have the true sense of Scripture.

¹ Jer. iv. 2.

² See Parkhurst’s Greek Lexicon under *Ei*. *Si je l’aime!* is not an *oath*, but a pretty powerful exclamation. Diderot.

³ Confess. Helvet. *ad finem*.

⁴ Barclay’s Apology, Prop. 15, sect. 10.

IV. The passages on which the objection is founded have no relation to the acts of the *magistrate*, as Luther observes: oaths taken in obedience to *authority* are not affected by them. Neither do they prohibit swearing by the *Deity* himself. People may indeed swear in private by the Deity himself, profanely and blameably; but that was not, seemingly, a *custom* amongst those who are reprov'd in the New Testament; indeed, the reasoning in both the passages of St. Matthew shews that it was carefully *avoided*, and on that avoiding all *excuses* were built.

535 All the oaths specified by Christ were *vain* and *childish*, though connected with the Jewish *religion*; for the people who used them were not, as in our days, dissolute and licentious, but formal and precise. We have not, that I know of, any set of people amongst us who have the "*form of godliness*,"⁵ and yet accustom themselves to a set of *pious oaths*, excusing themselves by saying, that such as they take are *no* oaths. Yet this seems to have been the case amongst the Jews: the very Scribes and Pharisees⁶ ran into the most frivolous and unmeaning distinctions between those sayings which were *real* oaths, and those *like* sayings which were *no* oaths. Now sayings like oaths, yet accounted no oaths, would produce two faults: one, hypocritical profaneness, the other, deceit and fraud. Matt. v. 33—37 seems to turn more upon the former; and Matt. xxiii. 16—22, more upon the latter. If it should be thought, that *ὀφείλει*, "he is a debtor," Matt. xxiii. 16, 18, means only, as opposed to, *οὐδέν ἐστι*, "it is nothing," to denote a *real* oath—still the two faults, profaneness and falsehood, would, in fact, arise, and would both deserve severe reprehension.

I remember to have heard very young and very ignorant people use words like oaths, and then excuse themselves by saying that they had not sworn; but grave, religious people have not, I think, amongst us, any such system of hypocritical profaneness. That our Saviour spoke of common *conversation*, appears from the word *λόγος*, *sermo*, discourse; and (Luther thinks) from the terms "yea yea, nay nay?"

⁵ 2 Tim. iii. 5.

⁶ Matt. xxiii. 15, 16.

⁷ April 21, 1792. The accounts given me this day, by a captain in the navy, of oaths in trials in the Admiralty-court, are curious. He says, that people of different nations and religions will swear

any thing, and flatter themselves they are not perjured, if only the *form* of taking the oath differs, in any thing, from that to which they have been accustomed. And methods are used, by those belonging to the court, to hit off their modes of swearing: one man, while a foreigner is taking

We can conceive that it might be worthy of our Lord to check such folly. It was profane and impious, and so had a tendency to debase and bring contempt upon religion; it must also greatly weaken and loosen men's principles of veracity. But why might not the evil most immediately in view be, its hurting the dignity and the obligation of *solemn oaths*? and so occasioning perjury? at least, stopping such foolish oaths as the Jews made use of, is rather supporting solemn oaths than discouraging them; and is perfectly consistent with such as St. Paul used.

5. With regard to St. *James*, he seems to have had the same view of the subject with our Saviour when on the mount. He mentions *two* of the same frivolous oaths, but goes no farther. Instead of going on he says, as a kind of *et cetera*, "neither by *any other* oath;"—which must mean, any other *such* oath; we cannot conceive his thoughts to leap from such a train of trifling profaneness, to a solemn, devout, deliberate oath by the Supreme Deity himself. "Let your yea be yea," has been understood to mean, 'speak the *truth*,' and therefore to *imply* that the Jews had run into falsehood. He concludes with, "lest ye fall into condemnation," ὑπὸ κρίσιν¹.

Our Lord had marked the *origin* of such folly, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ²; St. *James* points out the *consequence*. But such oaths as are described in our *Article* would scarcely be said to proceed from *evil*, at least, in the speaker; though, as before, oaths, in *general*, may imply some presumed imperfection in mens general *veracity*³.

As the *Quakers* will allow of nothing but literal construction, one might ask them, in the way of *argumentum ad hominem*, how they understand Matt. v. 40⁴.

taking an oath, will hold up one finger, another two fingers, a third presents a crucifix, and so on; meaning to use that form which the witness will deem binding.

The chief case in which these oaths are taken seems to be, when enemy's property has been taken under neutral colours; then the neutral captain swears the property to be neutral: there are always papers, concealed somewhere, shewing the real case, and others, counterfeits, to produce to captors. The real papers had, in one case, been found, and the captain, not knowing that, swore to the

counterfeits; on the real papers being produced he dropped down dead. One could not hear such an account, from respectable authority, without recollecting the death of *Ananias*, Acts v. 5.

¹ For ὑπὸ κρίσιν, the MSS. Steph. 1st. and Vales, read εἰς ὑπόκρισιν, which Grotius adopts: how such hypocritical oaths may make men fall into *hypocrisy*, is intelligible enough.

² The First Bodleian MS. has ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου.

³ Art. xxxvii. sect. 3.

⁴ P. S. When I appealed to this text I believe I was not aware of Dr. Ogden's appeal

IV. I will here close my indirect proof, presuming that objections to our proposition are now removed.

6. If we had *time*, I might make some *application*, by offering a few remarks on *perjury*, and on *profane swearing*, such as shocks our ears in *modern* times ; but this is at present impracticable. Perjury I have treated in a System of Morality ; and profane swearing is attacked in a very masterly manner in Dr. Ogden's Sermons on the Commandments.

appeal to the same (Serm. V. on the Commandments, vol. II. p. 57, duodecimo.) He says, "It is written, *If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak*

also. Are they willing to deliver up their property always to the first invader? of these rights they are sometimes, and with reason, a little more tenacious."

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

I N D E X.

THIS Index is not intended to supersede the use of the printed *Heads* of Lectures, which the Author imagines would be very serviceable in giving the reader the true scope and purpose of each part of the work; but only to enable him to find what the printed Heads would not readily point out. The figures are meant to mark *Book*, *Chapter*, and *Section*, as placed at the top of each page. In some few places, a fourth number marks *Sub-section*. And sometimes, when a section is long, the *page* is mentioned.

In the fourth Book, each *Article* of the Church of England is considered as a Chapter. The *Introductions* and *Appendixes* will be easily understood from the Heads of Lectures.

If reference is made, in the Index, to more Sections than one in the same Chapter, they are separated only by *commas*. If to several in *succession*, only the first and last are mentioned, and a line is put between them.

Where the same object occurs repeatedly, it is sometimes mentioned both in the Index and Heads of Lectures.

Thus, III. xiii. 1, means the third Book, the thirteenth Chapter, and the first Section.

IV. xvi. 3, means the fourth Book, the sixteenth *Article*, and the third Section.

III. x. 15. (4), means the third Book, tenth Chapter, fifteenth Section, and fourth Subsection.

III. xv. 11, vol. i. p. 457, means that Section 11 is so long, that it is worth while to note the *page*.

II. iii. 4, 5, 6, means the second Book, third Chapter, and Sections fourth, fifth, and sixth.

II. iv. 1—6, means the second Book, fourth Chapter, and the first six Sections.

I may here observe, that it seemed better to refer to texts of Scripture than to *quote* them; because not quoting must make the work much shorter, and may engage the reader's attention to the context. These reasons extend to other passages, which might have been quoted, besides those of Scripture.

I beg permission to mention, that whenever I have been induced to give any part of this work a *second reading*, in what might be called one perusal, I have seen its force and meaning more clearly than at first; a consequence, probably, of its having been written merely as a preparation for speaking;—which has also occasioned a word to be used here and there not thoroughly adopted into the English Language.

- ABBE Paris.** I. xvi. 10, 14.
Abgarus. I. xii. 5.
 xvii. 6.
 IV. xxii. 4.
Absolution. IV. xvi. 18.
 xxv. 4.
Accommodation. I. xviii. 19.
Accursed. III. ix. 1.
 IV. xviii. 8.
 xxxiii. 3.
Acontius. IV. vii. 4.
Acrimony in dispute.
 I. xii. 14.
 II. ii. 14.
 III. x. 15. (4).
Adam. I. xvi. 8.
 IV. ix. *Introd.* 16.
 ix. 1, 2, 4, 6, 14, 15,
 19, 21, 29.
 x. 24, 37.
Addison. I. xviii. 19.
 II. iv. 13.
 IV. xxxi. 13.
Adults. IV. xxvii. 14, (see
 Sponsors) 17.
Agape. IV. xxviii. 5, 21.
**Agency, divine and human
 opposed.** IV. ix. *Introd.* 1.
 x. 41.
 xvii. 9, 79, 98.
Agent. (see Minister.)
 IV. xxii. 17.
 xxv. 4.
 xxvi. 4, 6.
 xxxiii. 11.
 xxxvi. 18, 19.
Agriculture. II. iv. 4.
 IV. ix. 44, 45.
Albigenses. IV. xxxiii. 3.
Alderman. IV. xxxvi. 1, 12.
Allegorists. I. xvi. 7.
 I. xvii. 19.
 IV. iv. 5.
 and page 627.
 IV. vi. 3.
 vii. 3.
 ix. 4.
Allix. I. xvii. 19.
 I. App. 21.
 IV. i. 2, 6, 16.
 ii. 1.
 vi. 3, 10, 11, 12.
 xxviii. 4.
Altar. IV. xxxi. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6.
Ambrose. IV. vi. 12.
 xxviii. 33.
America. III. v. 1, 4.
 IV. iii. 2.
 viii. 12.
 xxxiii. 7.
 xxv. 4.
 xxxvii. 13.
Anabaptists. IV. vii. 3.
 ix. 12.
 x. 12.
 xi. 11.
 xiii. 5.
 xv. 4.
 xvi. 3.
 xxvi. 2.
 xxxviii. 11.
Anabaptists. IV. xxxvii. 6.
Anatomists. II. iv. 7.
Angels. I. App. 8, 9, 18, 26.
 IV. xxv. 4.
Antilegomena. I. xii. 4.
 IV. vi. 14.
Antinomians—see Crispe.
 IV. vii. 3.
 xv. 6.
 xvi. 9.
Apocrypha. I. xii. 2.
 IV. vi. 10, 11, 34.
 xxxv. 4.
Apollonius. I. xii. 17.
Apology. IV. viii. 8, 12.
Aquinas. IV. xiii. 4, 14.
 xvii. 8, 71.
 xxii. 2.
 xxiv. 1.
Archontici. IV. xxv. 2.
Argumentum ad Hominem.
 I. xvii. 19.
 II. ii. 13, 14.
 IV. ix. *Introd.* 16.
Aristides. I. xiv. 4.
Aristophanes. II. iv. 10.
Aristotle. II. iii. 15.
Arminius, and followers.
 IV. x. 15.
 xvi. 8.
 xvii. 4, 11, 12, 19,
 20, 30.
Arthur, Prince. IV. vii. 5.
Articles. III. i. 1, 5, 6.
 v. 1, &c.—also
 Chap. ix, &c.
 IV. *Introd.* entire.
 IV. xvii. 20, 23,
 24. (see Lam-
 beth).
 IV. xviii. 1, 7.
 xix. 1.
Ascodrutæ. IV. xxv. 2.
 xxvii. 28.
 xxviii. 2.
Asseman. IV. ii. 9.
Assembly of Divines.
 IV. xvii. 20, 23.
 xxiii. 12.
 xxxiii. 6.
Association. III. iii. 6, 8, 10.
 IV. xx. 7.
 xxii. 4, 5,
 19.
 xxiii. 22.
Assurance. IV. xvi. 10, 25,
 31, 37.
Athanasian Creed.
 III. iv. 4.
 ix. 9.
 IV. ii. 9.
 ii. 42.
 iv. 4.
 viii. 8. &c.
 Review of Sermon on
 it, IV. viii. 12 end.
Athanasius. IV. i. 10 end.
 i. 17, p. 526.
 ii. 21.
 viii. 2, 8.
 xvi. 4.
Athanasius. IV. xxvi. 3, 6.
Attrition. IV. xxv. 4.
Augustin. I. i. 6.
 I. App. 4—6.
 II. v. 11.
 III. x. 15. end.
 IV. i. 1, 4, 6, 17.
 ii. 45.
 ix. 5, 7, 9, 44.
 x. 6, 20, 26.
 xiii. 2.
 xiv. 3.
 xvi. 5, 10, 30.
 xvii. 5, 28.
 xxiii. 2.
 xxii. 2, 4, 5, 18.
 xxiv. 1.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvi. 1.
 xxvii. 14.
 xxxix. 2.
 xxxiii. 3.
 xxxiv. 5.
 xxxvi. 4, 18.
 xxxvii. 5, 17.
Authority. III. xiv. 12.
 IV. xxxvi. 1.
Balguy, Mr. John.
 IV. xi. App. 9.
Balguy, Dr. Thomas.
 I. xix. 11, 14.
 II. v. 1, 3.
 III. iv. 3, 4, 6, 9.
 v. 2.
 vi. 6.
 ix. 6.
 x. 14.
 xi. 4, 6, 11.
 xiii. 8.
 xiv. 12, 13.
 xv. 4, 9.
 IV. *Introd.* 2, 3.
 ii. 42.
 vii. 6, 13.
 viii. 11.
 ix. 20, 32.
 xi. App. 9.
 xiii. 1, 4, 17, 22, 24,
 30.
 xv. 23.
 xvii. 20.
 xix. 19.
 xxiii. 17, 22, 26.
 xxviii. 13, 20, 30.
 xxix. 5.
 xxxv. 1.
Baptism. IV. i. 18.
 ix. 32.
 xiii. 10.
 xvi. 5, 19.
 xxiii. 5, 14.
 xxv. 2, 3, 5,
 7, 8.
 xxvi. 6.
 xxvii. *passim.*
 (see Heads.)
 IV. xxxiii. 3.
 xxxiv. 2, 7.
 viii. 11, p. 51.
 xvii. 22.

- Baptist. IV. xxv. 3, 7.
 xxvii. 15, 30,
 35.
 xxviii. 12.
 xxxiii. 7.
- Baptistery. IV. xxvii. 4.
- Barbeyrac. IV. xii. 14.
 xiv. 5.
- Barclay. I. xi. 6.
 (see Quakers).
 IV. xxvii. 29.
 xxviii. 20.
 xxx. 10.
 xxxiv. 2.
 xxxvii. 19.
- Barnabas. IV. xi. App. 1.
- Baxter. III. iv. 1.
 IV. x. 4.
 xii. 25.
 xiii. 5.
 xiv. 7.
 xv. 23.
 xvi. 5, 10, 15,
 29, 30, 31.
 xxi. 1.
 xxiii. 4, 16, 25.
 xxxvi. 4.
- Belsham. I. xvi. 8.
 IV. xvii. 21.
- Bennet. IV. Introd. 6.
 xx. 1.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvii. 29.
 xxix. 1.
 xxxvi. 5.
- Bentley. I. ix. 3.
 IV. i. App.
- Berquin. II. iv. 13.
- Berriman, John. IV. ii. 37.
- Beza. I. vii. 5.
 IV. xvii. 15.
- Bible, our present.
 I. ix. 11.
 III. ix. 1.
 IV. iii. 6.
- Bigotry. II. ii. 8.
 III. xv. 6.
- Bilson, Bishop. III. iv. 3.
- Bingham, passim.
 III. xi. 10.
 xiii. 1, 8.
 IV. Introd. 3, 6.
 i. 4. p. 499.
 iv. 17.
 v. 1.
 vi. 16.
 xxiii. 1.
 xxiv. 2.
 xxv. 4.
 xxvii. 5, 15.
 xxviii. 5.
 xxxvi. passim.
- Bishop. IV. xxxvi. 1, 2, 3,
 5, 11, 12, 13.
- Blasphemy. IV. v. 11.
 xvi. 11, 34.
 xxxi. 8, 10.
- Blood. IV. xi. App. 2, 27.
 IV. xxxiv. 27.
- Böhmen, Jacob. III. xv. 11.
 p. 463, &c.
- Bona, Cardinal. III. xv. 11.
 p. 471, &c.
 IV. xxv. 5.
 xxvi. 3.
 xxxi. 1, 4.
- Boys, on the Articles.
 IV. xiii. 14.
- Bradford. IV. xvii. 17.
- Bramhall, Archbishop.
 III. xiii. 1.
 IV. xxiii. 4, 12.
 xxv. 2.
- Brerewood. IV. xxiv. 1.
 xxxii. 10.
- Brown, Dr. John.
 II. iii. 10, 15.
 iv. 14.
- Brownists. IV. vii. 6.
 xvi. 3.
 xxiii. 6.
- Bullet. I. xiv. 12.
 I. xvi. 10.
 I. xviii. 11. et passim.
- Burges, Dr. John.
 II. v. 11.
 III. vii. 4.
 IV. Introd. 6.
 xix. 1.
 xxxv. 1.
 xxxvi. 7.
- Burn. IV. xvi. 3.
 xxvii. 15.
 xxxiii. 8.
 xxxv. 1.
 xxxvii. 6, 10.
- Burnet, Bishop.
 III. iv. 5.
 xii. 1.
 xiii. 8.
 IV. Introd. 1, 2, 6.
 i. 4, p. 497.
 i. 18.
 i. App.
 ii. 1.
 iii. 1, 6.
 iv. 7.
 vii. 3, 5.
 xiii. 14.
 xiv. 4.
 xvii. 10, 14.
 xviii. 2, 10.
 xix. 1.
 xxiv. 2.
 xxvi. 5.
 xxviii. 11, 20.
 xxx. 1, 2.
 xxxiv. 17.
 xxxv. 2.
 xxxvi. 5.
 xxxvii. 19.
- Butler, Joseph, Bishop.
 I. xii. 1.
 xv. 6.
 xvi. 12.
 xix. 1, 15, 19.
 IV. ix. 34.
 xi. App. 9, 29,
 p. 199.
 xvi. 31.
 xvii. 86.
- Butler, Samuel. II. iv. 13.
- Cajetan, Cardinal.
 IV. xiii. 5.
 xxiv. 1.
- Called. IV. xvii. 44.
 xxiii. 15, 16.
 xxxvi. 18.
- Calmet. I. ix. 6, 10.
 x. 8.
 IV. x. 9.
- Calvin, and followers. (See
 Predestination).
 IV. Introd. 4.
 iii. 2.
 vii. 4.
 ix. 13.
 x. 15, 20, 39.
 xvi. 7, 8, 37.
 xvii. 9, 11, 12,
 15, 17, 18, 86.
 xix. 9.
 xxii. 19.
 xxvi. 11.
- Campbell. I. ix. 11.
 IV. ii. 1.
- Candid Disquisitions.
 IV. viii. 11, 12.
- Candor. I. i. 5.
 App. 30.
 III. v. 3.
- Canonical. I. xii. 2.
 IV. vi. 11, 14.
- Carless. IV. xvii. 17.
- Catalogues. IV. vi. 12, 19.
- Catechism.
 (See Racovian, and Trent).
 III. x. 11.
 IV. ii. 42.
 vii. 7.
 xvii. 20.
 xix. 11.
 xxv. 4, 8.
 xxviii. 3.
- Cathari. I. App. 4, 12.
 IV. vi. 2.
- Catholicus consensus.
 IV. xi. App. 2.
 xxix. 2.
- Cave. IV. xxv. 2, 4, 5, 7.
 xxvii. 5.
- Ceremonies.
 III. iv. 2.
 xv. 12.
 IV. xx. 1, 2, 7.
 xxv. 3, 5, 10.
 xxviii. 4.
 xxxiii. 4.
 xxxiv. 2, 3, 14.
- Cerinthus. I. App. 22, 25, 28.
 IV. ii. 5, 15.
 iv. 1.
- Cervantes. II. iv. 13.
- Chambers. I. xv. 22.
- Chances, calculation of.
 I. xvi. 6.
- Chandler, Bishop.
 I. xvii. 9, 15, 18, 19.
 IV. vi. 12.
- Character, indelible.
 IV. xxv. 2, 3, 5, 6.
- Charlemagne. IV. xiii. 4.
 xxii. 4.

- Charlemagne. IV. xxxv. 1.
 Charms. IV. xxv. 7, 8.
 xxxix. 1.
 Chatham, Earl of.
 IV. xvii. 21.
 Cheynel. IV. iv. App.
 vii. 3.
 xxxvii. 6.
 Chillingworth. IV. vii. 7.
 Chivalry. IV. xiii. 22.
 Chosen. (see Elect.)
 Christm. IV. xxv. 3.
 xxxvii. 6.
 Church.
 III. vii. 4.
 xi. 4.
 IV. iii. 6.
 xviii. 7, 14.
 xix. 2, 4, 5, 7, 15, 17.
 xxi. 1, 17.
 xxiii. 13, 14, 17.
 xxx. 4.
 xxxiv. 19.
 Church, attendance on.
 II. iv. 5, 7.
 Church, eastern and western.
 IV. v. 3.
 vi. 23.
 xxiv. 1, 4.
 xxvii. 10.
 xxxiv. 5.
 xxxvii. 2.
 Cicero. I. xiv. 5, 7.
 xix. 12, 19.
 II. iii. 3, 12.
 III. vii. 2.
 x. 2, 4.
 IV. i. 1.
 iii. 8.
 ix. 3.
 x. 2.
 xvii. 2.
 xxii. 2, 6.
 Circumcelliones. IV. xxvi. 1.
 Circumstances, as helping in
 interpretation.
 I. x. 1.
 III. i. 7.
 vii. 5.
 IV. Introd. 7.
 x. 42.
 Clarke. I. iii. 3.
 xix. 19.
 IV. i. 4. p. 494.
 i. 8, 18.
 i. Appendix.
 iii. 6.
 viii. 11.
 Cleaver, Bishop.
 IV. xi. App. 27.
 xxviii. 1, 13, 20, 30, 33.
 xxx. 10.
 Clemens Romanus.
 IV. xxiii. 2.
 xxxvi. 3.
 Clinical. IV. xxv. 4, 12.
 xxvii. 10.
 Cole. II. iii. 4, 11.
 iv. 11.
 Colleges. III. viii. 2.
 IV. xxiv. 5.
 Collins. I. xvii. 10, 14.
 IV. Introd. 6.
 vi. 9.
 Collyridians. IV. xxii. 4.
 Comber. IV. xxiv. 1.
 xxv. 4.
 Commination.
 IV. viii. 11, p. 53.
 Communion, for families.
 IV. xxviii. 5.
 for funerals.
 xxviii. 11.
 Communion of Saints.
 IV. viii. 4.
 xxii. 6.
 xxv. 4.
 xxx. 4.
 Comprehension.
 III. xiv. 15.
 Concubinage. IV. xxv. 6.
 Concupiscence.
 IV. ix. 2, 5, 12, 26, 32.
 Confession. IV. xxv. 4.
 xxxiii. 5.
 Confirmation. IV. xxv. 3, 9.
 Constantine. I. xviii. 15.
 III. v. 3.
 IV. i. 15.
 xvi. 2.
 xxxiv. 7.
 Constitution. IV. ix. 13, 28.
 xxxvi. 1.
 Consubstantiation.
 IV. xxviii. 10.
 Contrition. IV. xxv. 4.
 Conversion. IV. x. 26, 50.
 xii. 8.
 xvii. 45.
 Convocation. III. vii. 4.
 Cooke, Dr. William, Dean of
 Ely. I. xvii. 10.
 (p. 170), 15, 20.
 I. xix. 12.
 Copts. I. v. 7.
 ix. 5.
 III. x. 8.
 IV. xxiv. 1.
 Corpus Christi.
 IV. xxviii. 10.
 Corpus et Syntagma. (see
 Syntagma).
 Councils, including Nicene;
 but see Trent.
 IV. i. 4.
 viii. 5.
 xxi. 1, 2, 3, 4, 10.
 xxii. 4.
 xxv. 2, 3.
 xxx. 1.
 xxxii. 3, 4.
 xxxiii. 3.
 xxxvii. 2, 13.
 Cranmer. I. xviii. 13.
 IV. Introd. 4.
 xiii. 5.
 xvii. 16.
 xxviii. 11.
 xxx. 6.
 xxx. 1.
 xxxii. 12.
 xxxv. 1, 4.
 Cranmer. IV. xxxvii. 2.
 Crellius, Paul. IV. vii. 3.
 Crispe. IV. xi. 10.
 xi. App. 9.
 xiii. 5.
 Criticism and taste. I. xii. 13.
 Cromwell. IV. xvi. 8.
 Cupid and Psyche. III. x. 15.
 Customs.
 IV. vi. 5. (see Habits.)
 IV. xxxiv. 2, 17, 24.
 xxxvi. 1.
 Cyrus. IV. xiii. 17.
 Dacier. IV. i. 1, 3.
 ix. 3, 5.
 x. 2.
 Dailé. I. xii. 16.
 IV. xxv. 4.
 D'Alembert. IV. x. 13.
 Damascene. IV. xxii. 4, 5.
 Deacon.
 IV. xxxvi. 1, 2, 3, 15, 17.
 Deaconess. IV. xxv. 5.
 xxxii. 19.
 Death. IV. ix. 14, 29.
 Deceased Christians.
 IV. xxii. 6.
 Defender of the Faith.
 III. ix. 1.
 IV. xxxvii. 2.
 Deformity. II. iii. 7.
 Deluge. I. xvi. 8. (see de
 Luc).
 Demoniaacs. I. xiii. 10.
 IV. ix. Introd. 16.
 xxv. 5.
 Dickinson. IV. xv. 6.
 Diderot. IV. xiii. 22.
 Digby, Lord. III. xiv. 10.
 xv. 6.
 Dionysius. III. x. 9.
 IV. iv. 5.
 viii. 6.
 xxxvii. 2.
 Diptychs. IV. xxxiii. 4.
 Directory. IV. xxv. 3, 4, 6.
 xxvii. 15.
 xxviii. 12.
 Discipline. III. xv. 12.
 IV. xxxiii. 1, 7.
 xxxvi. 16.
 Dissenter. III. iv. 4, 5.
 xiv. 2, 8, 15.
 xv. 6.
 IV. i. 3, p. 493.
 i. 15.
 ii. 43.
 viii. 11, p. 50.
 xvi. 3.
 xvii. 21.
 xx. 4, 7.
 xxii. 26.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvi. 6.
 xxviii. 12.
 xxx. 5.
 xxxiii. 7.
 (see Puritans
 and Presby-
 terians).

- Dissertation on the 17th Article, Oxf. 1772.
 III. iv. 9.
 ix. 1.
 IV. Introd. 4.
 xvii. 7, 9, 16, 29.
- Divorce. IV. vii. 13.
 xxv. 2, 6.
 xxxvii. 2.
- Docetæ. I. App. 19, 20, 24.
 IV. ii. 4, 15.
 vi. 29.
 xi. App. 2.
- Doctrina, &c. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. IV. Introd. 4.
 ii. 3.
 vii. 3.
- Donatists. IV. viii. 4.
 xvi. 2.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvi. 1.
- Dort, Synod of. IV. x. 15.
 xvii. 11, 19.
- Doxologies. IV. i. 4.
 v. 1.
- Duelling. IV. xiii. 22.
 xxxvii. 3.
- Eachard. II. iv. 13.
- Easter. IV. xxxiv. 5.
 xxxvii. 2.
- Ebionites. IV. ii. 5.
- Edwards, Jonathan.
 II. v. 10.
 IV. x. 19, 33.
 xi. App. 9.
 xii. 25.
 xiii. 5.
 xvi. 8.
 xvii. 22.
- Election.
 IV. xvi. 5, 20.
 xvii. 5, 14, 30, 44, 69, 92.
 xix. 12.
 xxiii. 15. (see Chosen).
- Enthusiasm.
 III. xv. 11, p. 462.
 IV. Introd. 3.
 x. 19, 49.
 xvi. 31, p. 299.
 xvii. 56.
 xxv. 2.
 xxxvi. 17.
- Epictetus, including Carter.
 IV. iii. 4.
 xvii. 89.
- Epiphanius. IV. i. 1.
 iv. 17.
 iv. App.
- Episcopius. IV. ii. 42.
 x. 15.
- Erasmus. IV. Introd. 4.
 i. 4.
 i. App.
 x. 2.
 xvii. 16.
 xviii. 5.
- Erastus. IV. xxxiii. 6.
- Evangelist. IV. xxiii. 24.
- Eucharist. IV. xxviii. 4.
- Euchitæ. IV. xxv. 2.
- Evil, referred to God.
 IV. x. 50.
 xvii. 92, 93.
 xxv. 10.
- Excision. IV. xxxiii. 2, 9.
- Excommunication.
 III. xiv. 1.
 IV. xxv. 4.
 xxxiii. passim.
- Execrations.
 IV. xxxiii. 2, 3, 4.
- Exorcism. (see Demoniacs).
 IV. xxvii. 4, 7.
- Faith. IV. x. 29.
 xi. 2, and passim.
 xi. 17.
 xii. 12, 14, 25.
 xvi. 3.
- Fall. I. xvi. 8. (see Adam).
 IV. ix. 19, 20.
 xvi. 22.
- Familists. IV. vii. 3, 7.
 xv. 5.
 xvii. 18.
 xxiii. 6.
 xxv. 2.
 xxviii. 11.
 xxxiv. 17.
 xxxvii. 10.
- Fanaticism.
 III. xv. 11, p. 463.
 IV. vii. 2.
 xxiii. 6.
 xxvi. 1.
- Fate. IV. iv. 4.
 ix. Introd. 8.
 x. 9.
 xvii. 2, 20, 25, 62.
- Fenelon. I. xvii. 14.
 II. v. 10, 11.
 III. xv. 11, p. 467, &c.
 (See Maxims of the Saints).
- Fielding. I. xiii. 7.
 II. iii. 4, 14.
 iv. 14.
 IV. xxxvii. 3.
- Filioque. IV. v. 3.
- Fisher, Bishop.
 IV. xxii. 21.
- Fitzjames, Duke of.
 IV. ix. 36.
- Five points. IV. x. 15, 26.
 xvii. 5, 19.
- Flesh. IV. xxxiii. 13. (see Docetæ.)
- Foote. II. iii. 1.
 iv. 13.
 v. 10.
- Forbes. passim.
 IV. i. 4, p. 495.
 x. 5.
 xxii. passim;
 partic. sect. 6.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvi. 2.
- Fox, John. IV. Introd. 4.
 vii. 2.
 xxv. 2.
 xxxviii. 26.
- Fox, John. IV. xxxii. 6, 12.
- Fulke. IV. xvi. 3, 8, 10.
 xvii. 9, 29.
 xxii. 2, 6.
 xxiv. 1.
 xxv. 2, 7.
 xxviii. 11.
 xxix. 1.
 xxx. 4.
 xxxi. 2, 12.
 xxxii. 17.
 xxxiii. 3.
- Fuller. IV. Introd. 4.
 vii. 3, 5.
- Fulness of time.
 I. xvi. 7, p. 135.
 xix. 18.
- Fur prædestinatus.
 IV. xv. 12.
 xvi. 8.
 xvii. 15.
- Galileo. II. v. 11.
- Geneva. (see Switzerland).
- Genlis. II. iv. 13.
- Gerizim. I. v. 4.
- Gibbon.
 IV. i. 1, 3, 4, 6, 17, end.
 I. App.
 viii. 8.
- Gibson, Bishop.
 I. xvii. 18.
 xix. 1, 7, 9.
 III. xiv. 15.
 xv. 11, p. 464, 472.
 IV. vi. 22, 26.
 ix. 3.
 x. 39.
 xxxvii. 2.
- Gift of God.
 IV. xvi. 30. (5).
 xvii. 83, p. 343.
 xxxii. 18.
- God, his nature how conceived. I. iii. 1, 3.
 IV. i. 10, p. 509.
- Golden Age. IV. ix. 20, 41.
- Good, hereditary. IV. ix. 36.
- Gordon, Lord George.
 I. xvii. 16.
 III. vi. 6.
- Gospellers. IV. x. 12.
 xii. 1.
- Gotescalc. IV. x. 11.
 xvii. 7.
- Grace. IV. x. 18, (end), 42, 43, 45, 49.
 xi. 4.
 xii. 8.
 xiii. 9.
 xvi. 5, 20, 21.
- Gratian. IV. xxxi. 2.
- Greeks. passim. (see in Heads of Lectures.)
 IV. xxv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7.
 xxvii. 5.
 xxviii. 4.
 xxx. 3.
 xxxii. 10.
 xxxiv. 7.
 xxxvi. 18.

- Green, Bishop. IV. xi. 8.
xxv. 2.
(see Methodist).
- Grey, on Hudibras. IV. Introd. 6.
xxiii. 6, 11.
xxv. 6.
xxviii. 12.
- Grotius. I. xvi. 13.
xvii. 8.
IV. vi. 9, 10, 13, 27.
vii. 14.
x. 15, 41.
xi. App. 8.
xiv. 5.
xvi. 5.
xxvii. 35.
- Gulliver's Travels. III. ii. 4.
- Gurtler. IV. xvi. 5.
- Guy Faux. IV. ix. 30, p. 94.
- Habits (customs). IV. x. 50, p. 148.
xvi. 33. (7).
xxxvi. 1.
- Habits (dresses). IV. xx. 1, 7.
- Hales. IV. xvi. 4.
xxv. 3.
xxxvii. 18.
- Hallifax, Bishop. I. xii. 9.
xvi. 11.
xvii. 10.
App. 5.
III. ii. 5.
IV. vi. 31, 32.
viii. 8.
xxii. 20.
- Hampton-Court Conference. II. i. 9.
IV. xvi. 8.
xvii. 19, 80.
xix. 1.
xxiii. 13.
xxv. 3, 8.
xxvii. 15.
xxxv. 1.
- Hardouin. I. xii. 16.
- Hartley. II. iii. 1, 3.
III. xv. 11.
IV. iv. 4.
x. 19, 49.
xviii. 5.
xxii. 2.
- Heads of Lectures. Vol. II. Advertisement. II. iv. 12.
IV. vii. 9.
viii. 9.
- Healing, bodily and spiritual joined. IV. xviii. 11.
xxv. 10.
- Heathens. IV. viii. 11, page 49.
xiii. 1, 3, 5, 8,
17, 21, 24, 29.
xviii. 9.
- Hebrew. I. i. 4.
v. 8.
- Hebrew. I. xvii. 9.
IV. xxiv. 3.
- Hell. IV. iii. 3.
iv. 4.
xxii. 1.
- Helmstadt. II. ii. 5.
v. 10.
- Herbert, Lord of Cherbury. I. xix. 19.
IV. x. 2.
- Hervey. I. iv. end.
IV. xi. 15.
xi. App. 9, 20.
- Hey, William, his Short Defences. IV. i. 18.
ii. 16, 37.
v. 13.
x. 37, 41.
xi. App. 22, 30.
xiii. 6.
- Hey, Samuel. IV. xvi. 33.
- Hey, Richard. IV. x. 22.
- Heylin. IV. Introd. 4.
vii. 13.
x. 15, 16, 20.
xvii. 16, 27.
xix. 12.
xx. 1.
xxiv. 5.
xxv. 2.
xxvi. 2.
xxxv. 1, 2.
- Hierocles. I. xii. 17.
- Hints, &c. a pamphlet. IV. viii. 8, 11, 12.
- Hoadley, Bishop. IV. xxviii. 13.
- Hobbes. IV. xviii. 6.
- Holmes. I. vi. 3.
- Holy Ghost. IV. v. passim.
x. 39.
xvi. 4, 17, 34, 37, end.
xxxiii. 3.
xxxv. 4.
xxxvi. 17, 18, 19.
- Homer. II. ii. 14.
IV. x. 2.
xvii. 2, 25, 79,
85.
- Homilies. III. v. 3, 6.
ix. 6.
IV. Introd. 4.
ix. 34.
x. 11, 39.
xi. 17, 19, 21, 23.
xi. App. 2.
xii. 12, 20.
xiii. 5.
xiv. 1.
xv. 15.
xvi. 3, 8, 10, 27.
xvii. 92.
xxi. 13.
xxiv. 1, 2.
xxv. 2, 4, 6, 8, 9.
xxviii. 11, 20, 24.
xxxi. 4.
xxxii. 19.
xxxv. passim.
- Honorius. IV. ii. 10.
- Hooper. IV. Introd. 4.
xvii. 16, 62, 67, 71.
xx. 1.
xxxiv. 17.
- Horace. III. ix. 1.
IV. ix. 3.
xv. 21.
- Horsley, Bishop. I. xi. 3.
xvii. 3.
IV. i. 1.
i. App.
xxxv. 4.
- Hospitality. I. x. 10.
xi. 7.
- Huet. I. xii. 1.
IV. iv. App.
- Hume. I. iv. 3, 4.
xiii. 8.
xv. and
xvi. passim.
xviii. 11.
xix. 19.
II. i. 3.
iv. 11.
v. 10, 11.
III. iii. 4.
vi. 6.
xiv. 10.
xv. 11.
IV. i. 17, p. 524.
v. 5.
vii. 14.
x. 19.
xiii. 5.
xvii. 2, 20.
xviii. 5.
- Hurd, Bishop. I. xiii. 13.
xvi. 7.
xvii. passim.
IV. Introd. 2, 3, 4.
xxii. 8, 20.
- Hypothesis. II. iii. 4.
IV. ii. 46.
xi. 34.
xxviii. 6.
- Hypsistarii. IV. i. 13.
- James. IV. vi. 25.
xi. 27.
- Jansen. III. x. 5.
IV. x. 17.
xvii. 28.
- Iconoclastæ. IV. xxii. 4.
- Idol. IV. xxii. 13, 18.
- Idolatry, its attractions. I. xviii. 6, 21.
IV. vii. 14.
- Ignatius. IV. xxiii. 2.
xxxvi. 3.
- Jerom. IV. vi. 10, 13.
x. 5, 39.
xiii. 2.
xv. 3, 12.
xvi. 9.
xxii. 5.
xxiv. 1.
xxv. 3.
xxxii. 4.

- Jews, modern.** I. xvii. 9, 16.
 IV. vii. 13, 14.
 xvii. 95.
 xxii. 19.
- Jewel, Bishop.** I. xii. 16.
 IV. *Introd.* 4.
 xvii. 18.
 xxxii. 12.
 xxxv. 1.
- Immersion.** IV. xxvii. 4, 26.
- Impossibility.** IV. x. 25.
 xv. 3, 4, 18, 23.
- Imprecations.** IV. xxxiii. 2, 4.
- Imputation.** IV. xi. 15.
 xi. *App.* 20.
- Independents.** IV. xxxiii. 6, 13.
- Indifferent.** IV. xx. 7.
 xxxiv. 17.
- Indulgences.** IV. xiv. 1.
- Infants.** IV. ix. 37.
 xvii. 6.
 xxv. 3.
 xxvii. 11, 18, 27, 31.
 xxviii. 9.
 xxx. 4.
- Infinity.** IV. i. 10, p. 508.
 i. 17.
 ii. 21.
 v. 11.
- Injunctions.** III. iv. 9.
 vii. 5.
 ix. 1.
 IV. *Introd.* 5.
- Insanity.** IV. x. 23, 44.
- Inspiration.** I. xii. 3.
 xvi. 9.
 IV. xiii. 10.
 xxiii. 15, 17.
- Intention.** IV. xxvi. 3, &c.
 xxvii. 6.
- Interest of Money.** IV. vii. 14.
- Jortin.** I. xvi. 7.
 II. v. 10.
 IV. ix. 8.
 x. 5, 39, 54.
 xvii. 21.
 xxi. 9.
- Josephus.** I. vi. 1.
 xiv. 11, 12.
 IV. vi. 9, 12.
- Judgment, general.** IV. xi. 26.
 xii. 25.
- Julian.** I. xii. 16.
 xviii. 15.
- Juliana.** IV. xxviii. 10.
- Justification.** IV. xi. 14, 21.
 xii. 8.
 xiii. 7.
 xvi. 8, 19.
- Justinian.** IV. xxiv. 1.
- Kennicott.** I. viii. 2.
- King, Lord.** IV. i. 4, p. 501.
 iii. 3, 6.
- King, Lord.** IV. iv. 4.
 iv. *App.*
 viii. 1.
 xvi. 2, 4, 27.
- King, Archbishop.** IV. ix. 22.
 xvii. 24.
- King's College Chapel.** III. xv. 10.
- Kneeling.** IV. xxxi. 5.
- Knowledge, *γνώσις*, and Wisdom, *σοφία*.** I. xi. 3, 7.
App. 20, 24.
- Knox, John.** IV. xvii. 23.
 xxiii. 4.
- Labour.** IV. ix. 14, 44.
- Lactantius.** I. xix. 5.
 IV. i. 4.
 xxxvii. 5.
- Lambeth Articles.** IV. xvi. 8, 10, 31.
 xvii. 13, 24, 29.
- Lancaster.** I. xvii. 6.
- Language, popular.** I. x. 2, &c.
 IV. i. 17.
 ix. *Introd.* 3.
 ix. 34.
 x. 39, 41, 42, 48.
 xii. 13, 23.
 xvi. 30, p. 298.
 xvii. 77.
- Lardner.** *passim*.
 I. xii. 4, 9.
 xvi. 3, 7.
 xviii. 12, 14.
 III. xv. 6.
 IV. ii. 6, 22.
 vi. 12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26.
 vii. 11.
 xvi. 2.
 xvii. 2, 25.
 xxxi. 5.
 xxxii. 2.
 xxxiv. 24, 27.
 xxxvi. 2.
- Latimer.** IV. *Introd.* 4.
 xvii. 16, 67, 80.
 xxiii. 16.
 xxviii. 11.
 xxxv. 1.
- Latitudinarian.** IV. xi. 12.
- Laud, Archbishop.** IV. xvii. 20, 24.
 xix. 8.
 xx. 1.
 xxvii. 18.
- Law, Edmund, Bishop.** I. xix. 18.
 III. ii. 5.
 vi. 6.
 xiii. 8.
 IV. *Introd.* 2, 3.
- Law, William.** IV. xvi. 10.
- Leclerc.** IV. x. 39.
- Lectures, things incidental to them.** I. xviii. 12.
 III. v. 2.
 IV. xvi. 4.
 xvii. 100.
- Lectures, things incidental to them.** IV. xix. 1.
 xxii. 15.
 xxv. 12.
 xxxi. *end.*
 xxxiii. *end.*
 xxxv. 1.
- Legends.** IV. vi. 2.
- Leland.** I. xii. 4.
 xv. 1, 6.
 xvi. 10, 11, 16.
 xviii. 27.
 xix. 13, 19.
 II. iii. 1.
 IV. vi. 15.
- Leporius.** IV. xv. 3, 7.
- Leslie.** IV. xxvi. 6.
 xxvii. 8, 29.
 xxxvii. 20.
- Liberty, or Freedom.** III. iv. 6.
 vi. 5.
 xii. 1.
 IV. vii. 3.
 ix. *Introd.* 5.
 ix. 5.
 x. 9, 19, 22, 42, 46, 49.
 xii. 1.
 xvii. 1, 86, 91.
- Limborch.** IV. xvii. 11.
 xxv. 7.
 xxvii. 35.
 xxxvii. 18.
- Liturgy.** IV. x. 39.
 xx. 2.
 xxiv. 1—5.
 xxv. 7.
 xxxiv. 2.
 xxxvi. 7, 8.
- Locke.** I. xii. 13, *end.*
 xv. 15.
 xvii. 19.
 II. ii. 13.
 iv. 5.
 III. iii. 6.
 xii. 5, 6.
 IV. i. 17, p. 524.
 vii. 4, *end.*
 vii. 12, *end.*
 ix. *Introd.* 7.
 ix. 40.
 x. 29.
 xi. *App.* 9, 25.
 xvi. 31.
 xvii. 81, 92.
 xxiv. 3.
 xxvii. 27.
 xxxi. 13.
 xxxii. 17.
- Logos.** I. *App.* 25.
 III. iv. 5.
 IV. i. 6, p. 504.
 ii. 1, 15.
 iii. 1.
 vi. 10.
- Longinus.** III. iii. 2.
- Lord's Supper.** I. xi. 7.
 IV. xxiii. 5.
 xxv. 2.
 xxviii. 11.
- De Luc.** I. xvi. 8. (5).

- Lucian. I. xii. 16.
xvi. 3.
II. iv. 10, 13.
IV. xxxviii. 8.
- Ludlam. I. iv. end.
IV. ix. 28.
x. 5, 37.
xi. 15.
xi. App. 7, 9, 16, 20.
xiii. 2, 22, 27.
- Luther, and followers. I. xii. 7.
IV. i. App. vi. 26.
vii. 3, 4, 7, 14.
ix. 12.
x. 16.
xi. 6.
xiii. 5.
xv. 3.
xvii. 12.
xxiii. 6.
xxvii. 7.
xxviii. 10.
xxx. 1.
xxx. 5.
xxxi. 4.
xxxvii. 2, 6.
xxxix. 2, 4.
- Macedonius. IV. v. 2.
viii. 5.
- Macknight. I. xiii. 11.
IV. xvi. 4, and elsewhere.
- Maclaurin, John. IV. vii. 3.
- Magistrate. III. xiv. according to Heads of Lectures.
IV. xx. 1.
xxxiv. 15, 17.
xxxvi. 14, 16.
xxxvii. passim.
part. sect. 3, 15.
- Maimonides. I. xvii. 19.
IV. vi. 3, end.
ix. 4.
x. 3.
xvii. 3.
- Manicheans. I. xii. 7.
App. 3, 4.
IV. i. 4, 16.
ii. 4.
iv. 4.
ix. 5, 7.
x. 20.
xxii. 2.
xxx. 2.
xxxii. 2.
xxxvii. 5.
- Marcellinus. IV. xv. 3.
- Marmontel. IV. xvii. 85.
- Marriage. IV. xxiii. 12.
xxv. 6, 9.
xxxii. according to Heads of Lectures.
xxxiii. 3.
- Marsh. I. xvi. 8.
App. 26.
IV. i. App. end.
- Mass. IV. xxiv. 2.
including Missa.
xxviii. 2.
xxxi. according to Heads of Lect.
- Mathematics. II. i. 4.
- Matthew. I. vi. 1.
xiii. 9.
- Maty. IV. v. 4.
- Maxims of the Saints. III. xv. 11, p. 467, &c.
(see Fenelon.)
- Mede. I. xvii. 15.
IV. vi. 32.
- Melancthon. IV. Introd. 4.
x. 16.
xvi. 15.
xvii. 9, 16, 99.
xxviii. 10, 32.
xxxiv. 17.
- Memories. IV. xxii. 5.
- Merit. IV. ix. Introd. 8.
xi. 16.
xiv. 4.
- Messaliani. IV. xxv. 2.
xxvi. 2.
- Metaphor. I. xvii. 6, 18.
IV. v. 6.
ix. Introd. 6.
xi. App. 27.
xxviii. 6, 19, 20, 26, 31.
xxxi. 2, 4.
- Metropolitan. IV. xxi. 10.
- Methodism. I. xviii. 27.
III. viii. 4.
xv. 10, p. 470.
IV. x. 39.
xi. 10.
xi. App. 9.
xii. 3, 8.
xvi. 10, 31.
xvii. 21.
xxiii. 6, 8, 26.
- Michaelis. I. App. 26. and often elsewhere.
III. iv. 5.
IV. i. App. xi. App. 9.
(see Marsh.)
- Middleton. I. ix. 8.
xii. 3, 16.
xiii. 10.
xxii. passim, and sect. 6.
xxviii. 28.
xxix. 1.
xxx. 1, 8.
- Mill. I. viii. 2.
- Millenarians. I. xi. 2.
III. ix. 7.
IV. iv. 5, 12.
- Milton. IV. xvii. 2, 100.
xviii. 6.
- Ministers, religious. III. i. 6.
v. 6.
ix. 12.
IV. xxiii. 1, 15, 16.
xxv. 4.
xxvi. 1, 2, 6.
- Ministers, religious. IV. xxvii. 8. (see Priests).
xxxv. 2.
xxxvi. 1, 8.
- Miracles. I. xiii. 10.
xv. and xvi. according to Heads of Lectures.
xviii. 25.
IV. xxiii. 5, 17.
- Misna, or Talmud. I. v. 3.
viii. 9.
II. iv. 5.
IV. vi. 3.
xxvii. 2.
xxxiv. 4, 24.
- Moderation. IV. xxxv. 1. (see Puller.)
- Monk. I. App. 5—9.
IV. xxxii. 1.
- Monophysites. IV. ii. 9.
- Montague, Bishop. IV. xvi. 22.
- Montanus. IV. v. 2.
xvi. 2.
xxii. 2.
xxvii. 14.
- Montesquieu. III. vi. 3.
xv. 11. (2).
IV. ix. 28.
xxxiv. 7.
- Montfaucon. I. vi. 7.
- Morality. I. xii. 1.
xvii. 18.
xix. 3, 4.
II. iv. 4.
III. i. 4.
ix. 10.
xi. 11.
xv. 4.
IV. Introd. 3.
vi. 5, 13, end.
vii. 7, 13, 14.
xii. 23.
xiv. 4.
xvi. 15, 30.
xvii. 1, 79.
xix. 4, 7.
xxi. 15.
xxii. 20.
xxv. 6, 10.
xxvii. 2, 11.
xxxii. 1, 14.
xxxvi. 1.
xxxvii. 18, 19.
xxxix. 6.
- Moravians. III. xv. 11, p. 468, &c.
xv. 12.
IV. i. 6, end.
vii. 13.
xi. App. 9.
xv. 6.
xxiv. 1.
xxxvii. 10.
- Mosheim. I. xii. 15.
I. App. iv. subs. (12.)
II. ii. 10.
v. 10.

- Mosheim. IV. xiv. 1.
xvi. 4. passim.
xxxvi. 6.
xxxvii. 6.
- Musgrave. xvii. 2.
- Music. III. xv. 10.
IV. xx. 1.
- Mysteries. IV. xxv. 2, 10, 11.
- Mysticism. III. xv. 11, p. 467.
IV. vi. 3.
vii. 3.
xv. 5.
xvi. 9.
xxiii. 6, 15.
xxviii. 11.
- Names, their effects.
IV. xviii. 11.
- Nares. I. xii. 16.
- Nature. IV. ix. Introd. 8, 9.
ix. 18, 26, 30.
- Neal. (see Puritans.)
III. iv. 6.
xiv. 15.
IV. xvi. 8.
xvii. 18.
xxv. 3.
xxvii. 15.
xxxvi. 5.
- Necker. IV. xxiv. 1.
- Necessary Doctrine.
passim. IV. Introd. 4.
v. 4.
viii. 4.
ix. 2.
x. 11.
xi. 8.
xii. 6, 25.
xiii. 5.
xiv. 1.
xvi. 3, 8, 10, 14.
xvii. 16, 80.
xxii. 4.
xxv. 2, 4, 7.
xxvi. 2.
xxviii. 11.
xxx. 6.
xxxi. 4.
xxxvii. 2.
- Necessity. (see Liberty.)
IV. ix. Introd. 5.
x. 19, 49
xvii. 5.
- Necessity, cases of.
IV. xxiii. 9, 20, 29.
xxv. iii.
xxvii. 6, 10, 14, 15.
xxxv. 1, 2.
- Nestorius. IV. i. 18.
ii. 8, 9.
xxi. 16.
- Newton, Sir Isaac.
I. vi. 1.
xvii. 15.
II. iv. 5.
III. iv. 7.
IV. App. 1.
xxx. 13.
- Nicholls. IV. Introd. 6.
x. 4.
xi. App. 2, 6.
- Nicholls. IV. xiii. 2.
xxxvi. 4, 5, 7.
- Norris. IV. Introd. 1.
xxvii. 29.
- Not at home. III. ii. 4.
viii. 1.
- Novatians. IV. i. 4, p. 495.
xvi. 2, 37.
- Numenius. IV. i. 3.
- Oaths. IV. xxxvii. 3, 5, 6, &c.
xxxix. passim.
- Ogden. IV. viii. 11.
ix. 36.
xi. App. 9, 27.
xxii. 20.
xxxix. 2, 5, 6.
- Offering. IV. xi. App. 14.
- Old Maids, Essay on.
IV. ix. 30.
- Omissions, in each System.
I. xvii. 1.
IV. ii. 1.
- Onkelos. I. vi. 7.
ix. 3.
- Opinions, seeming inconsistent, to be retained till reconciled.
IV. xvi. 5.
xvii. 5, 91.
- Oracles. I. xvii. 12.
- Ordinances, ordinary built upon extraordinary.
IV. xxiii. 25.
xxv. 3, 10, end.
xxxvi. 18, 19.
- Ordination.
IV. xxiii. 4, 6, 11, 22.
xxv. 5, 9.
xxvi. 6.
xxxiv. 7.
xxxvi. according to Heads of Lectures; particularly sect. 2, 5.
- Origen. I. viii. 6, p. 35.
xii. 17.
xvi. 7.
xix. 5.
App. 1.
II. iv. 10.
IV. i. 4.
iv. 4, 17, & App. v. 2.
vi. 21, 23, 25, 28.
xvi. 4.
xxii. 2.
xxiii. 9.
xxiv. 1, 2.
xxvii. 14.
- Ormerod. I. xii. 3.
IV. iii. 6, 8.
v. 5.
- Orobio. I. viii. 1.
- Overal, Bishop.
IV. xv. 12.
xvi. 8, 22.
xvii. 5.
- Painting. III. xv. 10.
IV. xx. 1.
- Painting. IV. xxvii. 27.
- Paley. IV. xiii. 1, 2.
xxvii. 14.
- Paphnutius. IV. xxxii. 3.
xxxvi. 4.
- Paraclete. IV. v. 1.
- Parkhurst. I. xv. 16.
App. 24.
II. iv. 15.
IV. i. 2.
iii. 6.
x. 2, 30.
xi. App. 12.
xiii. 17.
xvii. 2, 83.
xxviii. 24.
and elsewhere.
- Parturition. IV. ix. 44.
- Pascal. II. iii. 1.
v. 10.
- Patronage. IV. xxiii. 16.
xxxiii. 17.
xxxvi. 5, 13.
- Paulus Jovius. IV. xviii. 5.
- Pax. IV. xxv. 3.
- Pearson, John, Bishop.
I. vi. 3, 6.
viii. 3.
xvii. 15.
IV. i. 4, p. 503.
i. 12, 17, 18.
ii. 4, 8, 28.
iii. 6.
vii. 10.
xi. App. 22.
xix. 1.
- Pearson, Edward.
IV. viii. 12.
- Pedantry. I. i. 5.
IV. xxiv. 5.
- Pelagius, and followers.
IV. viii. 9, 11, p. 52.
ix. 6, 7.
x. 5.
xiii. 3.
xv. 3, 18.
xvi. 6.
xvii. 5, 83.
xxviii. 3.
xxxvii. 5.
- Perfection. IV. xi. 1.
xv. 5.
xvi. 9.
xvii. 91.
xxxvii. 3.
xxxviii. 6.
- Perseverance.
III. iv. 1.
IV. x. 15.
xvi. 5, 8, 9, 22, 29, 30, 37.
- Peter Lombard.
IV. v. 1.
x. 26.
xiii. 4.
xvii. 29.
xxii. 13.
xxv. 2, 4.
- Pews. III. iv. 2.
- Pharaoh. I. x. 9.
IV. ix. Introd. 16.
x. 3.

- Pharaoh. IV. x. 50, p. 150.
xvii. 29, 95.
- Pharisees. IV. iv. App. p. 626.
- Philo. I. vi. 1.
IV. i. 1, 2, 3.
- Philosophers, opposed to People. II. iv. passim.
III. xv. 5.
IV. vi. 5.
xix. end.
xx. 5.
xxxiii. 14.
- Philostratus. I. xii. 17.
xiii. 13.
- Pilate. I. xiii. 11.
- Pindar. IV. x. 2.
- Pious frauds. I. viii. 9.
xii. 15.
xv. 1.
- Plaifere. IV. x. 5, 15, 19.
xvii. 71, 73.
- Platonists. I. xii. 15.
App. 12.
IV. i. 1, 3.
ix. 3, 5.
- Pleasure, in studying religion.
I. i. 9.
- Pliny. I. xii. 16, 17.
xvi. 11.
xviii. 13, 19.
IV. ii. 41.
- Plutarch. I. xii. 16.
- Polycarp. IV. xxiii. 2.
xxxvi. 3.
- Pope, Alexander.
IV. xvii. 79.
xviii. 6, 17.
- Popes, of Rome.
III. xiv. 7.
IV. xxxvii. 2, 13, 18.
- Porson. IV. i. App.
xxix. 2.
- Porteus, Bishop.
I. x. 11.
xi. 5.
xvii. 15, 18.
III. ii. 5.
IV. iii. 8.
iv. App.
xiv. 1.
xxii. 6, 20.
xxv. 4.
xxx. 16.
- Postlethwaite.
I. xvii. 8, 12, 14, 19.
- Potter. (in various places).
IV. xi. App. 2.
xxvii. 2, 4.
xxviii. 24, 30.
xxix. 1.
- Powell. I. xii. 5, 3.
xvi. 9.
xvii. 16, 19.
xviii. 4, 7, 10, 30.
xix. 1, 16.
App. xi. subs. (6).
II. i. 2.
ii. 10.
iv. 2.
III. iv. 4.
v. 2.
- Powell. III. vi. 4.
ix. 5.
xi. 10.
IV. xi. App. 9.
xxxvi. 5, 7.
- Practice, aimed at in Speculation. IV. ix. Introd. 4.
x. 39.
xvii. 77.
xxvi. 6.
- Preaching. (see Homilies).
I. xii. 12.
III. v. 5.
ix. 6.
IV. xxiii. 9, 24.
xxvii. 3.
xxxv. 1, 2, 5.
- Precepts and Counsels.
IV. xiv. 2, 4, 5.
- Predestinarians.
IV. xvii. 28.
- Predestination.
III. ix. 1.
xv. 9.
IV. Introd. 4.
ii. 42.
ix. Introd. 11.
x. 26.
xvii. 5, et passim.
That it is no
Doctrine of the
Church of Eng-
land.
IV. xvii. 16.
See also IV. xvii.
30, 62, 73, 74, 77,
89.
- Presbyters, or Elders, and
Presbyterians.
IV. xxiii. 4, 6, 11, 17.
xxv. 3, 6, 10.
xxxvi. 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 14.
- Prescience.
IV. ix. Introd. 8.
xvi. 31, p. 300.
xvii. 7, 14, 29, 90.
- Priest. IV. xxv. 4.
xxx. 1, 9, 11.
xxxi. 3, 10.
xxxii. 1, 14.
xxxv. 1.
- Priestley, Doctor.
I. xii. 13.
App. 5.
II. iv. 7.
v. 10.
IV. 1, 4, 14, 16.
ii. 1, 6, 12, 43, 46.
x. 18, 24.
xi. App. 1, 2, 11, 24,
25, 26, 27, 29, 30.
xii. 24.
xvii. 21.
xxiii. 8, 22, 26.
xxvii. 18, 35.
xxviii. 12.
- Primate. IV. xxi. 10.
- Priscillianists. IV. i. 4.
v. 2.
- Promises, opposed to Decrees.
IV. xvii. 69, 97.
- Prophecy, the Gift of.
IV. xxiv. 3.
- Protesting Catholics.
IV. xxxvii. 2.
- Proselytes. I. xvi. 3.
- Prudence. III. xv. 8.
- Puller. IV. Introd. 3.
xxiii. 12.
xxv. 2.
- Punishment. IV. xxxvii. 18.
and elsewhere.
- Puritan. IV. Introd. 2.
ii. 21.
vi. 10.
xi. 12.
xvi. 2, 3, 8.
xvii. 18, 19.
xx. 1, 2, 4, 7.
xxiii. 16.
xxv. 3, 8.
xxvii. 14.
xxx. 5.
xxxiii. 6, 8.
xxxiv. 3, 17.
xxxv. 1.
xxxvi. 4, 7, 16.
xxxvii. 8, 11.
- Purity. IV. xxvii. 2.
- Pythagoras. I. App. 12.
IV. ix. 3.
x. 2.
xxxvii. 4.
- Quakers.
III. iii. 10.
xi. 9.
xiv. 10.
xv. 11, p. 470.
IV. ii. 46.
vii. 3.
xvii. 21.
xxiii. 6.
xxv. 2, 11.
xxvi. 2, 6.
xxvii. 8, 17, 29, 34.
xxviii. 11, 29.
xxx. 10.
xxxvii. 10, 20.
xxxix. 4, 5.
- Quietism. (see Mysticism).
- Racovian Catechism. passim.
IV. x. 20.
xi. App. 8, 24.
xiii. 6.
xvii. 14.
xviii. 5.
xxiii. 5.
xxv. 2.
xxxiii. 5.
- Randall. IV. xxv. 2, 10.
- Ransom. IV. xi. App. 2.
- Re-baptizing, re-ordaining,
&c. (see Repeating).
- Redemption. IV. xi. App. 2,
17, 29, p. 199.
xvii. 13, 22.
xviii. 3.
- Redman. IV. xxxii. 10.
- Reductio ad absurdum.
II. ii. 13.

- Reductio ad absurdum.**
 II. v. 6.
 IV. x. 5.
 xxvi. 5.
 xxix. 1.
- Reformatio Legum.**
 IV. Introd. 4.
 vii. 3.
 ix. 12, 17.
 x. 11, 15.
 xi. 8.
 xiii. 5.
 xvi. 3, 8.
 xvii. 16, 18, 32, 61, 66.
 xviii. 5.
 xxi. 13.
 xxiii. 6.
 xxv. 2, 8.
 xxvi. 2.
 xxvii. 17.
 xxviii. 11, 20.
 xxx. 4.
 xxxiii. 5.
- Reformed Churches.** (see Syntagma).
 IV. xxviii. 10.
 xxx. 4, 8.
 xxxii. 12.
 xxxiii. 5.
 xxxiv. 2.
 xxxvii. 7.
- Reformers.**
 III. xv. 5.
 IV. Introd. 2, 3, 4.
 IV. xii. 1.
 xvii. 9, 16, 17.
 xx. 1.
 xxi. 2.
 xxii. 21.
 xxv. 2, 8.
 xxvi. 17.
- Regeneration.**
 IV. ix. 24.
 xii. 8.
 xvi. 20.
 xxvii. 2, 14, 17.
- Reland.** I. v. 8.
- Relics.** I. xiii. 10.
 IV. xxii. 5, 19.
- Remonstrants.**
 III. v. 1.
 IV. x. 15.
- Repeating, Baptism, &c.**
 IV. v. 1.
 xxiii. 12.
 xxv. 2, 3.
 xxvi. 1, 3.
 xxvii. 15.
 xxxiii. 3.
- Repentance.**
 I. xix. 8, 13.
 IV. xvi. 2, 5, 18, 23, 27,
 32, 33, 34.
 xvii. 91.
 xxv. 4.
 xxvii. 3.
- Repentance.** IV. xxxiii. 1, 5.
 including Penance.
- Reprobation.**
 IV. x. 50.
 xvii. 29, 30, 32, 73, 92.
- Republication of the Law of**
 Nature. IV. xi. 12.
- Retracting.** I. i. 6.
 III. ii. 5.
 IV. i. 1.
- Revelation, Book of.**
 I. xvii. 15.
 III. x. 9.
 IV. iv. 5.
 vi. 15, 31.
- Review, Monthly.**
 IV. xxxv. 2.
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua.**
 IV. xv. 19.
- Rhemish Testament.**
 IV. xi. App. 6.
 xiii. 5.
 xiv. 1.
 xvi. 3, 4, 8.
 xvii. 7, 9, 29, 66.
 xix. 9.
 xxi. 12.
 xxii. 2, 3, 4.
 xxiv. 1.
 xxv. 2.
 xxviii. 32.
 xxix. 1.
 xxx. 4, 13.
 xxx. 2, 3, 10, 12.
- Rhetorians.**
 IV. xviii. 2.
- Ricaut.** IV. xxiv. 1.
 xxvii. 5.
 xxx. 3.
- Ridley.** IV. Introd. 4.
 xii. 1.
 xiii. 5.
 xvii. 16.
 xxv. 2.
 xxviii. 26.
- Rimius.** (see Moravians).
- Rite.** IV. xxxiv. 2, 25.
- Robinson.** III. xiv. 14.
 IV. xxvii. 16.
- Rogers.** IV. Introd. 6.
 xxv. 2.
 xxxiv. 17.
 xxxvii. 10.
- Rome.** (see, in the Heads of Lectures, Romanists—and, Age of the Reformation.)
 IV. xix. 2, 8.
 xx. 1.
 xxii. 13.
 xxix. 1.
 xxx. 12, 13.
- Rosenberg, Countess of.**
 I. vi. 2.
- Rutherford.** I. ix. 11.
 II. v. 10.
 IV. ii. 42.
- iv. App.
 viii. 5.
 x. 41.
- Sabbath.** I. xi. 5.
 IV. vii. 5, 7, 13.
 xxxiv. 2, 7, 15.
- Sacramental Justification.**
 IV. xi. 6.
 xxv. 2.
- Sacramentarian.** IV. xvii. 18.
 xxviii. 10.
- Sacraments.** IV. xxv. passim.
 Definition,
 IV. xxv. 8, 9.
 xxvi. 1, 2, 4, 6.
 xxviii. 17.
- Sacramentum.** IV. xxxv. 2.
 and Sacrament, p. 459.
 IV. xxv. 6, 11.
 xxxvii. 5.
- Sacred Language.**
 IV. xxiv. 5.
- Sacrifice.**
 IV. xi. App. 1, 2, 14, 27.
 xxv. 5.
 xxviii. 1, 10, 13, 17,
 20, 24, 30.
 xxxi. 2, 3, 6, 10.
- Sadducees.** IV. iv. App. p. 626.
- Salvation.** IV. xi. App. 17.
 xviii. 12.
- Salvian.** I. xii. 4.
- Samaritan.** I. ix. 2.
 xiii. 11.
- Sandys, Sir Edwin.**
 III. xv. 12.
 IV. xxiv. 2.
 xxv. 4.
 xxx. 3.
- Satan, events referred to.**
 IV. x. 50.
 xvii. 64.
 xxxiii. 13.
- Satisfaction.** IV. xxv. 4.
- Schism.** III. iv. 4.
 xi. 2.
 xii. 1.
- Schoolmaster, how the Law of Moses was one.**
 IV. vii. 14.
- Schoolmen.**
 IV. xiii. 4.
 xxii. 4, 6, end.
 also sect. 8.
 xxiv. 1.
 xxv. 3.
 xxvi. 3.
 xxxiii. 4.
- Schwenkfeld.** IV. vi. 1, 17.
 xxv. 2.
- Sclavonian.** IV. xxiv. 1.
- Secker, Archbishop.**
 IV. xiv. 1.
 xvi. 4.
 xix. 1.
 xxv. 3.
 xxvii. 8, 13, 26.
 xxviii. 11.
 xxxi. 5.
- Sectaries.** (see Dissenters).
- Self-deceit.** IV. xvi. 31, p. 300.
- Seminaries.** II. iv. 7.
- Sent.** IV. xxxii. 15.
- Sephiroths.**
 I. App. 15, 20, 24, 26.
- Sermo de Tempore.**
 IV. i. 10, p. 511.
 ii. 6, 19.

- Sermon on the Mount. IV. xxxvii. 3, 6, 19.
vi. 4.
xxxviii. 3.
- Servant, in forms of civility. III. viii. 2.
- Servetus. IV. i. 6.
ii. 14.
xxvii. 14.
- Shaftesbury. II. iv. 15.
- Shakspeare. IV. ix. 3, 30, 37.
x. 41.
xvii. 66.
xxvii. 14.
- Sharp, Archbishop. II. v. 4, 6.
III. iv. 4.
xi. 10.
xvi. 4.
xvii. 83.
- Sharp, Granville. IV. xxxvi. 7.
- Sheridan. II. iv. 13.
- Sherlock, Bishop. IV. iv. 13, 16.
iv. App.
x. 32.
xi. 2.
xxxvii. 15.
- Siam, King of. I. xv. 15, 16.
- Sick. IV. xxv. 4, 7, 10.
xxviii. 10, 21.
- Simeon Stilitis. IV. xiv. 4.
- Sins, mortal, venial, &c. IV. xvi. 2, 13, 15.
- Sleidan. IV. vii. 3.
xvi. 3.
xxxvii. 6.
- Society, for propagating the Gospel. I. xix. 18.
- Society, religious. I. xix. 15—17.
IV. xxxvi. 7.
- Socinus, and followers. (see Dr. Priestley). IV. Introd. 2.
i. 14, 16.
ii. 12, 21.
iv. 2.
v. 4.
ix. 14.
x. 18.
xi. App. 1, 8, 33.
xvii. 14, 21.
xxiii. 5, 22, 24.
xxv. 2.
xxvii. 9, 27, 35.
xxviii. 13.
xxxiii. 5.
xxxvi. 6.
- Soul. IV. iii. 8.
ix. Introd. 6, 7.
- Socrates. I. xii. 16.
II. iv. 10, 13, 14.
IV. xiii. 24.
- Sparrow, Bishop. III. iv. 1.
IV. xxiv. 5.
xxv. 4.
xxxiv. 5, 7.
xxxv. 1.
- Spirits. I. i. 9. App. 8.
- Sponsors. IV. xxv. 3.
xxvii. 14.
- Sprinkling. IV. xxvii. 10.
- Sterne. I. App. 14.
II. i. 9.
iv. 13.
III. iv. 1.
IV. xxx. 6.
- Stillington. IV. vii. 14.
xxxvi. 5.
- Stoics. IV. xvi. 5.
xvii. 2.
- Strype. IV. Introd. 4.
iii. 2.
vii. 7.
ix. 12.
xvi. 3.
xvii. 18.
xxv. 2.
xxxv. 4.
- Suarez. IV. xiii. 4.
- Subintroduced women. IV. xxxii. 2.
- Succession of Bishops. IV. xxiii. 4, 7, 18.
xxxvi. 7.
- Supererogation. IV. xiv. 2.
- Superstition. I. i. 9.
III. xv. 11.
IV. Introd. 3.
- Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians. IV. xvii. 29.
- Swedenborg. I. xvi. 7.
III. xv. 11, p. 467, &c.
IV. i. 6, p. 505.
- Swift. II. iii. 1, 4.
iv. 13.
- Switzerland. I. viii. 1.
III. vi. 6.
vii. 6.
IV. iii. 1, 2.
xvii. 15, 18.
xx. 1.
xxiii. 12.
- Synesius. IV. iv. 1.
xxxiii. 3.
- Synod. IV. xxi. 10.
- Syntagma, or Corpus et Syntagma. (see Reformed Churches.) IV. xi. App. 2, 5.
xvi. 19.
xvii. 14.
xix. 7.
xxv. 2.
xxvi. 2.
xxviii. 10.
xxxiv. 20.
- Targum. I. ix. 3.
- Taylor, Jeremy. III. iv. 8.
vi. 6.
- Taylor, John. IV. ix. 13, 14, 29, 30,
34, 35, 36.
x. 18, 19.
xi. 14, 27, 28.
xi. App. 9, 12, 22,
29, p. 199.
- Taylor, John. IV. xii. 20.
xiii. 10.
xvii. 81, 92.
- Temptations. IV. ix. Introd. 12, 16.
x. 3.
- Tertullian. IV. i. 4, p. 495.
vii. 5.
xi. App. 2.
xv. 2.
xxvii. 2, 14.
xxxiv. 5.
- Test and Corporation Acts. III. xiv. 15.
- Testament. IV. xxviii. 24.
- Testament, Old. I. v.
vi. 3.
viii. 1.
ix. 1, 2.
xii. Introd.
xvi. 8.
xvii. 1, &c.
App. 4. subs. (8).
IV. iv. 6—9.
vii. 2.
xi. App. 24.
xxiii. 22.
- Theodoret. IV. xxv. 2.
xxvii. 14.
- Thomas, Bishop. IV. xxxii. 10.
- Tillotson. I. xvi. 14.
IV. i. 3, 16.
ii. 1.
- Tindal. IV. xi. 12.
- Toland. I. xii. 4.
IV. vi. 15.
- Toleration. III. xiv. 4, 15.
xv. 5.
IV. xix. 1.
xxxiii. 8.
xxxiv. 17, 19, 24.
xxxvii. 13.
- Tombs. IV. xxvii. 14, 35.
- Tradition. IV. vi. 2, &c.
xxxiv. 1, 4,
and according to Heads of Lectures.
- Traitor. IV. xxvi. 1.
- Transubstantiation. I. xvi. 14.
IV. xxviii. according to Heads of Lectures.
xxix. and xxx.
xxx. 2, 10.
- Travis. III. xv. 6.
IV. i. App.
- Trent Catechism. IV. xxv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9.
xxvi. 2, 3.
xxvii. 6.
xxviii. 10, 20, 33.
xxix. 1, 4.
xxx. 4.
xxx. 3.
xxx. 3.
- Trent, Council of. IV. vi. 2, 10.

- Trent, Council of.
 IV. ix. 12.
 x. 20.
 xi. 7.
 xi. App. 6.
 xiii. 6.
 xiv. 1.
 xv. 4.
 xvi. 3.
 xvii. 9, 29. (See, in Heads of Lectures, Romanists, and Age of the Reformation.)
 xxi. 2—4.
 xxii. 2—6.
 xxiv. 1, 2.
 xxv. 2—7.
 xxvi. 2, 3.
 xxvii. 6.
 xxviii. 10, 20.
 xxix. 1.
 xxx. 4.
 xxxi. 3, 8.
 xxxii. 11.
 xxxiii. 5.
 xxxvi. 7.
- Trent Creed. IV. ix. 2.
- Tribes. I. ix. 1.
- Trinity. I. xii. 12.
 xvi. 7.
 III. xv. 9.
 IV. Introd. 1.
 i. 1, &c. according to Heads of Lectures.
 ix. 6.
- Trisagium. IV. xxviii. 4.
- Tucker. IV. x. 15.
 xix. 7.
- Turretin. IV. x. 50.
 xvii. 29.
- Twining. IV. iv. App.
 x. 44.
- Twisse. IV. xvii. 29.
- Ubiquity. -IV. iv. 3.
 xxviii. 10, 11.
- Vener. IV. Introd. 6.
 xiii. 2.
 xxii. 2.
 xxiv. 1.
- Vespasian. I. xvi. 10.
- Ugolino. I. x. 8.
- Vigilantius. IV. xxii. 5, 6
 xxxii. 4.
- Virgin Mary.
 IV. xv. 4, 24.
 xxii. 4, 6, 13, 20.
- Virtue. IV. xi. 28, 29.
 xii. 23, 25.
 xvii. 87.
- Virtue, what may be called original. IV. ix. 36.
- Visitation. IV. xxxv. 1.
- Unction. IV. xxv. 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, including Extreme Unction.
- Unction. IV. xxvii. 4.
- Uniformity, Act of.
 III. xiv. 15.
 IV. xxxiv. 17.
 xxxvi. 5.
- Unitarians. IV. i. 5, 13.
- Vocation. (see Called.)
 IV. xvii. 14.
 xxiii. 16.
- Voltaire. I. App. 26.
 II. v. 10, 11.
 III. iv. 5, 9.
 xv. 11, p. 467.
 IV. i. 4, p. 505.
 i. App.
 iv. App. end.
 ix. 4, 40.
 x. 9, 17, 19.
 xxi. 9.
 xxii. 3.
 xxx. 4.
- Vossius. IV. x. 4, 5, 9.
 xii. 3.
 xvi. 5.
 xvii. 28.
- Usher. IV. viii. 5.
 x. 9.
 xvii. 24, 30, 37,
 71, 75, 95, 98.
 xxiv. 1, 2.
- Wafer. IV. xxviii. 3, 11.
- Wakefield. I. ix. 11, p. 44.
 xvii. 6.
- Waldenses. IV. xxiii. 3.
 xxviii. 10.
 xxxvi. 4.
 xxxvii. 6.
- Wall.
 IV. ix. 8.
 xi. App. 2.
 xv. 3.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvii. 4, 12, 13, 14, 27.
- Walton. I. ix. 3, 10.
 IV. xvii. 24.
 xxii. 20.
- Warburton.
 I. xi. 3.
 xii. 3, 15.
 xvii. 3, 7, 10, 14, 15,
 p. 174, 18.
 II. iii. 1, 6, 14.
 iv. 13, 16.
 v. 10.
 III. xiv. 5.
 IV. vii. 8.
 ix. 21, 34, 38.
 xi. App. 9, 19, 21.
 xii. 2, 19.
 xx. 7.
 xxviii. 13.
 xxxiii. 8.
- Washing of feet.
 I. xi. 6.
 IV. xxv. 2.
 xxviii. 29.
- Waterland.
 IV. i. 12.
- Waterland.
 IV. i. App.
 viii. 8, 9, 12.
 xiii. 4, end.
 xvi. 8.
 xvii. 24.
- Wesley. II. iv. 16.
 III. viii. 4.
 xv. 11, p. 470.
 IV. x. 39.
 xi. App. 9.
 xv. 5.
 xvi. 10. (see Methodism.)
 xxiii. 8.
 xxvii. 17.
 xxviii. 11.
- Wheatly. passim.
 IV. xxv. 3.
 xxviii. 11.
- Whiston. IV. i. 6.
 ii. 14.
- Whitby. I. xvii. 19.
 IV. vi. 32.
 x. 15.
 xvi. 5.
 xvii. 5, 71.
- Whitehead, William.
 IV. xvii. 85.
- Whitfield. IV. x. 39.
 xvi. 10.
 xxvii. 15, 18.
- Whitgift. IV. iii. 2.
 xvii. 18.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvii. 15, 18.
- Wickliffe.
 IV. xvii. 9.
 xxi. 2.
 xxv. 2.
 xxvi. 2.
 xxviii. 10.
 xxxi. 4.
 xxxiii. 5, 8, 13.
 xxxvi. 5.
 xxxvii. 6.
- Will-worship. IV. xiv. 3.
 xxii. 15.
- Wisdom. (see Knowledge.)
- Witches. I. xiii. 10.
 III. vi. 6.
- Woolston. I. xvi. 7.
 IV. iv. 1, 7, 13.
 vii. 3.
- Works. IV. xi. 18, 27, 28.
 xii. 6, 23.
 xiii. 8.
- Worship. IV. ii. 16.
 xxii. 9.
 xxv. 6.
- Wotton. (See Misna).
 IV. vi. 3.
 xxxiv. 4, 24.
- Ximenes. I. ix. 10.
- Zuingle, and followers.
 IV. xvi. 7, 10.
 xvii. 9, 10.
 xxviii. 10.

INDEX OF PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

<p>GENESIS xxxvii. 10. ... I. xvii. 6. Exodus vii. 13. x. 9. Deuteronomy iv. 2. IV. vi. 4. — xii. 32. Ibidem. 1 Sam. xiii. 14. I. x. 10. Proverbs xvi. 4. IV. xvii. 95. Isaiah vii. 14—16. I. xvii. 14. — ix. 6. xvii. 10. — xi. 6. Ibidem. — Liii. I. xvii. 15. Ezekiel xviii. IV. ix. 36. Daniel v. 28. I. xvii. 19. Joel i. 7, &c. } I. xvii. 10. — ii. 1—10. } Matthew ii. 15. I. xvii. 19. — — 23. Ibidem. — — iii. 2. IV. xxvii. 3. — v. and vi. vi. 4. — — 29, 30. xxxviii. 9. — — 33—37. xxxix. 4. — — 38—41. xxxvii. 19. — xviii. 7. ix. Introd. 12. — — 15—18. xxxiii. 7, 9, 11. — xix. 11, 12. xxxii. 18. — — 16, &c. xxxviii. 6. — — 17. xv. 16. — — 21. xiv. 5. — xxi. 16. I. xvii. 19. — xxiii. 16—22. IV. xxxix. 4. — xxiv. I. xvii. 10. — — 24. IV. xvi. 30. — xxv. 34. xvii. 80. Mark x. 14. xxvii. 27. — xii. 29, 32. i. 17. — xiii. 24—26. I. xvii. 10. — xvi. 16. IV. viii. 11, 12, 32. — — 17. I. xvi. 13. Luke i. 6. IV. xv. 17. — iv. 13. I. xvi. 11. — ix. 55. Ibidem. — xi. 15, 16. Ibidem. — xvi. 8. I. x. 10. — — 19, &c. IV. xxxviii. 7. — xvii. 1. ix. Introd. 12. — xviii. 22. xiv. 5. John i. 1, &c. IV. ii. 37. — — 19—23. xxvii. 11. — vii. 11. xvii. 83. — viii. 56. ii. 35. — xvii. i. 17. — xvii. xvi. 30. Acts ii. 23. xvii. 79. — ii. 44, 45. xxxviii. 8. — iv. 32, 34. Ibidem. — viii. 4. IV. xxiii. 24. — x. 32. I. x. 11. — xi. 19. IV. xxiii. 24. — xiii. 2. xxiii. 22. — — 48. xvii. 83. — xv. xxi. 1. — xx. 28. i. 18.</p>	<p>Romans ii. 14, 27. IV. xiii. 24. — v. ix. 29. — — viii. 1, 2. xv. 20. — — 5—7. ix. 18, 25. — — 28—30. xvii. 49, 77. — — — 33, &c. xv. 20. — ix. 13, &c. xvii. 95. — xi. 29. xvi. 30. — xvi. 17. xxxiii. 12. 1 Cor. i. 8. xvi. 30. — — 30. xv. 20. — v. xxxiii. 13. — — — — — } I. xii. 3. — — — — — } IV. xxvii. 27. — — — — — } xxxii. 17. — — — — — } xxxiii. 15. — — — — — } IV. i. 17. — — — — — } xxxii. 17. — — — — — } vi. 5. — — — — — } x. 41. — — — — — } iv. 20. — — — — — } xvi. 30. — — — — — } xxxiii. 14, 15. — — — — — } i. 17. Gal. iv. 5. xvi. 30. Eph. i. 13. Ibidem. — iv. 30. Ibidem. — v. 27. IV. xv. 20. Phil. i. 1—10. xiii. 30. — — 6. xvi. 30. — — ii. 5—11. ii. 31. — — — 12, 13. x. 41. Col. i. 16—20. ii. 31, 35. — — ii. 20—23. xvi. 3. 1 Thess. v. 9. xvii. 83. 2 Thess. ii. 15. vi. 5. — — — — — } iii. 3. xvi. 30. 1 Tim. vi. 20. I. App. 24. — — — — — } iii. 16. IV. ii. 37. 2 Tim. i. 9. xvii. 83. — — — — — } ii. 19. xvi. 30. — — — — — } iii. 14, 15, &c. vi. 4. Hebrews i. ii. 31. — — — — — } vi. 1—9. xvi. 33. — — — — — } — 11. xvi. 31. — — — — — } x. 22. Ibidem. — — — — — } — 26. IV. xvi. 33. James ii. 10. Ibidem. — v. 12. IV. xxxix. 5. — — — — — } — 14, 15. xxv. 10. 1 Peter i. 5. xvi. 30. — — — — — } — 10—12. I. xvii. 13. — — — — — } ii. 8. IV. xvii. 95. — — — — — } iv. 8. xiv. 6. 2 Peter i. 20. I. xvii. 15. 1 John iii. 9. } IV. xv. 19. — — — — — } xvi. 33. — — — — — } v. 16. IV. xvi. 33. 2 John 10, 11. xxxiii. 14. Jude 4. xvii. 95. Revelation xxii. 18, 19. vi. 4.</p>
--	--

HEADS OF LECTURES

IN

DIVINITY,

DELIVERED

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

By JOHN HEY, D.D.

NORRISIAN PROFESSOR FROM 1780 TO 1795, AND FORMERLY
FELLOW OF SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE.

FIFTH EDITION.

THE Author printed three Editions of the Heads of Lectures; in 1783, 1792, and 1794. From which last, with a few corrections in manuscript by the Author, the fourth Edition was printed.

April, 1822.

TO
THE RIGHT REVEREND
BEILBY,
LORD BISHOP OF LONDON,
THIS ATTEMPT TO FORM
A COURSE OF LECTURES
IN
A PROFESSORSHIP
INSTITUTED
CHIEFLY UPON HIS LORDSHIP'S SUGGESTIONS,
IS,
WITH SENTIMENTS OF RESPECT AND GRATITUDE,
INSCRIBED,
BY HIS LORDSHIP'S OBLIGED
AND MOST OBEDIENT HUMBLE SERVANT,
JOHN HEY.



ADVERTISEMENT.

By the particular directions of the Founder of the Norrisian Professorship, so large a number of the Lectures given on his Foundation are taken out of Bishop Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, that it seems necessary to say something of that work.

The directions are these:—" I make it essential to this Institution that the Professor reads, or causes to be read, during the course of Lectures, the following articles in the said Exposition of the Creed; viz. the whole article relating to our blessed Saviour, beginning with,—‘and in Jesus Christ his Only Son our Lord,’ and ending with,—‘the quick and the dead:’—the Article relating to the Holy Ghost,—‘ I believe in the Holy Ghost;’—and the Article,—‘the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life everlasting.’”

Though I believe that the Founder was not aware how much time it would take up to follow his directions, yet I have thought it my duty to comply with them literally; and that the true intent of them might not be frustrated, I have intermixed with the reading some *remarks*:—these seemed to be required both by the *text*, and by the *notes*.

Some remarks seemed wanting occasionally upon the *text*, lest the force of the reasoning, which is very regular, should be impaired by the intervals between the successive readings, and by the absence of any hearers from any preceding Lecture.

But I found remarks chiefly wanting for the *notes*; which consist of authorities and illustrations; and point out to the Scholar the principal sources of Theological learning. The erudition displayed in them is wonderful. Every authority made use of seems the very best of its kind:—by which I do

not mean that every sentence quoted is excellent in itself; but as far as any passage is used or applied to any particular purpose, so far it seems to have been the best which could be found in the whole range of human learning. Indifferent writers, inaccurate historians, may supply useful and authentic information in certain cases; nevertheless it is proper to understand the *characters* of the several Authors from whom proofs and illustrations are derived; and the degree of credit due to each, in any particular matter or question.

I cannot content myself, whilst I am speaking of Bp. Pearson's learning, without particularly mentioning his intimate acquaintance with the *Scriptures*: he seems to have kept all the important passages in his view, relating to any subject under his consideration, in a manner I never before observed. Dr. Jortin* speaks of "the amazing harmony, analogy, and correspondence between the Old and New Testament, not only in the direct Prophecies, but in the types, rites, ceremonies, and events contained in the former, and fulfilled in a sublimer sense in the latter, which upon the whole could never be the effect of blind chance:" Bishop Pearson mixes and interweaves sentences and expressions of Scripture with his other expressions in such a manner as to shew this "harmony, analogy, and correspondence," more fully and rationally than any other author that I have known.

It will be naturally concluded, from what has been now said, that I feel no reluctance in obeying the directions of the Founder with regard to Bishop Pearson. I certainly should feel none, if the Students had seemed to entertain the same opinion with myself;—but the fact is, that the Lectures on his Exposition of the Creed have been more thinly attended than the rest: this must necessarily take off something from the pleasure of reading them. Nevertheless, I am very far from being insensible to many instances of regularity and attention, of the most becoming and exemplary sort, during the fourteen years I have read in the University; but at the

* Remarks, vol. II. p. 38.

same time that I reflect upon these with the most cordial satisfaction, I must be permitted to lament, that a work shewing the greatest soundness of reasoning, clearness of method, and depth of knowledge, should not universally meet with its merited respect and admiration.

Whence (I have sometimes asked myself) can this arise? Is it because some think they need not confine themselves to read that in a Lecture-room, at a certain hour, which they can read at home at any "convenient season*?" If so, it should be considered that setting apart an hour for the mere *reading* of *any* book, in company with others equally interested in it, is a plan rational in itself. It is one likely to defeat the little subterfuges of self-deceit and indolence, and to occasion sympathetic feelings of a desirable sort: it also prevents *cursor*y reading, by calling up every passage into full view:—and after all, it hinders no argument from being reconsidered in retirement. Perhaps hearing original disquisitions may be more amusing at the time, at least to a common ear;—but as they will not always be perfectly digested by him who delivers them, hearing an author of established reputation distinctly read, may be more satisfactory upon the whole:—and the idea that it may be so, may anticipate the satisfaction, and make it felt even at the time of the reading.

Can a masterly work be undervalued because it was composed in the last century, and because the language is therefore now become in a small degree antiquated? It were a pity indeed if that did any harm in a place where the arbitrary and variable nature of *words* must be well understood. To me the style of Bishop Pearson's work, when I have allowed for the effects of a century upon it, seems that of simple grandeur and manly decorum. Though the work may be chiefly intended to instruct and convince, the style is never low or vulgar; nor ever really cold and lifeless: it is always chaste and noble: there is in it a venerable animation, and a decency of zeal, rarely to be found in writers on controverted subjects. The

* Bp. Hurd, vol. 11. Sermon, xvi. p. 273.

expressions are full of meaning and dignity; they glow with the fervent piety of a well-informed mind. If such a style does not gratify the ear of modern delicacy, I should infer that it must be owing, either to some vicious refinement, or to a want of that philosophy which regards all changes of mere *fashions* with indifference. And I should say the same to one who was disgusted with such a style of writing, that I should to one who was not at first captivated with what is called the grand style of painting:—be persuaded that the highest sort of pleasure is to be found in that to which the best judges ascribe consummate excellence; go at first upon their authority; turn not away for a momentary disgust; if you are struck with a seeming uncouthness and hardness, the imperfection may really lie in your own prejudices; persevere in your contemplation; and ere long, that very plainness and noble simplicity, which at first offended, will excite your admiration and conciliate your affections, so as to make you set little value upon what is ornamented by a corrupt taste, or a luxuriant imagination.

I must then be permitted to hope that those Students in Divinity, whose time is not occupied by business which appears to them indispensable, will attend all the Lectures with equal assiduity; or at least will not particularly overlook the rational care of the Founder to secure to them, in spite of the partiality of Lecturers for their own notions and inventions, a never-failing fund of solid and salutary instruction.

J. H.

Sidney College, Cambridge,
Nov. 3, 1794.

BOOK I.

OF DIVINITY AS COMMON TO ALL CHRISTIANS.

CHAPTER I. *General Introduction.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 THE utility of having right views of the work to be undertaken. | 6 The suspending and retracting of judgments. |
| 2 What views are right, in the present case. | 7 The connection of the several parts of this Work. |
| 3 A view of the gradual formation of opinions. | 8 The nature of the <i>difficulties</i> which may be expected. |
| 4 Of the various states of learning. | 9 Of the <i>pleasure</i> attending religious inquiries. |
| 5 Consequences from the foregoing. Candor. | |

CHAPTER II. *Of the principal Sources of Religious Truth.*

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1 INVESTIGATION of the nature of God. | | 2 Interpretation of Sacred Writings. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|

CHAPTER III. *Of the manner of acquiring right notions of the nature of GOD; and first, of reasoning A PRIORI.*

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 BRIEF account of natural Theology. | | and <i>à posteriori</i> . |
| 2 Distinction between reasoning <i>à priori</i> , | | 3 <i>A priori</i> . Dr. Samuel Clarke. |

CHAPTER IV. *Of reasoning A POSTERIORI.*

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| 1 REASONING <i>à posteriori</i> explained. | | 4 His reasoning on Providence and a future State. |
| 2 The number of instances in which it may be used. | | 5 Natural Theology not superseded by Revelation. |
| 3 Mr. Hume's Dialogues on Natural Religion. | | |

CHAPTER V. *Of the Holy SCRIPTURES; and first, of the HEBREW Language.*

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1 THE Bible consists of writings differing much from each other. | | 4 Of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Dr. Kennicott. |
| 2 These Writings may be formed into <i>classes</i> . | | 5 Of the Chaldee, and Syriac. |
| 3 The Hebrew Language ought to be studied by Christians. | | 6 Of the manner of learning the Hebrew Language. |
| | | 7 Rabbinical Hebrew. |
| | | 8 Paucity of Hebrew Books. |

CHAPTER VI. *Of the Greek Language.*

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1 Of the original Language of the New Testament. | | Apostles. |
| 2 Of a Gospel in the Hebrew Language. | | 5 Its peculiarities. |
| 3 Of the Septuagint. | | 6 Hellenistic Greek. |
| 4 Of its being quoted by Christ and his | | 7 Of Aquila, and other Greek Translators of the Old Testament, |

CHAPTER VII. *Of the Manner in which the Sacred Writings appeared, before the Art of Printing was known.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 MANUSCRIPTS. Autographs. 2 Decay, or Loss, of MSS. no objection to the authority of the Scriptures. 3 Ages and divisions of MSS. Sticho- | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> metries. 4 Authors who treat of MSS. 5 Some particulars relative to the Alexandrian and Cambridge MSS. |
|--|--|

CHAPTER VIII. *Of Various Readings.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 OF the <i>integrity</i> of the Hebrew Text. 2 Of the <i>number</i> of Various Readings. 3 They do not affect our faith or practice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Yet are not to be neglected as insignificant. 5 Sources of Various Readings. 6 Methods of attempting to ascertain the <i>true</i> reading. |
|---|--|

CHAPTER IX. *Of Versions of the Sacred Writings.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 VERSIONS of the Old Testament unnecessary before the Babylonish captivity. 2 Whether any translation earlier than the Septuagint. 3 Chaldee Paraphrases. 4 Christians differently situated from Jews, with respect to Translations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 Enumeration of Ancient Versions. 6 ————— of Modern. 7 Utility of some Versions. 8 Concerning the Vulgate in particular. 9 Versions of Versions. 10 Polyglotts. 11 Of the expediency of making a new English Version for common use. |
|--|---|

CHAPTER X. *Of interpreting expressions of Scripture, by entering into the CIRCUMSTANCES of those to whom they were immediately addressed.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 GENERAL view of the subject. 2 In every language <i>allusions</i> are made to particular <i>customs</i>, and customary <i>notions</i>; and then the <i>literal</i> sense of expressions must be more restrained than the <i>true</i> sense. 3 This perceived in explaining customs to <i>foreigners</i>. 4 ————— in studying dead languages. 5 The <i>true</i> sense of <i>declarations</i>, in popular language, is more restrained than the <i>literal</i> sense. 6 The <i>directions</i> also, which we give to others, frequently admit of exceptions and limitations. 7 Application of these remarks to the | <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Allusions, Declarations, and Precepts of Scripture.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 Scriptural <i>Allusions</i>, to Antiquities,—natural, artificial, public, private;—to History, Geography, Chronology, Controverted Opinions. 9 Scriptural <i>Declarations</i>. Perfect universality, in affirming, seldom intended. 10 Scriptural <i>Precepts</i>. Hospitality: Sympathy: Imitation of Children: Use of Wine: Precepts implied in Praise and Blame. 11 Most danger of error where that which is only implied is the least likely to take our attention. |
|--|--|

CHAPTER XI. *Of applying Sayings and Actions recorded in Scripture, to ourselves.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 CONNECTION between this Chapter and the preceding. 2 Distinction between them. 3 General idea of the Application here meant. 4 Instances. Of Ministers of the Church. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 Instances. Of the Sabbath, Jewish and Christian. 6 ————— Of washing the feet of the disciples. 7 ————— Of the Lord's Supper. 8 This Application liable to abuse. |
|--|---|

CHAPTER XII. *Of examining the Genuineness and Authenticity of Books accounted Sacred.*

INTRODUCTION.

THAT there is a divine Revelation, has been hitherto taken for granted; but its existence ought to be carefully proved. The remaining Chapters of this first Book are employed in proving it.

Revelation is contained in the Old Testament and the New. But, if the New be of Divine Authority, so must the Old.—Our proofs therefore will apply, immediately, only to the *New Testament*, and we are to consider,

- 1 The Book itself.
- 2 The *reception* of it in the world.
- 3 The *need* there was of it, for the instruction and reformation of mankind.
- 1 With regard to the *New Testament* itself; there being several particulars to be considered, it may be useful previously to give a collective view of them.
 - The *New Testament*,
 - By whom written.—when.
 - Not invented.
 - Containing in itself evidence of its truth.
 - Containing accounts of *Miracles*. Can Miracles be made credible? *Have* there been any? Do they prove any thing, if there have? Ability, Intentions, Number of witnesses.
 - Containing completions of *Prophecies*.
- 2 With regard to the *reception* of the *New Testament* in the *World*, we must take notice of,
 - The accounts of *Friends*.
 - _____ of *Enemies*.
- 3 With regard to the *need* which men had of Revelation, we must explain,
 - Their religious state, as mere *men*,
 - _____ as *Christians*.

- 1 THE proofs here to be given can only be of the *probable* kind.
- 2 *Some terms explained.* *Genuine. Authentic. Apocryphal. Canonical.*
- 3 Of the meaning of the word *Inspired*.
- 4 Of writings, the pretensions of which to inspiration, or the genuineness of which, have been disallowed by some Christians.—Fabricius. Jones. Toland. Richardson.
- 5 Such writings do not afford any valid objection to our receiving the Books of the *New Testament*.
- 6 The genuineness of the canonical books how proved, against some sects of *Christians*, and against *unbelievers*;—from the writings of *Friends*, and of *Enemies*.
- 7 Against some sects of *Christians*.
- 8 Against *unbelievers*—generally.
- 9 More particularly: The writings of *Friends*: and first, of Dr. Lardner's works.
- 10 Of the writings of those called collectively, the *Fathers*.
- 11 The *Fathers*—as records of *Christian antiquity*.
- 12 _____ as preachers of *Christian Virtue*.
- 13 _____ as expositors of *Holy Writ*.
- 14 _____ as defenders of *pure doctrine*.
- 15 _____ as liable to suspicion of *pious fraud*.
- 16 _____ of *credulity*.
Daillé.
- 17 The genuineness of the canonical Books, how far rendered doubtful by the writings of *enemies* to *Christianity*. Celsus. Porphyry. Julian. &c.

CHAPTER XIII. *Of the difference between real and fictitious narratives.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 GENERAL notion of the contents of this Chapter. 2 Method of discerning <i>real</i> from <i>fictitious</i> narratives. 3 Of the difficulty of drawing particular characters in order to have them pass for <i>real</i>; and first, the character of an <i>equal</i>. 4 _____ of one remote, in place, or time. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5 _____ of a <i>superior</i>. 6 _____ of one more than human. 7 Objection, from the success of fictitious characters in epic and dramatic compositions. 8 Application of the foregoing to the Gospel-narratives. 9 The literary characters of the sacred Historians. |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>10 Of the <i>supernatural</i> events related by them.</p> <p>11 Of the <i>natural</i> incidents, manners, sentiments, and expressions, found in the Gospel-narratives.</p> | <p>12 Of the <i>agreement</i> between the several Narrators.</p> <p>13 The reasoning of this Chapter will appear the more forcible as the human mind shall be more improved.</p> |
|---|--|

CHAPTER XIV. *Of the evidence which a book may contain, in itself, of the truth of facts related in it.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 CONNECTION with the preceding.</p> <p>2 Historical assertions likely to have been contradicted, if false, and not contradicted, are credible.</p> <p>3 Events allowed to be true, by those who must have wished them false, are credible.</p> <p>4 Events are credible, when men are solicitous to deny their plain <i>consequences</i>; or <i>account</i> for them absurdly.</p> <p>5 Facts implied in <i>Letters</i>, may sometimes be conceived as attested by those to whom the Letters are addressed.</p> <p>6 Persons declared to have been <i>present</i></p> | <p>at any event, may often be considered as witnesses of that event, if they know of the declaration.</p> <p>7 It is not always necessary, that such persons should be mentioned by <i>name</i>.</p> <p>8 Remarkable <i>effects</i> of an event related may make it credible.</p> <p>9 These proofs may concur.</p> <p>10 The evidence here spoken of, distinguished from <i>traditional</i> evidence.</p> <p>11 The preceding observations applied to the events of the New Testament.</p> <p>12 Of the writings of <i>Josephus</i>, considered with relation to the affairs of Christians.</p> |
|---|--|

CHAPTER XV. *Of the credibility of Miracles in general.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 Mr. Hume.</p> <p>2 The conclusion of his argument on Miracles, quoted and explained.</p> <p>3 His argument confounds prejudice with reasoning.</p> <p>4 <i>Laws of nature</i>, are not <i>laws</i>, strictly so called.</p> <p>5 The Law of gravity, means only a series of past <i>facts</i>.</p> <p>6 Of conclusions from <i>analogy</i>. Analogies conspiring; opposing, and interrupting each other.</p> <p>7 Analogy is not rightly opposed, by Mr. Hume, to <i>testimony</i>.</p> <p>8 His opposition of analogy and testimony, goes upon several suppositions which are not true.</p> <p>9 Belief in testimony, is to be distinguished from expectation grounded on simple analogy.</p> <p>10 Supposing men always to have spoken truth, the testimony of one man is sufficient to gain credit for what we call a violation of a law of nature.</p> <p>11 Any testimony, which has never been known to mislead, is sufficient to gain credit for such an event.</p> <p>12 We expect, by analogy, extraor-</p> | <p>dinary measures on extraordinary <i>occasions</i>.</p> <p>13 Conclusion, in favour of the <i>credibility</i> of Miracles in general.</p> <p>14 Miracles may answer <i>some</i> purposes, to those whose assent concerning them is <i>suspended</i>.</p> <p>15 Men, who choose the probable side of a question sometimes err by forgetting that many things happen against probability.</p> <p>16 Mr. Hume's distinction between a <i>miraculous</i>, and an <i>extraordinary</i> event, is not important.</p> <p>17 The difference between expecting <i>like</i> events, and disbelieving <i>unlike</i>.</p> <p>18 A caution to be used in reading Mr. Hume's reasonings.</p> <p>19 One cause of admitting false accounts of Miracles, is <i>credulity</i>.</p> <p>20 Another, is the pleasure of gratifying <i>admiration</i>.</p> <p>21 The <i>number</i> of miracles falsely pretended to, ought not to prevent belief of miracles in general.</p> <p>22 Criteria, for discerning true miracles from false, are proper objects of inquiry,</p> |
|---|--|

CHAPTER XVI. *Of the credibility of the Miracles recorded in the New Testament, and the conclusions to be drawn from them.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 ABILITY of witnesses, in what it consists.</p> <p>2 Possessed by the witnesses of the Gospel-miracles.</p> <p>3 Mr. Hume's calumny, grounded on Lucian's Pseudomantis, refuted.</p> <p>4 <i>Intention</i> of good witnesses, described.</p> <p>5 The description applied to the Gospel-witnesses.</p> <p>6 Of the <i>number</i> of the Gospel-witnesses, and the force of concurrent testimony.</p> <p>7 The notion of Miracles being <i>allegorical</i>: with some account of Thomas Woolston.</p> <p>8 Mr. Hume's challenge, concerning the Miracles recorded in the <i>Pentateuch</i>.</p> | <p>9 Miracles, supposed real, must manifest the purpose of God:—this proved by five observations, their substance taken from the 7th Discourse of Dr. Powell.</p> <p>10 Farther remarks on the <i>criteria</i> of true and false Miracles:—the <i>nature</i> of any particular miracles, proposed for our belief, is to be considered.</p> <p>11 ———— their <i>purpose</i>.</p> <p>12 The evidence of the Gospel-miracles is sufficient.</p> <p>13 The Miracles intended to establish Christianity, may probably be the <i>last</i>.</p> <p>14 Summary Review of Mr. Hume's Essay, by way of recapitulation.</p> |
|--|--|

CHAPTER XVII. *Of Prophecies.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 PROPHECIES of the Old Testament. Bp. Newton.</p> <p>2 ———— of the New.</p> <p>3 The gift of prophecy, as possessed by early Christian teachers.</p> <p>4 Some of the difficulties, attending the prophecies of the old Testament, may be neglected. Dr. Powell.</p> <p>5 The plainest sort of prophecies, which we can conceive, rarely, if ever, occur.</p> <p>6 <i>Obscurity</i>, in prophecies, owing, in part, to the nature of <i>language</i>. Bp. Hurd.</p> <p>7 In part to the <i>circumstances</i> in which they were delivered.</p> <p>8 Prophecies raising a single expectation.</p> <p>9 Those who agree in such expectation, may disagree as to the fact of its being fulfilled.</p> | <p>10 Prophecies raising more than one expectation, or admitting of more than one completion.</p> <p>11 <i>Literal</i> and <i>mystical</i> senses.</p> <p>12 Prejudice against double senses.</p> <p>13 Conjecture what might be the conception of a man, who uttered a prophecy containing two senses.</p> <p>14 How such a prophecy is judged to be a prophecy, by a reader of Scripture.</p> <p>15 Prophecies raising no expectation.</p> <p>16 Of the expectation of <i>two</i> Messiahs.</p> <p>17 Recapitulation.</p> <p>18 Of <i>Types</i>.</p> <p>19 Of references to the Old Testament, as found in the New. Bp. Chandler. Dr. Randolph.</p> <p>20 Miracles and prophecies compared.</p> <p>21 Conclusion.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER XVIII. *Of the first propagation of the Christian Religion.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 TRANSITION.</p> <p>2 Brief account of the fact.</p> <p>3 Three methods of accounting for it.</p> <p>4 Any, or all of them, might be adopted.</p> <p>5 Farther account of the <i>fact</i>, of the <i>solution</i> of it, and of the <i>conclusions</i> to be drawn from it.</p> <p>6 First, of the <i>fact</i>.</p> <p>7 Knowledge of this to be derived chiefly from Heathen Writers. Lardner. Bullet.</p> <p>8 Observations previous to reading Heathen writers on this subject.</p> | <p>9 ———— Christians are not always called by one name.</p> <p>10 ———— Opprobrious names given to Christians. Dr. Powell.</p> <p>11 ———— The nature of <i>toleration</i> among the Heathens. Mr. Hume.</p> <p>12 ———— <i>Persecutions</i> of Christians.</p> <p>13 ———— Pliny and Trajan.</p> <p>14 ———— Writers by whom Christians are not mentioned. Lardner.</p> <p>15 Two <i>æras</i> distinguished; The close of the first century, and the time of the Emperor Julian.</p> |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>16 Farther thoughts on the <i>solution</i> of the fact.</p> <p>17 Difficulties obstructing the propagation of Christianity; on the part of those to whom it was <i>taught</i>.</p> <p>18 ——— prejudices.</p> <p>19 ——— interests.</p> <p>20 ——— vicious habits.</p> <p>21 Diana of the Ephesians; Acts, Chap. xix.</p> <p>22 Difficulties on the part of the <i>teachers</i>.</p> <p>23 <i>Conclusions</i> to be drawn from the above.</p> <p>24 The supposition, that the teachers of Christianity thought it a false</p> | <p>religion.</p> <p>25 The supposition, that they were deceived.</p> <p>26 <i>Objection</i>, from the propagation of the religion of Mohammed.</p> <p>27 ——— from the quick spreading of some religious sects, without military force.</p> <p>28 The extent of this subject.</p> <p>29 Its utility.</p> <p>30 The difference between the propagation of Christianity, when it is considered as proving the Divine Authority of the Gospel, and when that is supposed to have been already proved.</p> |
|---|---|

CHAPTER XIX. *Of the need which men have of Revelation.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 PECULIAR caution requisite in treating this subject.</p> <p>2 That method is best which proceeds most upon <i>fact</i>.</p> <p>3 Yet previously we may say, experience <i>might</i> have conducted mankind to considerable good.</p> <p>4 Destitute of every other guide, men <i>might</i> have run into much evil.</p> <p>5 They might incur the displeasure of God; (that expression not unphilosophical.)</p> <p>6 Heathens <i>have</i> run into moral and religious <i>errors</i>.</p> <p>7 ——— into many <i>vices</i>.</p> <p>8 ——— have not had sufficient ground to expect <i>remission</i> of punishment.</p> <p>9 ——— have wanted rules of conduct for the <i>people</i>.</p> <p>10 These evils not <i>likely</i> to be remedied</p> | <p>by mere philosophy.</p> <p>11 Philosophers unlikely to convince men of moral and religious <i>errors</i>.</p> <p>12 Philosophy inadequate to excite in men an abhorrence of their <i>vices</i>.</p> <p>13 ——— to ensure <i>remission</i> of punishment.</p> <p>14 ——— to inculcate effectually good principles of action, on the minds of the <i>people</i>.</p> <p>15 Civil <i>laws</i> not likely to establish a good religion.</p> <p>16 All the above defects supplied by Revelation.</p> <p>17 Objection, from the state of some nations, to which no revelation has been made.</p> <p>18 Christianity seems to pre-suppose some civilization.</p> <p>19 Other objections. Mr. Hume. Lord Herbert of Cherbury.</p> |
|--|--|

APPENDIX. *Concerning the early Sects, or Heresies, of Christians.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 REASONS for treating of Christian Sects.</p> <p>2 Two Classes of them; <i>Oriental</i> and <i>Judaical</i>.</p> <p>3 <i>Oriental</i> may be best understood by beginning with the <i>Manicheans</i>.</p> <p>4 Twelve observations relative to Mani and his followers.</p> <p>5 Attempt to assign some principles of human <i>nature</i>, from which some oriental notions and practices might be derived.</p> <p>6 A Life of solitary contemplation promotes mortification and self-denial.</p> | <p>7 Abstemiousness promotes solitary contemplation.</p> <p>8 A temper formed by contemplation and abstemiousness encourages notions of the agency of <i>Spirits</i>.</p> <p>9 A disposition to admit the agency of <i>Spirits</i> promotes abstemious and contemplative life.</p> <p>10 Such life not recommended here, upon the whole.</p> <p>11 General principles of human nature are liable to considerable <i>variations</i>, in different circumstances. State of <i>science, government, &c.</i>—the religion of the <i>East</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 12 Egypt, its peculiarities with respect to religious sentiments.
13 Greece and Rome.
14 Modern Europe.
15 Jewish Essenes.
16 Conclusion, that the principles of the Christian Heretics, now spoken of, existed before Christianity.
17 Attempts to explain some terms, <i>Æons, Pleroma, Anchoret, Ascetic, &c.</i>
18 Of the Valentinians.
19 Of the Marcionists.
20 Of the Gnostics.
21 <i>Judaical</i> sects, or Heresics— <i>Ebionites</i> and <i>Nazarenes</i> .
22 Some early Heresies seem <i>compound-ed</i> of Oriental and <i>Judaical</i> . | 23 Other differences between the early sects.
24 Expressions of <i>Scripture</i> seeming to be connected with the above.—And first, expressions seeming to refer to <i>Oriental</i> notions.
25 Of St. John's writing his Gospel against Heretics.
26 Of fallen Angels.
27 Of scriptural references to <i>Judaical</i> Notions.
28 _____ to <i>compound</i> Heresies.
29 The use of some acquaintance with early Heresies in reading the Fathers.
30 _____ in promoting candour.
31 Conclusion: compendious history of Heresy. |
|---|--|

BOOK II.

OF POLEMICAL DIVINITY.

CHAPTER I. *Of the nature and effects of Controversy.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 THIS subject worthy of the attention of every student in Theology.
2 Of removing the mischiefs of controversy, and preserving its advantages. Dr. Powell.
3 Ideal perfection a right object of Pursuit.
4 Controversy is not essentially an evil.
5 The good of controversy shewn, in | an apology for an advocate at the bar.
6 In any kind of question, it may be useful to separate the <i>for</i> , the <i>against</i> , and the <i>determination</i> .
7 More than one person may be employed in each part.
8 Controversy may be <i>voluntary</i> .
9 Farther account of useful controversy. |
|---|---|

CHAPTER II. *Of the qualities of the Controversialist.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 <i>GOOD</i> qualities of an <i>advocate</i> ; respecting <i>himself</i> .
2 _____ respecting his <i>adversary</i> .
3 <i>Faults</i> of an <i>advocate</i> ; respecting <i>himself</i> .
4 _____ respecting his <i>adversary</i> .
5 Qualities of a <i>judge</i> of controversy.
6 A good <i>advocate</i> may be a bad <i>judge</i> .
7 <i>Faults</i> of controversy, selected more with a view to <i>fact</i> . | 8 Causes of the actual faults of controversialists.
9 Missing the question.
10 Presumption.
11 Needless and unlawful hostilities.
12 Qualities, when one man assumes both characters, of <i>advocate</i> and <i>judge</i> .
13 Some faults above mentioned resemble some modes of disputing generally allowed.
14 Some faults have arisen from misapplication of <i>Scripture</i> . |
|---|---|

CHAPTER III. *Of introducing RIDICULE into controversy; and first, of ridicule in general.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 RIDICULE may be a powerful <i>friend</i>, or <i>enemy</i>, to religion. 2 Of the means of acquiring a right knowledge of it. 3 Phenomena of Infants. Dr. Hartley. 4 Applied to Adults. Hypothesis. 5 Things not really absurd may excite ridicule. 6 Instances: Ecclesiasticus xix. 30, and xxi. 20. 7 Some difficulties removed. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8 Some faults are ridiculous, others detestable. 9 Causes of seriousness. 10 Of the internal sentiment of ridicule. 11 To ridicule a subject, what it means. 12 Man the only risible animal. 13 Ridicule how far the test of <i>truth</i>. 14 How to be rendered <i>useful</i>. 15 Of the saying quoted by Aristotle* from Gorgias. |
|---|--|

CHAPTER IV. *Of using ridicule in disputes about Religion.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 ON what the Question, concerning the use of ridicule in religious disputes, will turn. 2 Opinions given against ridicule, in terms seemingly universal, may only belong to some particular cases. 3 Division of men, into <i>philosophers</i>, and <i>people</i>. 4 <i>Establishments</i> useful in Religion, as well as in Morals, Law, Physic, Agriculture, &c. 5 Farther explanation of the difference between <i>philosophers</i> and <i>people</i>. 6 <i>Ridicule</i> may be used by philosophers, but not by the people. 7 How this rule may be modified for | <p style="text-align: center;"><i>practice</i>: some <i>illustration</i> being premised.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8 The above notion reconciled with what seems to oppose it. 9 Additional remarks. The bad effects of ridicule, <i>transitory</i>. 10 The case of Socrates as ridiculed by Aristophanes. 11 Whatever is peculiar to human nature deserves the attention of mankind. 12 Abuses of ridicule. 13 Authors who have used it. 14 The use of it in <i>private life</i>. 15 Whether ridicule be forbidden in <i>Scripture</i>. 16 Those who blame ridicule use it. 17 Conclusion. |
|--|--|

CHAPTER V. *Canons of Controversy.*

INTRODUCTION.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Every disputant must solemnly acknowledge that he is perpetually liable to <i>error</i>. 2 All expressions of <i>self-sufficiency</i> shall be punished with disgrace. 3 Expressions <i>unmeaning</i>, as to the subject in dispute, shall be regarded as obstructing the pursuit of useful knowledge. 4 He who uses <i>personal</i> reflections shall be deemed an enemy to truth. 5 Let no one accuse his adversary of <i>indirect</i> motives; | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6 —Or charge upon him those <i>consequences</i> of his opinions which he disclaims. 7 It is unlawful to blame any saying of an adversary, as dictated by a <i>party-spirit</i>. 8 Misapplication of <i>ridicule</i> shall be punished according to the circumstances of the case. 9 The above Canons pretend not to perfection. 10 The violation of them exemplified. 11 Exhortation to improvements in controversy. |
|---|---|

* Aristot. Rhet. L. III. c. xviii. This passage is quoted in Dr. Brown's Essays, p. 43.

BOOK III.

OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES IN GENERAL.

CHAPTER I. *Arrangement of the subject-matter.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 IN the present state of Religious Societies, our principal business is, to give a right account of <i>Articles of Religion</i>.</p> <p>2 Analytical investigation of their general nature.</p> <p>3 Synthetical.</p> <p>4 The general end or design of Religious Societies.</p> <p>5 Articles of Religion ought never to be</p> | <p>used but as means of accomplishing that end.</p> <p>6 Consequences from the above, relative to the <i>assent</i> to be given to Articles of Religion.</p> <p>7 Such assent must be regulated, by the nature of <i>veracity</i>, and by the <i>end</i> for which Articles were formed; namely, the promoting of religious <i>sentiments</i>, by <i>unity of doctrine</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER II. *Of Veracity.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 DEFINITION.</p> <p>2 <i>Apparent</i> falsehood distinguished from <i>real</i>.</p> <p>3 <i>Words</i> become signs of our ideas, by arbitrary <i>agreement</i>.</p> <p>4 Such agreement may be <i>changed</i>—</p> | <p>tacitly, or expressly.</p> <p>5 Nothing here said of apparent falsehood is meant to detract from the excellence of veracity.</p> <p>6 Mischiefs of not seeing distinctly the nature of apparent falsehood.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER III. *Of Religious Sentiments.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 SENTIMENTS the causes of actions.</p> <p>2 Their number indefinitely great.</p> <p>3 Religious sentiments may be ranged into two Classes; <i>fear</i> and <i>love</i>.</p> <p>4 <i>Doubt</i> impedes and obstructs the flow of sentiments.</p> <p>5 In order to give due force to religious sentiments, attention must be paid to</p> | <p>the principles of <i>association</i> and <i>sympathy</i>.</p> <p>6 Association, in general.</p> <p>7 Sympathy, in general.</p> <p>8 Association, in Religion.</p> <p>9 Sympathy, in Religion.</p> <p>10 These principles may conspire.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER IV. *Of Unity of Doctrine.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 UNITY of <i>doctrine</i> does not require perfect unity of private opinion.</p> <p>2 Uniformity in <i>ceremonies</i>, mentioned by the way.</p> <p>3 Dissension in religious assemblies may prevent devout sentiments.</p> <p>4 Means of avoiding such dissension.</p> <p>5 These means not impracticable.</p> | <p>6 Defect in some writings which plead for private judgment.</p> <p>7 Establishments do not prevent improvement.</p> <p>8 ————— are useful even to the best informed.</p> <p>9 Mutual <i>concessions</i>, in speculative doctrines, reasonable.</p> |
|---|---|

CHAPTER V. *Of Articles of Religion.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 ARTICLES of Religion are not to be used, where unity of doctrine can be obtained without them.</p> <p>2 Cases may be <i>conceived</i>, in which Assent to a form of doctrine would be needless.</p> <p>3 Suppose great agreement in opinion, or a great degree of <i>candour</i>.</p> | <p>4 Suppose no <i>disturbance</i> to have happened, nor any <i>signs</i> of disturbance to appear.</p> <p>5 ———teachers to deliver all doctrines, as doctrines of the <i>Church</i> from which they received their commission.</p> <p>6 Whether Articles of Religion are to be used, or not, depends upon <i>experience</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER VI. *Of Articles of Religion, which have been continued for a length of TIME, whilst other things have been changing.*

PREFACE.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 Ordinary effects of the long <i>continuance</i> of Articles of Religion.</p> <p>2 Supposition of an error discovered in a body of doctrines.</p> <p>3 Reasons for suffering the <i>words</i> expressing that error to grow <i>obsolete</i>; or the <i>law</i>, enjoining the use of such</p> | <p>words, to be tacitly <i>repealed</i>.</p> <p>4 A number of improvements, adopted tacitly, constitute a tacit <i>reformation</i>.</p> <p>5 Tacit reformations give more <i>liberty</i> than such as are expressed.</p> <p>6 Prejudices against the above obviated by some <i>facts</i>.</p> |
|---|---|

CHAPTER VII. *Of Truth opposite to the Letter.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 TIME and changes in things may change the sense of words.</p> <p>2 A man may be sincere who declares his assent to a proposition expressed in words, the <i>literal</i> sense of which he thinks false.</p> <p>3 Regard must be had to the sense in which that person understands a declaration to whom it is addressed.</p> | <p>4 Who that person <i>is</i>, when assent is given to a body of doctrines.</p> <p>5 Regard may be paid to the <i>end</i> and <i>design</i> of any form to which assent is required.</p> <p>6 Explanation of a passage in Dr. Powell's second Discourse.</p> <p>7 <i>Reserve</i>, in treating this subject, not always necessary.</p> |
|---|--|

CHAPTER VIII. *Of Falseness in speaking according to the Letter.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 WHEN words have changed their meaning, what, in the new sense, is truth, may, in the old or literal sense, be falseness.</p> <p>2 Instances.</p> <p>3 Prejudice in favour of the literal sense.</p> <p>4 It is not impossible that there might be two religious societies, dissenting</p> | <p>from each other, and yet using the same Articles of Faith.</p> <p>5 Explanation of a passage in Dr. Powell's second discourse.</p> <p>6 Illustration of some things in this, and the two preceding Chapters, from the 74th Canon of the Church of England.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER IX. *Of the use of HISTORY, in determining the sense of Articles of Religion.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 GENERAL design of this chapter.</p> <p>2 The sense of Articles of one sect, may be affected by changes in <i>other</i> sects.</p> <p>3 Every Article is a remedy for some error, judged likely to interfere with unity of doctrine, and to promote disorder.</p> <p>4 The interpretation of each Article</p> | <p>ought to be the same as if such error had been specified.</p> <p>5 <i>Reasons</i> for such limited interpretation. First, We are not to suppose liberty to have been abridged unnecessarily.</p> <p>6 The reference to the <i>times</i>, in our 35th Article.</p> |
|---|--|

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>7 Compilers of Articles would have no <i>wish</i> to form any, except for urgent occasions.</p> <p>8 Inspired Writings themselves are to be interpreted by reference to the occasions on which they were written.</p> <p>9 Conclusions from the above. First, Articles, or parts of them, may become a dead letter.</p> | <p>10 Articles are not inconsistent with any doctrines which were unknown to the compilers of them :</p> <p>11 Nor with any subsequent solutions of difficulties.</p> <p>12 The case of those who are ignorant of the facts to which the Articles refer.</p> |
|--|--|

CHAPTER X. *Of assenting to propositions which are unintelligible.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 CONNECTION of this Chapter with the preceding.</p> <p>2 Unintelligible propositions arise in natural Religion.</p> <p>3 — in revealed.</p> <p>4 So far as they are unintelligible, when affirmative, they affirm nothing ; when negative, they deny nothing.</p> <p>5 Assent to them does not affect veracity.</p> <p>6 The end of such assent is not <i>truth</i>, but <i>utility</i>.</p> <p>7 Wherein that utility consists.</p> <p>8 Verbal assent, in the case described, is not a violation of duty, either to God,</p> | <p>or man.</p> <p>9 Proof of this, from the gradual revelation of the Divine Will—to mankind.</p> <p>10 — to each individual.</p> <p>11 Illustration, from the practice of catechizing.</p> <p>12 — from different orders in the Church.</p> <p>13 Of assenting to propositions which are <i>obscure</i>.</p> <p>14 Attempt to reconcile these notions with those of Dr. Balguy.</p> <p>15 Inferences.</p> |
|--|--|

CHAPTER XI. *Of choosing the least evil.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 THOUGH a man be dissatisfied with some things in his own Society, it does not follow that he is to quit it.</p> <p>2 The nature of <i>schism</i>.</p> <p>3 Grounds of the reluctance with which men allow religious societies to be <i>faulty</i> or <i>imperfect</i>.</p> <p>4 The Church, in what sense instituted by Christ, and how far human.</p> <p>5 Result, as to choosing what is the <i>least evil</i> on the whole.</p> <p>6 Our views not likely to be more distinct in forming <i>religious</i> than <i>other</i> institutions.</p> | <p>7 Of publishing imperfections of religious societies, considered as a matter of <i>prudence</i>.</p> <p>8 To continue members of a church, with which we are dissatisfied, if that be the least evil, is not wrong.</p> <p>9 Yet, in practice, the principle is liable to <i>abuse</i> ; by too much regard being paid to <i>temporal</i> and <i>private</i> evil.</p> <p>10 Nevertheless, temporal and private evil need not be <i>wholly</i> neglected, in adhering to a religious society.</p> <p>11 The mischiefs of not following the rule laid down in this Chapter.</p> |
|---|---|

CHAPTER XII. *Of the Assent of the Clergy to Articles of Religion, as distinguished from that of the Laity.*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 BISHOP Burnet's opinion.</p> <p>2 There may be a difference between Clergy and Laity, in the <i>degree</i> of assent, without any in the <i>kind</i>.</p> <p>3 Some laymen may not in fact give any assent, expressly :</p> <p>4 Or may be pardoned, if their examination of doctrines has not been the</p> | <p>most exact.</p> <p>5 The knowledge of the grounds of opinions being the same, in Clergy and Laity, the assent ought to be the same, in all respects.</p> <p>6 Yet a certain degree of dissent in opinion, may have different <i>effects</i> on Clergy and Laity.</p> |
|--|---|

CHAPTER XIII. *Of the difference between ASSENTING, and determining to CONFORM.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 THIS difference, and the grounds of it, explained.</p> <p>2 If a promise to <i>conform</i> were the only thing required by authority, <i>assent</i> might, in some points, be dispensed with.</p> <p>3 The question here is not, how <i>laws</i> are to be <i>made</i>, but how they are to be <i>obeyed</i>.</p> <p>4 When <i>assent</i> is required by authority, a determination to <i>conform</i> is not sufficient.</p> | <p>5 <i>Opinions</i> of teachers;—considered as <i>means</i> of attaining unity of doctrine.</p> <p>6 ————— as a <i>security</i> for their performance of duty.</p> <p>7 Relaxation on the part of the Church, may justify relaxation on the part of him who assents to its doctrines.</p> <p>8 Nothing can justify any one's acting <i>against</i> the welfare of a Church of which he is a member.</p> |
|---|--|

CHAPTER XIV. *Of the authority of the Civil Magistrate, as influencing Religious Society.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 THE powers of ecclesiastical Society, when unconnected with civil.</p> <p>2 The views with which the civil Magistrate connects himself with ecclesiastical Society.</p> <p>3 Religion may be a powerful friend, or enemy, to the Magistrate.</p> <p>4 Explanation of Establishment, Toleration, Connivance.</p> <p>5 Defence of the notion of an <i>Alliance</i> between Church and State.</p> <p>6 Benefits of every Alliance mutual. The Magistrate may have a powerful influence on Religion.</p> <p>7 Of the King's Supremacy.</p> | <p>8 Of a maintenance for the established teachers of Religion.</p> <p>9 Of the <i>independence</i> of the Church.</p> <p>10 Of Tests.</p> <p>11 Of the manner in which the same individuals compose two different Societies.</p> <p>12 No Society is conducted without <i>authority</i>.</p> <p>13 Some passages read from the works of Bp. Warburton and Dr. Balguy.</p> <p>14 Remarks on Mr. Robinson's "Discourse on sacramental tests."</p> <p>15 Historical account of English laws relating to religious doctrines.</p> |
|---|--|

CHAPTER XV. *Of improving Religious Societies.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 ALL human institutions admit of improvement.</p> <p>2 <i>Express</i> improvements and reformations are to be attempted in the first instance:</p> <p>3 But when difficulties occur, <i>tacit</i> improvements may <i>prepare</i> the way for express.</p> <p>4 Improvements may be <i>right</i>, though attended with some appearance of <i>injury</i>.</p> <p>5 Whether a <i>teacher</i> can be a reformer of his own Church.</p> <p>6 Dispositions <i>previously</i> requisite for religious improvements. Freedom from <i>bigotry</i>.</p> | <p>7 Particulars of which such improvements would consist.</p> <p>8 Acquiring experimental knowledge of human nature.</p> <p>9 Religious cultivation of the <i>understanding</i>.</p> <p>10 ————— of the <i>imagination</i>.</p> <p>11 Correction and melioration of the <i>affections</i>. Superstition. Enthusiasm. Mysticism. Lukewarmness.</p> <p>12 Formation and improvement of <i>discipline</i> and <i>ceremonies</i>.</p> <p>13 These species of improvement might forward each other mutually.</p> |
|--|--|

BOOK IV.

OF PARTICULAR RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

INTRODUCTION.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 REASONS for treating of the Articles of the Church of England.</p> <p>2 Of the <i>number</i> of those Articles.</p> <p>3 Of their <i>worth</i>.</p> <p>4 Of collecting their <i>primitive sense</i>.</p> <p>5 Of the <i>declaration</i> prefixed to them.</p> | <p>6 Of <i>authors</i> who have written upon them.</p> <p>7 Of the most useful method of treating them. 1. <i>History</i>. 2. <i>Explanation</i>. 3. <i>Proof</i>. 4. <i>Application</i>.</p> |
|--|---|

ARTICLE I. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.*

THERE is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

- 1 HISTORY of the doctrine of the Trinity. *Heathens*, particularly Plato.
- 2 Jews.
- 3 Christians in general; whether they *adopted* the doctrine of the Trinity from others.
- 4 Whether it can be said, in any sense, that the doctrine of the Trinity did not exist till the fourth century. Where, of Theophilus of Antioch, Philopatris ascribed to Lucian, the Nicene Council and Creed, Lactantius, Erasmus, &c.
- 5 Difference between ancient and modern Unitarians.
- 6 Sketch of the history of the doctrine of the Trinity, from the fourth century down to modern times.
- 7 EXPLANATION.
- 8 PROOF.

- 9 APPLICATION, consisting of four particulars:
 1. In what sense a thinking man may now *assent* to our Article.
 2. *Concessions* which might be made on our part.
 3. *Concessions* which might be expected from our *adversaries*.
 4. Ideas of *improvement*.
- 10 In what sense a thinking man may now *assent* to our Article.
- 11 *Concessions* on our part. The term *Trinity*.
- 12 Industriously professing our doctrine to be *unintelligible*.
- 13 Constantly proclaiming the Divine *Unity*.
- 14 Addressing the Son and Holy Ghost in words of *Scripture*.
- 15 *Concessions* on the part of our *adversaries*.
- 16 *Improvements*; and first, of modern *philosophy*.
- 17 Of minuteness in attending to *circumstances*.
- 18 Of caution in forming difficult expressions into *arguments*.
- 19 Of the term *God*, as used in different parts of *Scripture*.
- 20 Of forming conjectures concerning the *uses* of the doctrine of the Trinity.

APPENDIX. *Concerning the Genuineness of the disputed Text 1 John v. 7.*

ARTICLE II. *Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very Man.*

THE SON, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and

of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that

- two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man; who truly suffered, 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.
- 1 HISTORY; and first of the ancient notions of the *Word* of God.
 - 2 Of the state of our doctrine before the Arian controversy.
 - 3 The probable *causes* of variations in doctrine concerning the Son of God; the principal *points* on which differences turned; and the principal *favourers* of various notions, enumerated.
 - 4 The notions of *oriental* Christians.
 - 5 ——— of *Judaizing* Christians.
 - 6 ——— of the *Arians*.
 - 7 ——— of the followers of *Pho- tinus*.
 - 8 ——— of the *Nestorians*.
 - 9 ——— of the *Eutyrians*.
 - 10 ——— of the *Monothelites*.
 - 11 ——— of the *Adoptionarii*.
 - 12 ——— of the *Socinians*.
 - 13 ——— of the *Anabaptists*.
 - 14 ——— of some distinguished *in- dividuals*.
 - 15 EXPLANATION, chiefly historical; in the order of the words of the Article.
 - 16 PROOF; and first, Christ is described, in Scripture, as *Divine*.
 - 17 The *Word* of God is spoken of as a *Person*: and as the *Son* of God.
 - 18 The word "*begotten*" is rightly used in our Article.
 - 19 The expression, "from everlasting," is justifiable.
 - 20 So are the following Expressions;— "Of the Father."
 - 21 —"Of one substance."
 - 22 —"Took man's nature."
 - 23 —"In the womb of the blessed Vir- gin."
 - 24 —"Of her substance."
 - 25 —"Two *natures* in one *Person*."
 - 26 —"Never to be divided."
 - 27 —"One Christ."
 - 28 The suffering, crucifixion, death, and burial, of Christ, were *real facts*, and not mere *appearances*.
 - 29 What relates to *atonement*, or pre- supposes *original sin*, is deferred.
 - 30 OBJECTIONS: too *numerous* to be all specified; some *general* remarks upon them.
 - 31 Some objections may be answered by distinguishing the three *conditions* or *states* of Christ.
 - 32 Others, by attending to his two dif- ferent *natures*.
 - 33 Others, by distinguishing between the *Deity* of natural Religion, and a divine Person of the Holy Trinity.
 - 34 Others, by examining into *partial quotations*.
 - 35 Others, by attending to the imper- fections of *language*.
 - 36 Others, by observing the particular *views* of objectors.
 - 37 Others, by *substituting an interpre- tation*, in the place of the words interpreted.
 - 38 APPLICATION, consisting of the same four parts as in the first Article.
 - 39 In what sense a person may now *assent* to this Article.
 - 40 *Concessions* on our part.
 - 41 Omission of the word "*God*."
 - 42 Forms composed of *scriptural* ex- pressions.
 - 43 Concessions, on the part of our *ad- versaries*.
 - 44 *Improvements*.
 - 45 Difference between expressions of sublime devotion, or *passion*, and those defining *speculative* truths.
 - 46 The *possibility* of men's uniting in worship, who differ in opinion.

ARTICLE III. *Of the going down of Christ into Hell.*

As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell.

- 1 HISTORY; the more ancient.
- 2 The more modern.
- 3 EXPLANATION; where, of the terms $\xi\delta\eta\varsigma$, $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, &c.
- 4 PROOF, that the Soul of Christ went into the ordinary receptacle of de- parted *human* souls.
- 5 *Objection* of Voltaire.
- 6 APPLICATION. Of *assent*, as given at this time.
- 7 Mutual *concessions*.
- 8 *Improvements*. Whether true philo- sophy obliges us to reject the popular language about the *soul*, and its changing *place*.

ARTICLE IV. *Of the Resurrection of Christ.*

CHRIST did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; where-with he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all Men at the last day.

Preface.

- 1 HISTORY; first, of the doctrine of the *resurrection* of Christ.
- 2 — of the Doctrine of the *ascension* of Christ.
- 3 — of Christ's *session*.
- 4 — of his *coming* to Judgment.
- 5 Of Millenarians.
- 6 EXPLANATION.
- 7 PROOF; the Propositions may be reduced to *four*.
- 8 Christ did rise from the dead as an *human* being.
- 9 He did *ascend* into heaven, without any change in his Person.
- 10 His *session* comprehends the time from his Ascension, to his return to judgment.
- 11 Christ will come to judge the world.

- 12 Arguments concerning a Millennium.
- 13 Indirect proof, or obviating *objections*.
- 14 It has been objected, that the body of Christ was probably *stolen* by his disciples.
- 15 — that the resurrection of Christ happened *sooner* than was foretold.
- 16 — that he appeared only to *select* witnesses.
- 17 — that the *body*, described as belonging to Christ after his resurrection, could not be truly *human*.
- 18 — that Christ is said, Acts vii. 55, to be *standing* at the right hand of God.
- 19 — that our Article, which says that Christ will come to judge "*all men*," differs too much from our *Creed*s, which say, that Christ will come to judge "*the quick and the dead*."
- 20 — that sitting *till* the last day, differs materially from possessing a kingdom, which "*shall have no end*."
- 21 APPLICATION.—Assent to the Article.
- 22 Mutual *concessions*.
- 23 Improvements.

APPENDIX. *Concerning the Resurrection of the BODY.*

ARTICLE V. *Of the Holy Ghost.*

THE Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

- 1 HISTORY; general ideas.
- 2 — of the first four centuries.
- 3 — of the eighth and ninth centuries.
- 4 — of the age of the *Reformation*.
- 5 EXPLANATION.
- 6 Senses of the word *Spirit*.
- 7 PROOF; four propositions.
- 8 The Holy Ghost is set forth to us in Scripture as a *Person*, or Agent.
- 9 We are authorized to say, that he *proceedeth* from the *Father*.
- 10 Also, that he *proceedeth* from the *Son*.
- 11 It is the meaning of Scripture, that we should treat this Person as *Divine*.
- 12 Indirect proof; or answering *objections*.
- 13 It is objected, that the Holy Ghost is only *personified* in like manner as *charity, sin, &c.*

- 14 — that the Holy Spirit is sometimes spoken of as *superior* to the *Son*.
- 15 The methods of answering objections, mentioned under the second Article, may be followed here.
- 16 APPLICATION. *Assent* to the Article.
- 17 Mutual *concessions*.
- 18 *Improvements*.
- 19 An increasing attention to *circumstances* in which words are used.
- 20 An endeavour to see whether expressions have not been construed too *definitely*.
- 21 Invention of criteria to distinguish *real persons* from such as are merely *rhetorical*.
- 22 — of *forms*, which might be used by different sects.
- 23 Inquiries whether the doctrine of the Trinity may not have a tendency to heighten our *devout affections*.
- 24 — whether the *difficulties* attending it are not owing, in a great measure, to our aiming at something above *human* views of things, and senses of *words*.

ARTICLE VI. *Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.*

HOLY Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be

thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis,
Exodus,
Leviticus,
Numeri,
Deuteronomium,
Joshua,
Judges,
Ruth,
The 1 Book of Samuel,
The 2 Book of Samuel,
The 1 Book of Kings,
The 2 Book of Kings,

The 1 Book of Chronicles,
The 2 Book of Chronicles,
The 1 Book of Esdras,
The 2 Book of Esdras,
The Book of Hester,
The Book of Job,
The Psalms,
The Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes or Preacher,
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,
4 Prophets the Greater,
12 Prophets the Less.

And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life, and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; such are these following:

The 3 Book of Esdras,
The 4 Book of Esdras,
The Book of Tobias,
The Book of Judith,
The rest of the Book of Hester,
The Book of Wisdom,
Jesus the Son of Sirach,

Baruch the Prophet,
The Song of the Three Children,
The Story of Susanna,
Of Bel and the Dragon,
The Prayer of Manasses,
The 1 Book of Maccabees,
The 2 Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.

PREFACE; accounting for a change of method in treating the present Article.

- 1 Our Observations here divided into *four parts*. The *first part* relating to *tradition*, the immediate object of the Article; the *second*, to the Books of the *Old Testament*; the *third*, to the *Apocrypha*; the *fourth*, to the Books of the *New Testament*.
- 2 *First part*;—of *tradition*: *facts* occasioning our Article.
- 3 Tradition amongst the *Jews*.
- 4 *Proof* of the first part: No doctrine is *necessary*, which is not supported by the *written word* of God.
- 5 *Objections* answered.
- 6 *Second part*: of the Books of the *Old Testament*: *History*.
- 7 *Explanation*.
- 8 *Proof* of the second part. The Books, which we call those of the *Old Testament*, are to be received as canonical.—This proposition examined by one who lived before the coming of Christ.
- 9 — examined by a Christian.

- 10 *Third part*: Of the *Apocrypha*;—*some facts*.
- 11 *Explanation* of the word *Apocryphal**.
- 12 *Proof*, that the Books, which we call *apocryphal*, ought not to be applied “to establish any *doctrine*.”
- 13 Reasons why they may be read publicly, as *moral*.
- 14 *Fourth part*: Of the Books of the *New Testament*.
- 15 *History* of the seven Books which, for a while, were not universally received.
- 16 Ways in which their reception might be obstructed.
- 17 *Explanation*.
- 18 *Proof*, that the seven controverted Books of the *New Testament* ought to be deemed canonical.
- 19 Those Books considered *collectively*.
- 20 — *separately*.
- 21 The Epistle to the *Hebrews*: its authenticity.
- 22 Its *genuineness*, how to be understood.
- 23 *Objections* answered.
- 24 The Epistle of *James*.

* Book I. Chap. xii. Sect. 2.

- 25 Its genuineness.
- 26 Its authenticity.
- 27 The second Epistle of *Peter* : its genuineness.
- 28 Its authenticity.
- 29 The second and third Epistles of *John*.
- 30 The Epistle of *Jude*.
- 31 The Book of *Revelation* was written

- by *John*, the Evangelist.
- 32 Some authors mentioned who have endeavoured to investigate the meaning of that Book.
- 33 The expression of our Article considered, "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."
- 34 *Application* ; belonging to the whole Article.

ARTICLE VII. *Of the Old Testament.*

THE Old Testament is not contrary to the New ; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth ; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

- 1 HISTORY may be best given in answer to five questions.
- 2 By whom has it been said, that the Old Testament is *contrary* to the New ?
- 3 Some account of *Antinomians*, *Anabaptists*, and the *Family of Love*.
- 4 By whom has it been said, "that the Fathers did look only for transitory promises?"
- 5 Have any Christians ever held, that

- the *ceremonial* Law of Moses continues in force under the Christian Dispensation ?
- 6 Has it been affirmed, that the *civil* Law of Moses is binding upon Christians ?
- 7 Have Christians ever been considered as free from the *moral* Law of Moses ?
- 8 EXPLANATION ; intended to reduce and simplify the propositions to be proved.
- 9 PROOF.—"Everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ," in the Old Testament.
- 10 "The old Fathers did" not "look only for transitory promises."
- 11 Christians are not bound to obey the *ceremonial* Law of Moses.
- 12 "The *civil* precepts" of the Mosaical Law, "ought" not "of necessity to be received in any commonwealth."
- 13 No Christian is free from the *moral* Law of Moses : where, of the *Decalogue*, and the *Sabbath*.
- 14 Considerations of the *propriety* and fitness of different divine Laws in different circumstances.
- 15 Some *difficulties* urged by the *Jews*.
- 16 APPLICATION, consisting of the same parts as before.

ARTICLE VIII. *Of the Three Creeds.*

THE Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed : for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.

- 1 HISTORY. Of creeds in general.
- 2 Of the *Apostles' Creed*.
- 3 Two expressions peculiar to this Creed. "The Holy catholic Church."

- 4 The "The Communion of Saints."
- 5 History of the *Nicene Creed*.
- 6 The expression, "Light of Light."
- 7 Expressions concerning the Holy Ghost.
- 8 History of the *Athanasian Creed*.
- 9 EXPLANATION of the *Athanasian Creed* ; historical.
- 10 PROOF.
- 11 Of the damnatory clauses.
- 12 APPLICATION.

The Articles of the Church of England divided into THREE PARTS.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND PART.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 GENERAL idea of the second part: it treats of the value of human actions.</p> <p>2 The free and simple consideration of it is impeded by <i>prejudice</i>.</p> <p>3 Popular language must mislead, if understood strictly.</p> <p>4 Language expressing acts of the <i>mind</i>, is taken, not from <i>theory</i>, but from <i>facts</i>; that is, from our <i>feelings</i>; and is used for some purpose of <i>convenience</i>, or <i>utility</i>.</p> <p>5 Instance, in expressions concerning <i>freedom</i> and <i>necessity</i>.</p> <p>6 Language expressing acts of the <i>mind</i>, is not <i>proper</i>, but <i>metaphorical</i> language.</p> <p>7 Language concerning voluntary actions, is <i>imperfect</i> in other respects: first, in using <i>positive terms</i> for <i>negative ideas</i>.</p> <p>8 Next, in assigning <i>causes</i> inaccurately.</p> | <p>9 Also, in using <i>general terms</i> to affirm what is true only in <i>particular circumstances</i>.</p> <p>10 Hence <i>seeming contradictions</i> when there is no real repugnancy.</p> <p>11 The subject of <i>predestination</i> exemplifies <i>all</i> these imperfections.</p> <p>12 The above observations applied to the language of <i>Scripture</i>.</p> <p>13 The language of <i>Scripture</i> (concerning voluntary actions) occasions <i>additional difficulties</i>: from our <i>judgment</i> being discomposed.</p> <p>14 — from our <i>scruples</i> about <i>limiting</i> expressions of the Word of God.</p> <p>15 — from our expecting Revelation to suggest <i>new truths</i>.</p> <p>16 — from our taking that for an <i>argumentum ad judicium</i>, which is only an <i>argumentum ad hominem</i>.</p> |
|--|--|

ARTICLE IX. *Of Original or Birth-sin.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>ORIGINAL Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam; 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 therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek, <i>φρόνημα σαρκός</i>, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized; yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.</p> <p>1 HISTORY.—The early Christians must have had <i>some</i> doctrine allied to ours of original sin.</p> <p>2 Original sin implies, both a <i>state</i> liable to <i>punishment</i>, and a <i>mind</i> in disorder.</p> | <p>3 Heathens.</p> <p>4 Jews.</p> <p>5 Christians before the 5th Century: including <i>Manicheans</i>.</p> <p>6 Fifth Century. Pelagius, and his followers.</p> <p>7 Opposed by Augustin.</p> <p>8 Some modern accounts of this Æra. Dr. Jortin. Dr. Wall.</p> <p>9 Semi-pelagians.</p> <p>10 Mohammedans.</p> <p>11 The Schoolmen.</p> <p>12 The age of the Reformation.</p> <p>13 Calvinists and Arminians.</p> <p>14 Socinians, including Dr. John Taylor.</p> <p>15 EXPLANATION.</p> <p>16 Sin, <i>original</i> and <i>actual</i>; <i>proper</i> and <i>improper</i>.</p> <p>17 "the <i>following</i> of Adam."</p> <p>18 "The fault and corruption of the <i>nature</i>," &c.</p> <p>19 "every man, that is naturally ingendered of the offspring of Adam."</p> <p>20 "Original righteousness."</p> <p>21 Of Man's being in the <i>image</i> of God.</p> <p>22 "deserveth God's wrath and damnation."</p> <p>23 Expressions of the Article taken from <i>Scripture</i>.</p> <p>24 "regenerated."</p> <p>25 "<i>φρόνημα σαρκός</i>."</p> <p>26 "is not subject to the Law of God."</p> |
|---|--|

- 27 **PROOF.** Four propositions.
- 28 Original sin signifies the corruption of our nature, or mental constitution.
- 29 There is some reason to think that we were brought into our state of mental corruption, by the offence of our *first parents*.
- 30 Original sin makes men *liable to Judgment*.
- 31 Illustration of this last proposition.
- 32 Christians, after baptism, are capable of concupiscence, or mental corruption.
- 33 Indirect proof; or answering *objections*.
- 34 It has been objected, that the doctrine of original sin is supported by a *small number* of passages of Scrip-

- ture.
- 35 It has been asked, Can any man be sinful except by *choice*?
- 36 It has been urged, that to punish original sin would be *cruel*.
- 37 A difficulty has been urged with regard to *infants* dying unbaptized.
- 38 Of the 18th chapter of the Book of Ezekiel.
- 39 Of original sin being a doctrine of little *utility*.
- 40 Of its disgusting philosophical men.
- 41 **APPLICATION.** Article of *Natural Religion*.
- 42 Paraphrase of our Article; or form of *assent* to it.
- 43 Mutual *concessions*.
- 44 Improvements.
- 45 Conclusion.

ARTICLE X. *Of Free Will.*

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.

- 1 **CONNECTION** of this Article with the preceding.
- 2 **HISTORY.** Heathens.
- 3 Jews.
- 4 Christians before the fifth century.
- 5 Fifth century. Pelagian Controversy.
- 6 Augustin.
- 7 Fulgentius, and others.
- 8 Semipelagians.
- 9 Centuries after the fifth, particularly the *ninth*.
- 10 The Schoolmen.
- 11 Age of the Reformation.
- 12 Antinomians and Anabaptists.
- 13 The Church of Rome.
- 14 Events in Spain.
- 15 — in Holland and Flanders: five Articles.
- 16 — in Germany.
- 17 — in France. Jansenists.
- 18 — in Poland: Socinians.
- 19 Modern times.
- 20 Separate history of those who have supposed God to deprive some men of that assistance which was necessary for the performance of their duty.

- 21 Conclusion of history.
- 22 **EXPLANATION.** The title, "Of free will."
- 23 "The condition of man."
- 24 "After the fall of Adam."
- 25 "is such, that he cannot," &c.
- 26 "turn and prepare himself,"
- 27 "by his own natural strength,"
- 28 "and good works;"
- 29 "to faith,"
- 30 "and calling upon God;"
- 31 "wherefore,"
- 32 "we have no power to do good works,"
- 33 "pleasant and acceptable to God"—
- 34 "without the grace of God by Christ preventing us."
- 35 **PROOF.** Two propositions;
- 36 When we have been converted to Christianity, we ought to *thank* God, and give him the *glory*.
- 37 When we have done any actions deemed good, we ought to ascribe them, as far as they really are good, to the assistance of God: and we ought to thank him, both for the *dispositions*, and the *actions*.
- 38 The texts, by which these propositions are proved, may receive light from the remarks offered in the *Introduction* to the second part of our Articles.
- 39 The expressions are to be understood by the good *purposes* for which they were used:—where, of referring *some* events to God, and not others.
- 40 Expressions *seemingly affirmative* are sometimes to be taken in a *negative* sense.
- 41 Expressions seeming to assign the

- cause* of an action *fully*, may be taken as assigning it *partially*: and hence, ascribing an action to the agency of God, does not exclude the agency of man.
- 42 The true sense of an expression depends greatly on the *circumstances* in which it was used.
- 43 Conclusion of the direct proof.
- 44 Indirect proof, or answering *objections*.
- 45 Our reasonings may be thought too *nice* and *intricate* for the generality of mankind.
- 46 The general *tenor* of the Scriptures is as if man were *free*.
- 47 Prayer implies the contrary of what has been affirmed with regard to a distinction between *past* and *future* actions.
- 48 Our reasonings may seem to lessen the *importance* of the doctrine of divine grace.
- 49 The doctrine of this Article may disgust *thinking men*, as seeming to be *enthusiastic*, and to favour the notion of *necessity*.
- 50 Separate argument, concerning the referring of *evil* to God; and the expressions of *hardening*, *blinding*, &c.
- 51 APPLICATION. Article of *Natural Religion*.
- 52 Form of *assent* to our Article.
- 53 Mutual *concessions*.
- 54 Improvements.

ARTICLE XI. *Of the Justification of Man.*

- WE are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.
- 1 HISTORY.—*Jewish* notions of Justification.
- 2 Heathens.
- 3 Christians, before the fifth century.
- 4 Fifth century.
- 5 Schoolmen.
- 6 Era of the Reformation.
- 7 Romanists.
- 8 Church of England.
- 9 Calvinists and Arminians.
- 10 Antinomians.
- 11 Anabaptists.
- 12 From the Reformation to the present time.
- 13 Socinians.
- 14 EXPLANATION. The *title* of the Article.
- 15 "We are accounted righteous before God."
- 16 "Only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."
- 17 "By faith."
- 18 "And not for our own works or deservings."
- 19 "Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only;"
- 20 "— is a most *wholesome* doctrine, and very full of *comfort*;"
- 21 "As more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."
- 22 PROOF; one proposition; resolvable into two.
- 23 We are not accounted righteous before God, for our own works.
- 24 We are accounted righteous, if at all, for the merit of Christ: or, we are justified by *faith*.
- 25 Indirect proof, or answering *objections*.
- 26 In the texts alleged in our direct proof, are not the Law of *Nature* and the Law of *Moses* confounded together? and, of course, *works* of obedience to those Laws?
- 27 Is not our doctrine of justification by faith contrary to what is taught by St. James?
- 28 Does not Scripture frequently ascribe salvation to virtue, or good *works*?
- 29 Is not our doctrine a means of disgusting plain *thinking men*?
- 30 APPLICATION. Article of *Natural Religion*.
- 31 Form of *assent* to our Article.
- 32 Mutual *concessions*.
- 33 Improvements.

APPENDIX. *On the Doctrine of ATONEMENT.*

- 1 HISTORY: summary account.
- 2 Some particulars: Heathens. Jews. Ancient Christians.
- 3 Schoolmen.
- 4 Extension of meritorious suffering to *martyrs*.
- 5 The era of the Reformation.
- 6 The Romanists.
- 7 The Puritans.
- 8 Socinians, and Grotius.
- 9 Modern times.
- 10 EXPLANATION.

- 11 Atonement.
- 12 Propitiation.
- 13 Reconciliation.
- 14 Sacrifice.
- 15 Vicarious suffering.
- 16 Punishment.
- 17 Redemption.
- 18 Salvation.
- 19 Satisfaction.
- 20 Imputation of guilt.
- 21 **PROOF.** Its nature. Only one proposition.
- 22 God will make sincere Christians eternally happy, notwithstanding some imperfections of theirs, on account of the merits, the sufferings, and the *death* of Christ.
- 23 Indirect proof; or answering *objections*.
- 24 It is urged, that our doctrine of Atonement is not laid open in either the *Old Testament*, the *Gospels*, or the *Acts* of the Apostles.

- 25 It is urged, that the Scriptures, according to their general *tenor*, represent God as pardoning penitent sinners *freely*.
- 26 — that we take some expressions of Scripture in *too strong* a sense.
- 27 — that when the death of Christ is called a *sacrifice*, the term is only *metaphorical*.
- 28 Result of the above reasoning.
- 29 — It is apprehended, as in former articles, that our doctrine may disgust plain *thinking* men.
- 30 Other objections might be solved, by the methods proposed in the second and fifth Articles.
- 31 **APPLICATION.** Declaration of *Natural* Religion.
- 32 Form of *assent* to the Christian doctrine of Atonement.
- 33 *Mutual concessions*.
- 34 Improvements.

ARTICLE XII.

Of Good Works.

ALBEIT that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

- 1 **HISTORY.**
- 2 Some account of the ninth Book of the Divine Legation of Moses.
- 3 Some expressions of those Christians, who are sometimes called *Methodists*, relative to *good works*.
- 4 **EXPLANATION.**
- 5 "Albeit that"—
- 6 "Good works"—
- 7 "Which are the fruits of Faith,"
- 8 "and follow after justification"—
- 9 "cannot put away our sins,"
- 10 "and endure the severity of God's judgment;"
- 11 "Yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ."
- 12 The rest of the Article, together.
- 13 Some particular expressions. "Ne-

- cessarily,"
- 14 "a true and *lively* faith."
- 15 "discerned."—
- 16 Conclusion of the explanation.
- 17 **PROOF.** Five propositions.
- 18 Good works of Christians cannot expiate past sins.
- 19 — cannot endure *judgment*, on a footing of strict justice.
- 20 — are *pleasing* to God.
- 21 The ground on which they are so is a regard in God to *Christ*.
- 22 When *faith* is commended in Scripture, it is supposed to be productive of good works.
- 23 Indirect proof; or answering *objections*. There may seem to be some impropriety in calling works *good*, which are allowed to be *imperfect*.
- 24 It has been urged, that our descriptions of faith are *indeterminate*, and leave the mind in *uncertainty*.
- 25 Our doctrine may seem to make virtue of but *secondary* importance.
- 26 **APPLICATION:** declaration of *Natural* Religion.
- 27 Form of *assent* to our Article.
- 28 *Mutual concessions*.
- 29 Improvements.

ARTICLE XIII. *Of Works done before Justification.*

WORKS done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they

spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors

say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY. Before the age of the Pelagian controversy.
- 3 The Pelagian controversy.
- 4 The Schoolmen. An idea of the nature of their attainments.
- 5 Age of the Reformation.
- 6 Socinians.
- 7 EXPLANATION. The title of the Article.
- 8 "Works"—
- 9 "done before the grace of Christ"—
- 10 "and the inspiration of his Spirit"—
- 11 "are not pleasant to God,"—
- 12 "forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ,"—
- 13 "neither do they make men meet to receive grace"—
- 14 "Or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity"—
- 15 "Yea rather"
- 16 "for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done"—
- 17 "we doubt not but they have the nature of sin."
- 18 PROOF. Three propositions.
- 19 Christians ought not to consider *Heathen* virtues as, in strictness, pleasing to God; because such virtues have not that right *Christian*

- principle to recommend them, which is intended for all mankind.
- 20 Good actions, popularly so called, of men not yet admitted into Christianity, cannot *entitle* them, even on a footing of propriety, to such divine assistance as may effect their admission.
 - 21 The good actions of mere men, who have no connection with Christianity, may, in strictness, be considered as having the nature of *sin*; because they do not answer perfectly to the *Will*, or the *Laws*, of God.
 - 22 Distinction between those who are Heathens *involuntarily*, and those who are Heathens by *choice*.
 - 23 Indirect proof: or obviating *objections*.
 - 24 Does not the doctrine, that Heathen virtues have the nature of sin, appear *harsh*, and inconsistent with Rom. ii. 14?
 - 25 Can it be right, that all the *finer principles* of moral action in man should be *superseded* by the one Christian principle of *faith*?
 - 26 Is it not contrary to our best *feelings*, to affirm, that pious and virtuous Heathens have no kind of *claim* to be admitted into Christianity?
 - 27 APPLICATION. Declaration of *Natural Religion*.
 - 28 Form of *assent* to our Article.
 - 29 Mutual *concessions*.
 - 30 Improvements.

ARTICLE XIV. *Of Works of Supererogation.*

VOLUNTARY Works besides, over and above God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

1 HISTORY.

- 2 Explanation.
- 3 Proof.—One proposition: We may not suppose any one man to have so much merit, as that some of it can be transferred, to lessen the punishment of another man.
- 4 *Objections*. Can a man do nothing beyond his mere strict *duty*?
- 5 Does not *Scripture* encourage the distinction between what we are *bound* to do, and what we might be *applauded* and *rewarded* for doing?
- 6 Objection from 1 Pet. iv. 8, "Charity shall cover the multitude of sins."
- 7 Application.

ARTICLE XV. *Of Christ alone without Sin.*

CHRIST in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was

clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of him-

self once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

- 1 Two subjects here; the *purity of Christ*, and the *sinfulness of man*.
- 2 HISTORY. Christians before Pelagius.
- 3 Pelagians.
- 4 Romanists.
- 5 Mystics.
- 6 Antinomians.
- 7 EXPLANATION. The *title*.
- 8 Expressions taken from *Scripture*.
- 9 Peccability distinct, in *idea*, from actual sinning.

- 10 "All we the rest"—
- 11 "baptized and born again"
- 12 "*offend* in many things."
- 13 PROOF. Two propositions.
- 14 Christ was void of sin.
- 15 No *man* is void of sin.
- 16 *Objections*.—Christ says, "Why callest thou me good?"
- 17 Some persons are called, in Scripture, *blameless*.
- 18 The Pelagian dilemma.
- 19 Objection from 1 John iii. 9.
- 20 Texts seeming to favour the *Antinomian* opinion.
- 21 As all men are sinful, shall no man be *happy* after this life?
- 22 APPLICATION.—Forms of *assent*.
- 23 Mutual *concessions*.
- 24 *Improvements*.

ARTICLE XVI. *Of Sin after Baptism.*

NOT every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. 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: and therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

- 1 HISTORY, here twofold: 1. Of those who have denied the efficacy of *repentance*. 2. Of those who have held the doctrine of *perseverance*.
- 2 History of those who have denied the efficacy of *repentance*. Ancients.
- 3 Moderns; beginning from the Reformation.
- 4 Of those, in particular, who have dwelt much on the "sin against the *Holy Ghost*."
- 5 History of those who have held the doctrine of *perseverance*: early Christians. Augustin, and others.
- 6 Pelagians.
- 7 The æra of the Reformation.
- 8 Romanists. Calvinists. Arminians. Church of England, with the case of Baret; and some other matters.
- 9 Whether there have not been other notions of exemption from sin, besides those already mentioned.

- 10 Of those who have maintained, that a man may be *assured* of his own exemption from sin and punishment.
- 11 EXPLANATION. The *title* of the Article.
- 12 "Not every"—
- 13 "deadly sin"—
- 14 "willingly committed"—
- 15 Distinction between *mortal* and *venial* sins.
- 16 "after baptism"—
- 17 "is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable."
- 18 "Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism."
- 19 "After we have received the Holy Ghost,"—
- 20 "we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin;"
- 21 "and by the grace of God,"
- 22 "we may rise again,"—
- 23 "and amend our lives."
- 24 "And therefore they are to be condemned which say,"—
- 25 "they can no more sin as long as they live here,"
- 26 "or deny the place of forgiveness"—
- 27 "to such as truly repent."
- 28 PROOF. Four propositions.
- 29 No Christian is incapable of falling into heinous sins, or of losing the favour which he has with God as a Christian.
- 30 Some observations on the *texts* of Scripture, which relate to this proposition.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>31 No Christian is taught in Scripture, that he is to be <i>assured</i> of his own salvation.</p> <p>32 No Christian, when he has fallen into any heinous sin, is incapable of recovery, if he sincerely repent.</p> <p>33 Objections to this proposition, from 1 John iii. 9. James ii. 6. 1 John v. 16. Heb. vi. Heb. x. 26. Jer. xiii. 23. Rom. i. 23. &c.</p> | <p>34 Not every heinous sin comes under those texts of Scripture which seem to condemn some sin against the <i>Holy Ghost</i> as <i>unpardonable</i>.</p> <p>35 APPLICATION. Declaration of <i>Natural Religion</i>.</p> <p>36 Form of <i>assent</i> to our Article.</p> <p>37 Mutual concessions.</p> <p>38 Improvements.</p> |
|--|--|

ARTICLE XVII. *Of Predestination and Election.*

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 to 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: they through 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.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and 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 mind 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 dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises 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.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY. Heathens.
- 3 Jews.
- 4 Christians before the fifth century.
- 5 Pelagian controversy.
- 6 Semipelagians.
- 7 The ninth century.
- 8 The Schoolmen.
- 9 The age of the Reformation.
- 10 Events in different *countries*. Spain.
- 11 Holland and Flanders.
- 12 Germany.
- 13 France.
- 14 Poland.
- 15 Switzerland.
- 16 England.
- 17 Reign of Queen Mary.
- 18 — of Queen Elizabeth.
- 19 — of James I.
- 20 — of Charles I.
- 21 — of Charles II.
- 22 Later times.
- 23 The church of Scotland.
- 24 — of Ireland.
- 25 Separate history of those who have ascribed *evil* to the decrees of God.— Heathens.
- 26 Jews.
- 27 Early Christians.
- 28 Age of Augustin.
- 29 Different ideas of divine reprobation.
- 30 EXPLANATION. The *title* of the Article.
- 31 The *first paragraph* is a collection of *scriptural* expressions.
- 32 Particular expressions: "Predestination to life"—
- 33 "is the everlasting purpose of God,"—
- 34 "whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid)"—
- 35 "he hath constantly decreed"—
- 36 "by his counsel,"
- 37 "secret to us,"
- 38 "to deliver from curse"—

- 39 "and damnation,"
- 40 "those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind,"
- 41 "and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation,"
- 42 "as vessels made to honour."
- 43 "Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God"—
- 44 "be called according to God's purpose,"—
- 45 "by his Spirit working in due season:"
- 46 "they through grace obey the calling;"
- 47 "they be justified freely:"
- 48 "they be made sons of God by adoption:"
- 49 "they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ:"
- 50 "they walk religiously in good works,"
- 51 "and at length by God's mercy,"
- 52 "they attain to everlasting felicity."
- 53 Connection of the *first paragraph* with the *second*.
- 54 "As the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ"—
- 55 "is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to *godly persons*,"—
- 56 "and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ,"—
- 57 "mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members,"—
- 58 "and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things;"
- 59 "as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ,"—
- 60 "as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God;"
- 61 "So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ,"
- 62 "to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination,"
- 63 "is a most dangerous downfall,"
- 64 "whereby the Devil doth thrust them,"—
- 65 "either into desperation,"—
- 66 "or into wretchedness of most unclean living,"
- 67 "no less perilous than desperation."
- 68 *Third Paragraph*. Words omitted in 1552.
- 69 "Furthermore, we must receive God's *promises* in such wise, as they be *generally* set forth to us in Holy Scripture:"
- 70 "And in our *doings*,"
- 71 "that will of God is to be followed,"
- 72 "which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God."
- 73 Conclusion of the Explanation.
- 74 Proof. One proposition.
- 75 When any thing important happens, of a tendency to bring Christians to heavenly happiness, they may ascribe that to the *purpose* of God; not limiting the *duration* of his purpose: if only they do it with due *diffidence*, and in *circumstances* similar to those in which it is done in Scripture.
- 76 The texts by which this proposition is proved, may receive light from the remarks offered in the *Introduction* to the second Part of the Articles.
- 77 Of interpreting popular language by the *uses* for which it was contrived.
- 78 Of taking expressions in a *negative* sense.
- 79 Of a *cause* assigned, not excluding other causes.
- 80 Of observing similarity of *circumstances*.
- 81 Of distinguishing between *eloquence* and *science*.
- 82 Of taking for granted that Scripture reveals *new truths*.
- 83 Remarks on *particular* texts adduced in the foregoing proof.
- 84 Indirect proof, or answering *objections*.
- 85 Our reasonings may be thought too *intricate* for the generality of men.
- 86 The general *tenor* of the Scriptures is as if men were *free*.
- 87 The doctrine of predestination may seem hurtful to *virtue*.
- 88 — or to interfere with the duty of *prayer*.
- 89 — or likely to *disgust* reasonable men.
- 90 Of the Divine *prescience*.
- 91 Recollection of what was said Book III. chap. xv. sect. 9.
- 92 Separate argument concerning *reprobation*.
- 93 The difference between referring *good* and *evil* to God.
- 94 God is not said, in Scripture, to ordain, by any direct act, any set of men to misery.
- 95 Examination of some *particular texts*, in which that has been supposed to be said.
- 96 APPLICATION. Declaration of *Natural Religion*.

97 Form of *assent* to our Article.
98 Mutual *concessions*.

99 Improvements.
100 Conclusion.

ARTICLE XVIII. *Of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.*

THEY also are to be had accursed that presume to say, That every Man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY. Before the fifth century.
- 3 Fifth century.
- 4 Mohammedans.
- 5 Age of the Reformation.
- 6 Later times.
- 7 EXPLANATION. The place and title

- of this Article.
- 8 "They also are to be had accursed,"
 - 9 "that presume to say, that every man shall be saved"—
 - 10 "by the law or sect which he professeth,"
 - 11 "only the *name*," &c.
 - 12 "saved."
 - 13 PROOF. One proposition.
 - 14 The Scriptures do not allow any one to consider it as an indifferent matter, whether he acts as a member of the true Church of Christ, or not.
 - 15 Objections.
 - 16 APPLICATION. Form of *assent*.
 - 17 Mutual concessions.
 - 18 Improvements.

ARTICLE XIX. *Of the Church.*

THE visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

- 1 PREFACE; the remaining Articles to be treated more briefly than the preceding.
- 2 HISTORY.
- 3 EXPLANATION: two *paragraphs*.
- 4 "The visible Church of Christ"
- 5 "is a congregation"
- 6 "of faithful men,"

- 7 "in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered," &c.
- 8 *Second paragraph*. The Church of Rome allowed to have the essence of a true Church.
- 9 Other remarks: "visible Church," to what opposed.
- 10 The *catholic* Church.
- 11 A *particular* Church.
- 12 Church *militant*, and *triumphant*.
- 13 Connection of this Article with the foregoing.
- 14 PROOF. Two propositions.
- 15 Christ has formed his followers into one Society*.
- 16 "The Church of Rome hath erred," both in regard to things to be *done*, and things to be *believed*.
- 17 APPLICATION. Form of *assent*.
- 18 Concessions.
- 19 Improvements.

ARTICLE XX. *Of the Authority of the Church.*

THE Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be

repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same; so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

- 1 HISTORY.
- 2 Explanation.
- 3 Proof. Three propositions.
- 4 Every Society must provide *means* of answering the ends of its institution.
- 5 In matters of opinion, or *doctrine*, the judgment of the Church ought

- to have great *weight*.
- 6 But no doctrine needs be received by the private individual as *necessary* to salvation, if it be not founded in Scripture.
 - 7 Application, relating chiefly to mutual candour.

ARTICLE XXI. *Of the Authority of general Councils.*

GENERAL Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

- 1 HISTORY. Origin of Councils.
- 2 Account of some principal Councils.
- 3 The *number* of persons of which they have consisted.
- 4 Their duration.

- 5 Their authority.
- 6 Farther remarks: On their manner of conducting disputes.
- 7 On the inequality of the parties contending in them.
- 8 What may be remarked in their favour.
- 9 Writers on Councils.
- 10 EXPLANATION.—“General Councils,”
- 11 the “will of *princes*.”
- 12 “all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God.”
- 13 Other expressions.
- 14 PROOF: Two propositions.
- 15 General Councils cannot be called without the consent of princes.
- 16 General Councils have erred.
- 17 APPLICATION.

ARTICLE XXII. *Of Purgatory.*

THE Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY. Of Purgatory.
- 3 — Pardons, or Indulgences.
- 4 — Images.
- 5 — Relics.
- 6 — the Invocation of Saints.
- 7 EXPLANATION. The *Title* of the Article.
- 8 “The Romish Doctrine”—

- 9 “worshipping and adoration”—
- 10 “invocation”—
- 11 “a fond thing vainly invented,”
- 12 “rather repugnant”—
- 13 Distinctions used by the Romish Church.
- 14 PROOF.—The doctrines condemned in this Article are not founded on reason, or warranted by Scripture.
- 15 Collectively.
- 16 This proved of *Purgatory* in particular.
- 17 — of Pardons, or Indulgences.
- 18 — of Images.
- 19 — of Relics.
- 20 — of the Invocation of Saints.
- 21 APPLICATION.

ARTICLE XXIII. *Of ministering in the Congregation.*

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully

called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY. Before the twelfth century.
- 3 Waldenses.
- 4 The age of the Reformation.
- 5 Socinus.
- 6 Fanatic teachers, Presbyterians, Independents.
- 7 Uninterrupted succession.
- 8 Dr. Priestley's address to the Methodists.
- 9 Cases of *necessity*: relative to preaching.
- 10 ——— to the Sacraments.
- 11 ——— to Ordinations.
- 12 ——— to Marriages.
- 13 EXPLANATION. The *title* of the Article.
- 14 "public," &c.
- 15 "called"—"sent"—"chosen and called."
- 16 Of those who *propose themselves* for the Ministry.
- 17 "by men,"
- 18 "who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation"—
- 19 "the Lord's vineyard."
- 20 The cases of *necessity*.
- 21 PROOF. One proposition.
- 22 It is not right to minister in any religious society, without an appointment from that society.
- 23 Indirect proof: or answering *objections*.
- 24 The objection of Socinus, from Acts viii. 4, and xi. 9.
- 25 Many texts, used in our proof, may seem to relate only to the *extraordinary* appointment of the *first* Ministers of the Gospel.
- 26 Dr. Priestley's advice to the Methodists.
- 27 APPLICATION. Form of assent.
- 28 Mutual concessions.
- 29 Improvements.

ARTICLE XXIV. *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the People understandeth.*

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.

1 HISTORY.

- 2 Explanation.
- 3 Proof.—It is contrary to Scripture to have Liturgies in any language not generally intelligible where they are used.
- 4 A few objections.
- 5 Application.

ARTICLE XXV. *Of the Sacraments.*

SACRAMENTS ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian mens profession; but rather, they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's

Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY: of the *seven* Romish Sacraments *collectively*; where, of the *efficacy* of sacraments in general.
- 3 ——— of Confirmation.
- 4 ——— Penance; including Confession, &c. and *Absolution*.
- 5 ——— Orders.
- 6 ——— Matrimony.
- 7 ——— Extreme Unction.

8 EXPLANATION.

9 PROOF.—The five ordinances above-mentioned are not properly Sacraments.

10 Separate remarks on James v. 14, &c.

11 Objections.

12 APPLICATION.

ARTICLE XXVI. *Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament.*

ALTHOUGH 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; yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own Name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgement be deposed.

1 HISTORY. Before the Reformation. Donatists.

2 At, and since, the Reformation. Anabaptists, Romanists, Quakers.

3 *Intention* of Ministers distinguished from probity.

4 EXPLANATION.

5 PROOF. Sacraments are not to be neglected by the people, because they think ministers blameable.

6 APPLICATION.

ARTICLE XXVII. *Of Baptism.*

BAPTISM is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

9 The Socinians.

10 *Pouring* and *sprinkling*, as opposed to *immersion*.

11 History of *Infant-baptism*. Heathens. Jews.

12 Christians. Wall's History.

13 The *time* of the first baptizing of Infants disputed.

14 Some principal facts stated, and considered. Tertullian, Augustin, Gregory of Nazianzum.

15 Cases of *irregular baptism*: and remarks upon them.

16 Robinson's History of Baptism.

17 EXPLANATION; of several expressions;—Regeneration, &c.

18 "to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."—Dr. Priestley.

19 PROOF. Eight propositions.

20 Baptism has an *external* part, in which *water* is used.

21 Baptism is the instrument by which men are *grafted* into the Church of Christ.

22 It ratifies the divine promises of *forgiveness*.

23 It ratifies the divine promises of *adopting* Christians as sons.

24 By Baptism our *faith* is confirmed.

1 HISTORY twofold; of *Baptism*, without regard to the *age* of the person baptized; and, of Baptism of *Infants*.

2 History of *Baptism*, without regard to age. Heathens. Jews.

3 Christians. John the Baptist.

4 Continuation.

5 The Greek Church.

6 The Romish Church.

7 The Reformed Churches.

8 The Quakers.

- 25 By Baptism our *grace* is increased.
- 26 The validity of Baptism is not destroyed by its being administered by *affusion*.
- 27 Baptizing *Infants* is *preferable* to leaving them unbaptized, till they are of age to answer for themselves.
- 28 *Objections* to the Article:—that the Religion of Christ is *spiritual*.
- 29 That many texts of Scripture are urged against water-baptism, by the *Quakers*.
- 30 That Baptism, in Scripture, is not always said to have been administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.
- 31 If *Infants* are capable of *one* Sacrament, why not of *both* ?
- 32 Infants may be born of *water*, but how of the *Spirit* ?
- 33 APPLICATION.
- 34 Mutual *concessions*: with *Quakers*.
- 35 — with *Baptists*: great room for candour.
- 36 Conclusion.

ARTICLE XXVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

THE Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

- 1 HISTORY: built on expressions of *Scripture*.
- 2 The ancient *Missa*.
- 3 — contributions.
- 4 — ceremonies.
- 5 — disposal of the elements contributed.
- 6 The origin of the notion of *Transubstantiation*.
- 7 Conceptions of it various.
- 8 Opposition made to it.
- 9 How it "hath given occasion to many superstitions."
- 10 Age of the Reformation. Luther. Romanists. Reformed Churches.
- 11 Events in our own Country. Quakers,

- and their predecessors in doctrine.
- 12 English Dissenters, commonly so called.
- 13 Dispute, concerning the Lord's Supper being a bare *memorial*.
- 14 EXPLANATION. The *title*: four paragraphs.
- 15 "not only a *sign*," &c.
- 16 "but rather"—
- 17 "a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death:"
- 18 The sentence taken from 1 Cor. x. 16.
- 19 "Transubstantiation," &c. "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament."
- 20 Of the Protestant notion of eating the Lord's body.
- 21 "by Christ's ordinance,"
- 22 PROOF: *six* propositions.
- 23 The Lord's Supper has an *external* part, or *sign*.
- 24 It denotes, or represents, our redemption by the death of Christ; and so has an *internal* part, or "spiritual grace."
- 25 Transubstantiation "cannot be proved by holy Writ."
- 26 — is "*repugnant*" to Scripture.
- 27 The Body of Christ is, in the Lord's Supper, eaten spiritually by *faith*.
- 28 Christ has not ordained that the Sacrament called the Lord's Supper, should be reserved, carried about, elevated, or adored.
- 29 *Objections*. Of the *Quakers*.
- 30 Destroying "the *simplicity* that is in Christ."
- 31 Arguments in *favour* of *Transubstantiation*.
- 32 — in favour of the Romish practices of reserving, carrying about, elevating, and adoring the consecrated elements.
- 33 APPLICATION. Great room for mutual *concessions*.

ARTICLE XXIX. *Of the Wicked, which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.*

THE wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

1 HISTORY.

- 2 Explanation.
- 3 Proof; that Christians do not obtain the benefits annexed to what, in Scripture, is called eating the body of Christ, merely by partaking of the Lord's Supper.
- 4 Application. The greatest room here for mutual candour.
- 5 Conclusion. A passage from Dr. Balguy's seventh charge.

ARTICLE XXX. *Of both Kinds.*

THE Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

- 1 HISTORY. The *origin* of the custom of withholding the cup from the laity.
- 2 Before the 12th century.—Manicheans.
- 3 The *Greek Church*.
- 4 The *Church of Rome*.
- 5 The *Lutherans*.
- 6 The *Church of England*.
- 7 Explanation.
- 8 PROOF.—By the ordinance of Christ, both bread and wine are to be ad-

- ministered in the Lord's Supper.
- 9 *Objections*: or arguments of the Romanists in favour of administering the bread only.
- 10 Of the phrase, "*breaking of bread*."
- 11 It is urged that the Apostles were *priests*.
- 12 — that he who receives the *body* receives the *blood*.
- 13 — that the *officiating* Minister alone has sufficient reason for receiving the cup.
- 14 — that giving the cup to the people occasions its being *dishonoured*.
- 15 — that withholding the cup affects only the *mode*, and not the *essence* of the ordinance.
- 16 Application.

ARTICLE XXXI. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*

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; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

- 1 PREFACE, concerning the general meaning of the Article.
- 2 *History*, of the *Mass*: concerning its *origin*.

- 3 What is to be learnt from the council of Trent, &c.
- 4 Reformers. Wickliff, Melancthon, Luther, Henry VIII. Archbishop Cranmer, Queen Elizabeth.
- 5 Puritans.
- 6 *Explanation*. The *title*.
- 7 "The offering," &c.
- 8 Other expressions.
- 9 *Proof*. Two propositions.
- 10 Masses are "*blasphemous fables*;" that is, unsupported by Scripture, and dishonourable to Christianity.
- 11 — "*pernicious*," or "*dangerous deceits*."
- 12 *Objections*.
- 13 Application.

ARTICLE XXXII. *Of the Marriage of Priests.*

BISHOPS, Priests, and Deacons are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

- 1 PREFACE; containing general views of men and Christians, with respect to marriage.
- 2 HISTORY. First three centuries.
- 3 Council of Nice.
- 4 Jovinian and Vigilantius.
- 5 Pope Gregory VII.
- 6 Lanfranc and Anselm.
- 7 Bernard.
- 8 Riots in England, occasioned by the

- Marriage of Priests.
- 9 Pope Pius II.
 - 10 Greek Church.
 - 11 Church of Rome.
 - 12 The Reformation. Henry VIII. Edward VI. Mary. Elizabeth.
 - 13 Dupin.
 - 14 Explanation.
 - 15 Proof; that priests are allowed by Scripture to marry.
 - 16 *Objections*: some frivolous.
 - 17 — that 1 Cor. ix. 5 should not be translated, "a sister, a wife," but "a Christian woman."
 - 18 — that celibacy seems to be recommended, in Matt. xix. 11, 12:— and in 1 Cor. vii. ver. 32d, and other parts of the chapter.
 - 19 Application.

ARTICLE XXXIII. *Of Excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.*

THAT person, which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

- 1 PREFACE.
- 2 HISTORY. Heathens. Jews.
- 3 Christians: first six centuries.
- 4 Following centuries, to the fourteenth.
- 5 Continuation, to the seventeenth.
- 6 Erastians, Puritans, and moderate members of the Church of England.
- 7 Baptists commended.
- 8 Mischiefs arising from the excom-

- municating of conscientious Christians.
- 9 Explanation.
 - 10 *Proof*.—Suppose a person rightly suspended from the use of Christian ordinances, every Christian ought to be cautious of frustrating such discipline.
 - 11 Some particular texts considered. Matt. xviii. 15—17.
 - 12 Romans xvi. 17.
 - 13 The fifth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians.
 - 14 Some other passages.
 - 15 Texts relating to mitigation of censures, and restoration to the favour of the Church.
 - 16 An objection.
 - 17 Application to the present state of things.

ARTICLE XXXIV. *Of the Traditions of the Church.*

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever through his private judgement, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God,

and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's

authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

- 1 In considering this Article it will be best to take *history* and *explanation* together.
- 2 "Traditions and ceremonies"—
- 3 "It is not necessary," &c.
- 4 "For at all times they have been diverse,"—Heathens, Jews, Christians.
- 5 Particular Instances.
- 6 "and may be changed"—
- 7 "according to the diversities of *countries, times, and mens manners.*"
- 8 "So that nothing be ordained against God's word."
- 9 Private judgment, how restrained.
- 10 "which be not repugnant to the word of God,"—
- 11 "ordained and approved by common authority,"
- 12 "ought to be rebuked openly"—
- 13 Three grounds on which men ought to avoid the violation of *human* ordinances of Religion.

- 14 — As an offence "against the common order of the *Church.*"
- 15 — As hurting "the authority of the *magistrate.*"
- 16 — As wounding "the consciences of *weak brethren.*"
- 17 This reasoning levelled against the Puritans. Flacius Illyricus.
- 18 The Familists.
- 19 The last paragraph connected with the foregoing.
- 20 Some reasons assigned for changing the human ordinances of the Church of Rome.
- 21 Wherein the goodness of human religious ordinances consists.
- 22 **PROOF.** Three propositions.
- 23 Human religious ordinances need not be, in all places, precisely the same.
- 24 Each individual ought to conform to those settled by the Authority to which he is subject.
- 25 Each particular Church hath authority to settle its own ordinances.
- 26 Objection.
- 27 Application.

ARTICLE XXXV.

THE second book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former book of Homilies, which were set

Of the Homilies.

forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

- 1 Of the right Use of the Church.
- 2 Against peril of Idolatry.
- 3 Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
- 4 Of good works: first of Fasting.
- 5 Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
- 6 Against Excess of Apparel.
- 7 Of Prayer.
- 8 Of the place and time of Prayer.
- 9 That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known Tongue.
- 10 Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.
- 11 Of Alms-doing.

- 12 Of the Nativity of Christ.
- 13 Of the Passion of Christ.
- 14 Of the Resurrection of Christ.
- 15 Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.
- 16 Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.
- 17 For the Rogation-days.
- 18 Of the state of Matrimony.
- 19 Of Repentance.
- 20 Against Idleness.
- 21 Against Rebellion.

- 1 **HISTORY.**
- 2 **Explanation.**
- 3 **Proof.**

- 4 Objections to our Homilies: their value, now, and when first published.
- 5 Application.

ARTICLE XXXVI. *Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.*

THE book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration

and Ordering: neither hath it any thing that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter

shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

- 1 PREFACE; on the general scope, and natural principles, of this Article.
- 2 HISTORY. The appointment of different ranks of sacred Ministers. Scriptures.
- 3 Apostolic Fathers. Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Ignatius.
- 4 From these to the 16th century.
- 5 Age of the Reformation.
- 6 Socinians.
- 7 State of the University of Cambridge in 1570; and a few other matters.
- 8 Explanation.
- 9 *Proof*; that Ordinations in the Church of England, are valid.
- 10 Several *objections*.
- 11 — Archbishops and Archdeacons not mentioned in Scripture.

- 12 — The three *names*, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, may not imply more than two *ranks*.
- 13 — Scriptural *Bishops* had not worldly *dignity*.
- 14 — Scriptural *Presbyters* were on a footing with *Bishops*.
- 15 — Scriptural *Deacons* were appointed for purposes of economy.
- 16 — The Church of Christ ought to be independent of the great men of this world.
- 17 — The question proposed to Deacons, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office," &c. is liable to exception.
- 18 — The ordaining Minister assumes too much, when he says, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost for the Office," &c.
- 19 Application.

ARTICLE XXXVII. *Of the Civil Magistrates.*

THE King's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain; and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the King's Majesty the chief government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's word, or of the Sacraments; the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

- 1 HISTORY; consisting of *two parts*: the *first* relating to the *Pope's Supremacy*; the *second*, to civil government, capital punishments, and war:—which *last* part may also include the history of the two subsequent Articles, concerning *property*, and *oaths*.
- 2 History of the *Pope's supremacy*, particularly in England.
- 3 *Second part* of the history: events resulting from a desire of attaining to *perfection*.
- 4 Heathens.
- 5 Christians. Lactantius. Manicheans. Pelagians.
- 6 The Waldenses. Wickliffe. Vows of poverty. German Anabaptists. Socinians.
- 7 Reformed Churches.
- 8 Puritans.
- 9 A society of Christians in the Isle of Ely, in 1573.
- 10 Familists. Quakers. Moravians.
- 11 Explanation.
- 12 *PROOF*. Five propositions.
- 13 The King of our Realm, and not the Pope, is the head of our Church.
- 14 The King is not a *minister* of the Church.
- 15 Christians owe obedience to the civil magistrate.
- 16 Capital Punishments are not always unlawful in a Christian country.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>17 It is not always unlawful for a Christian to engage in war.</p> <p>18 Objection: with regard to <i>capital</i></p> | <p><i>punishments.</i></p> <p>19 ——— with regard to <i>war.</i></p> <p>20 Application.</p> |
|--|--|

ARTICLE XXXVIII. *Of Christian Mens Goods, which are not common.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>THE Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.</p> <p>1 HISTORY given under the preceding Article.</p> <p>2 Explanation.</p> | <p>3 Proof; that the institution of <i>property</i> is not contrary to the Gospel.</p> <p>4 Objections.</p> <p>5 From Matt. vi. 19.</p> <p>6 From Matt. xix. 16, &c.</p> <p>7 From the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.</p> <p>8 From Acts ii. 44, 45.</p> <p>9 From 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10, and similar passages.</p> <p>10 Application.</p> |
|---|---|

ARTICLE XXXIX. *Of a Christian Man's Oath.*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>As we confess, that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgement, and truth.</p> <p>1 THE History of this Article already</p> | <p>given.</p> <p>2 Explanation.</p> <p>3 Proof; that solemn oaths, taken in obedience to authority, and from benevolent motives, are not forbidden by the Gospel.</p> <p>4 Objection to the use of oaths, from St. Matthew's Gospel.</p> <p>5 ——— from the Epistle of St. James.</p> <p>6 Application.</p> |
|--|--|

UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE,
June, 1885.

CATALOGUE OF
WORKS
PUBLISHED FOR THE SYNDICS
OF THE
Cambridge University Press.



London: C. J. CLAY AND SON,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.

GLASGOW: 263, ARGYLE STREET.

Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL, AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

PUBLICATIONS OF
The Cambridge University Press.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, &c.

THE CAMBRIDGE PARAGRAPH BIBLE of the Authorized English Version, with the Text Revised by a Collation of its Early and other Principal Editions, the Use of the Italic Type made uniform, the Marginal References remodelled, and a Critical Introduction prefixed, by F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., LL.D., Editor of the Greek Testament, Codex Augiensis, &c., and one of the Revisers of the Authorized Version. Crown 4to. gilt. 21s.

From the *Times*.

"Students of the Bible should be particularly grateful to (the Cambridge University Press) for having produced, with the able assistance of Dr Scrivener, a complete critical edition of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, an edition such as, to use the words of the Editor, 'would have been executed long ago had this version been nothing more than the greatest and best known of English classics.' Falling at a time when the formal revision of this version has been undertaken by a distinguished company of scholars and divines, the publication of this edition must be considered most opportune."

From the *Athenæum*.

"Apart from its religious importance, the English Bible has the glory, which but few sister versions indeed can claim, of being the chief classic of the language, of having, in conjunction with Shakspeare, and in an immeasurable degree more than he, fixed the language beyond any possibility of important change. Thus the recent contributions to the literature of the subject, by such workers as Mr Francis Fry and Canon Westcott, appeal to a wide range of sympathies; and to these may now be added Dr Scrivener, well known for his labours in the cause of the Greek Testament criticism, who has brought out, for the

Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, an edition of the English Bible, according to the text of 1611, revised by a comparison with later issues on principles stated by him in his Introduction. Here he enters at length into the history of the chief editions of the version, and of such features as the marginal notes, the use of italic type, and the changes of orthography, as well as into the most interesting question as to the original texts from which our translation is produced."

From the *Methodist Recorder*.

"This noble quarto of over 1300 pages is in every respect worthy of editor and publisher alike. The name of the Cambridge University Press is guarantee enough for its perfection in outward form, the name of the editor is equal guarantee for the worth and accuracy of its contents. Without question, it is the best Paragraph Bible ever published, and its reduced price of a guinea brings it within reach of a large number of students."

From the *London Quarterly Review*.

"The work is worthy in every respect of the editor's fame, and of the Cambridge University Press. The noble English Version, to which our country and religion owe so much, was probably never presented before in so perfect a form."

THE CAMBRIDGE PARAGRAPH BIBLE. STUDENT'S EDITION, on *good writing paper*, with one column of print and wide margin to each page for MS. notes. This edition will be found of great use to those who are engaged in the task of Biblical criticism. Two Vols. Crown 4to. gilt. 31s. 6d.

THE AUTHORIZED EDITION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE (1611), ITS SUBSEQUENT REPRINTS AND MODERN REPRESENTATIVES. Being the Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph Bible (1873), re-edited with corrections and additions. By F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter and Vicar of Hendon. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE LECTIONARY BIBLE, WITH APOCRYPHA, divided into Sections adapted to the Calendar and Tables of Lessons of 1871. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse
Ave Maria Lane.

BREVIARIUM AD USUM INSIGNIS ECCLESIAE

SARUM. Juxta Editionem maximam pro CLAUDIO CHEVALLON ET FRANCISCO REGNAULT A.D. MDXXXI. in Alma Parisiorum Academia impressam: labore ac studio FRANCISCI PROCTER A.M., ET CHRISTOPHORI WORDSWORTH, A.M.

FASCICULUS I. In quo continentur KALENDARIVM, et ORDO TEMPORALIS sive PROPRIUM DE TEMPORE TOTIUS ANNI, una cum ordinali suo quod usitato vocabulo dicitur PICA SIVE DIRECTORIUM SACERDOTUM. Demy 8vo. 18s.

"The value of this reprint is considerable to liturgical students, who will now be able to consult in their own libraries a work absolutely indispensable to a right understanding of the history of the Prayer-Book, but which till now usually necessitated a visit to some public library, since the rarity of the volume made its

cost prohibitory to all but a few. . . Messrs Procter and Wordsworth have discharged their editorial task with much care and judgment, though the conditions under which they have been working are such as to hide that fact from all but experts."—*Literary Churchman*.

FASCICULUS II. In quo continentur PSALTERIVM, cum ordinario Officii totius hebdomadae juxta Horas Canonicas, et proprio Completorii, LITANIA, COMMUNE SANCTORUM, ORDINARIUM MISSAE CUM CANONE ET XIII MISSIS, &c. &c. Demy 8vo. 12s.

"Not only experts in liturgy, but all persons interested in the history of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, will be grateful to the Syndicate of the Cambridge University Press for forwarding the publication of the volume which bears the above title, and which has recently appeared under their auspices."—*Notes and Queries*.

"Cambridge has worthily taken the lead with the Breviary, which is of especial value for that part of the reform of the Prayer-Book which will fit it for the wants of our time . . .

For all persons of religious tastes the Breviary, with its mixture of Psalm and Anthem and Prayer and Hymn, all hanging one on the other, and connected into a harmonious whole, must be deeply interesting."—*Church Quarterly Review*.

"The editors have done their work excellently, and deserve all praise for their labours in rendering what they justly call 'this most interesting Service-book' more readily accessible to historical and liturgical students."—*Saturday Review*.

FASCICULUS III. In quo continetur PROPRIUM SANCTORUM quod et sanctorale dicitur, una cum accentuario. [*Nearly ready*].

GREEK AND ENGLISH TESTAMENT, in parallel Columns on the same page. Edited by J. SCHOLEFIELD, M.A. late Regius Professor of Greek in the University. Small Octavo. New Edition, with the Marginal References as arranged and revised by Dr SCRIVENER. Cloth, red edges. 7s. 6d.

GREEK AND ENGLISH TESTAMENT. THE STUDENT'S EDITION of the above, on *large writing paper*. 4to. 12s.

GREEK TESTAMENT, ex editione Stephani tertia, 1550. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK according to the text followed in the Authorised Version, with the Variations adopted in the Revised Version. Edited by F. H. A. SCRIVENER M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. Crown 8vo. 6s. Morocco boards or limp. 12s.

THE PARALLEL NEW TESTAMENT GREEK AND ENGLISH, being the Authorised Version set forth in 1611 Arranged in Parallel Columns with the Revised Version of 1881, and with the original Greek, as edited by F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. Prebendary of Exeter and Vicar of Hendon. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d. *The Revised Version is the Joint Property of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford.*

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES, with Notes and Introduction. By the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells. Large Paper Edition. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"No one can say that the Old Testament is a dull or worn-out subject after reading this singularly attractive and also instructive commentary. Its wealth of literary and historical illustration surpasses anything to which we can

point in English exegesis of the Old Testament; indeed, even Delitzsch, whose pride it is to leave no source of illustration unexplored, is far inferior on this head to Dr Plumptre."—*Academy*, Sept. 10, 1881.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MATTHEW in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions, synoptically arranged: with Collations of the best Manuscripts. By J. M. KEMBLE, M.A. and Archdeacon HARDWICK. Demy 4to. 10s.

NEW EDITION. By the Rev. Professor SKEAT. [*In the Press.*]

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions, synoptically arranged: with Collations exhibiting all the Readings of all the MSS. Edited by the Rev. Professor SKEAT, M.A. late Fellow of Christ's College, and author of a MÆSO-GOTHIC Dictionary. Demy 4to. 10s.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE, uniform with the preceding, by the same Editor. Demy 4to. 10s.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN, uniform with the preceding, by the same Editor. Demy 4to. 10s.

"The Gospel according to St John, in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions: Edited for the Syndics of the University Press, by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A., Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge, completes an undertaking designed and com-

menced by that distinguished scholar, J. M. Kemble, some forty years ago. Of the particular volume now before us, we can only say it is worthy of its two predecessors. We repeat that the service rendered to the study of Anglo-Saxon by this Synoptic collection cannot easily be overstated."—*Contemporary Review*.

THE POINTED PRAYER BOOK, being the Book of Common Prayer with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches. Royal 24mo. 1s. 6d.
The same in square 32mo. cloth. 6d.

"The 'Pointed Prayer Book' deserves mention for the new and ingenious system on which the pointing has been marked, and still more

for the terseness and clearness of the directions given for using it."—*Times*.

THE CAMBRIDGE PSALTER, for the use of Choirs and Organists. Specially adapted for Congregations in which the "Cambridge Pointed Prayer Book" is used. Demy 8vo. cloth extra, 3s. 6d. cloth limp, cut flush. 2s. 6d.

THE PARAGRAPH PSALTER, arranged for the use of Choirs by BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Fcap. 4to. 5s.

The same in royal 32mo. Cloth 1s. Leather 1s. 6d.

"The Paragraph Psalter exhibits all the care, thought, and learning that those acquainted with the works of the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge would expect to find,

and there is not a clergyman or organist in England who should be without this Psalter as a work of reference."—*Morning Post*.

THE MISSING FRAGMENT OF THE LATIN TRANSLATION OF THE FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA, discovered, and edited with an Introduction and Notes, and a facsimile of the MS., by ROBERT L. BENSLEY, M.A., Reader in Hebrew, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Demy 4to. 10s.

"Edited with true scholarly completeness."—*Westminster Review*.

"It has been said of this book that it has added a new chapter to the Bible, and, startling as the statement may at first sight appear, it is

no exaggeration of the actual fact, if by the Bible we understand that of the larger size which contains the Apocrypha, and if the Second Book of Esdras can be fairly called a part of the Apocrypha."—*Saturday Review*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

THEOLOGY—(ANCIENT).

THE GREEK LITURGIES. Chiefly from original Authorities. By C. A. SWAINSON, D.D., Master of Christ's College, Cambridge. Crown 4to. Paper covers. 15s.

THE PALESTINIAN MISHNA. By W. H. LOWE, M.A., Lecturer in Hebrew at Christ's College, Cambridge. Royal 8vo. 21s.

SAYINGS OF THE JEWISH FATHERS, comprising Pirque Aboth and Perek R. Meir in Hebrew and English, with Critical and Illustrative Notes. By CHARLES TAYLOR, D.D. Master of St John's College, Cambridge, and Honorary Fellow of King's College, London. Demy 8vo. 10s.

"The 'Masseketh Aboth' stands at the head of Hebrew non-canonical writings. It is of ancient date, claiming to contain the dicta of teachers who flourished from B.C. 200 to the same year of our era. The precise time of its compilation in its present form is, of course, in doubt. Mr Taylor's explanatory and illustrative commentary is very full and satisfactory."—*Spectator*.

"If we mistake not, this is the first precise translation into the English language, accompanied by scholarly notes, of any portion of the Talmud. In other words, it is the first instance of that most valuable and neglected portion of

Jewish literature being treated in the same way as a Greek classic in an ordinary critical edition. . . The *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* may claim to be scholarly, and, moreover, of a scholarship unusually thorough and finished."—*Dublin University Magazine*.

"A careful and thorough edition which does credit to English scholarship, of a short treatise from the Mishna, containing a series of sentences or maxims ascribed mostly to Jewish teachers immediately preceding, or immediately following the Christian era. . ."—*Contemporary Review*.

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA'S COMMENTARY ON THE MINOR EPISTLES OF S. PAUL. The Latin Version with the Greek Fragments, edited from the MSS. with Notes and an Introduction, by H. B. SWETE, D.D., Rector of Ashdon, Essex, and late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. In Two Volumes. Vol. I., containing the Introduction, with Facsimiles of the MSS., and the Commentary upon Galatians—Colossians. Demy 8vo. 12s.

"In dem oben verzeichneten Buche liegt uns die erste Hälfte einer vollständigen, ebenso sorgfältig gearbeiteten wie schön ausgestatteten Ausgabe des Commentars mit ausführlichen Prolegomena und reichhaltigen kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen vor."—*Literarisches Centralblatt*.

"It is the result of thorough, careful, and patient investigation of all the points bearing on the subject, and the results are presented with admirable good sense and modesty."—*Guardian*.

"Auf Grund dieser Quellen ist der Text bei Swete mit musterhafter Akribie hergestellt. Aber auch sonst hat der Herausgeber mit uner müdlichem Fleisse und eingehendster Sachkenntniß sein Werk mit allen denjenigen Zugaben ausgerüstet, welche bei einer solchen Text-Ausgabe nur irgend erwartet werden können. . . Von den drei Haupt-

handschriften . . . sind vortreffliche photographische Facsimile's beigegeben, wie überhaupt das ganze Werk von der *University Press* zu Cambridge mit bekannter Eleganz ausgestattet ist."—*Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

"It is a hopeful sign, amid forebodings which arise about the theological learning of the Universities, that we have before us the first instalment of a thoroughly scientific and painstaking work, commenced at Cambridge and completed at a country rectory."—*Church Quarterly Review* (Jan. 1881).

"Herrn Swete's Leistung ist eine so tüchtige dass wir das Werk in keinen besseren Händen wissen möchten, und mit den sichersten Erwartungen auf das Gelingen der Fortsetzung entgegen sehen."—*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (Sept. 1881).

VOLUME II., containing the Commentary on 1 Thessalonians—Philemon, Appendices and Indices. 12s.

"Eine Ausgabe . . . für welche alle zugänglichen Hilfsmittel in musterhafter Weise benutzt wurden . . . eine reife Frucht siebenjährigen Fleisses."—*Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Sept. 23, 1882).

"Mit deiselben Sorgfalt bearbeitet die wir bei dem ersten Theile gerühmt haben."—*Literarisches Centralblatt* (July 29, 1882).

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

SANCTI IRENÆI EPISCOPI LUGDUNENSIS libros quinque adversus Hæreses, versione Latina cum Codicibus Claromontano ac Arundeliano denuo collata, præmissa de placitis Gnosticorum prolusione, fragmenta necnon Græce, Syriace, Armeniæ, commentatione perpetua et indicibus variis edidit W. WIGAN HARVEY, S.T.B. Collegii Regalis olim Socius. 2 Vols. Demy 8vo. 18s.

M. MINUCII FELICIS OCTAVIUS. The text newly revised from the original MS., with an English Commentary, Analysis, Introduction, and Copious Indices. Edited by H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D. late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THEOPHILI EPISCOPI ANTIOCHENSIS LIBRI TRES AD AUTOLYCYM edidit, Prolegomenis Versione Notulis Indicibus instruxit GULIELMUS GILSON HUMPHRY, S.T.B. Collegii Sanctiss. Trin. apud Cantabrigienses quondam Socius. Post 8vo. 5s.

THEOPHYLACTI IN EVANGELIUM S. MATTHÆI COMMENTARIUS, edited by W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D. Prebendary of St Paul's, late Fellow of Trinity College. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

TERTULLIANUS DE CORONA MILITIS, DE SPECTACULIS, DE IDOLOLATRIA, with Analysis and English Notes, by GEORGE CURREY, D.D. Preacher at the Charter House, late Fellow and Tutor of St John's College. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THEOLOGY—(ENGLISH).

WORKS OF ISAAC BARROW, compared with the Original MSS., enlarged with Materials hitherto unpublished. A new Edition, by A. NAPIER, M.A. of Trinity College, Vicar of Holkham, Norfolk. 9 Vols. Demy 8vo. £3. 3s.

TREATISE OF THE POPE'S SUPREMACY, and a Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church, by ISAAC BARROW. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PEARSON'S EXPOSITION OF THE CREED, edited by TEMPLE CHEVALLIER, B.D. late Fellow and Tutor of St Catharine's College, Cambridge. New Edition. Revised by R. Sinker, B.D., Librarian of Trinity College. Demy 8vo. 12s.

"A new edition of Bishop Pearson's famous work *On the Creed* has just been issued by the Cambridge University Press. It is the well-known edition of Temple Chevallier, thoroughly overhauled by the Rev. R. Sinker, of Trinity College. The whole text and notes have been most carefully examined and corrected, and special pains have been taken to verify the almost innumerable references. These have been more clearly and accurately given in very many

places, and the citations themselves have been adapted to the best and newest texts of the several authors—texts which have undergone vast improvements within the last two centuries. The Indices have also been revised and enlarged.....Altogether this appears to be the most complete and convenient edition as yet published of a work which has long been recognised in all quarters as a standard one."—*Guardian*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EXPOSITION OF THE CREED written by the Right Rev. JOHN PEARSON, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Chester, by W. H. MILL, D.D. late Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 5s.

WHEATLY ON THE COMMON PRAYER, edited by G. E. CORRIE, D.D. Master of Jesus College, Examining Chaplain to the late Lord Bishop of Ely. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CÆSAR MORGAN'S INVESTIGATION OF THE TRINITY OF PLATO, and of Philo Judæus, and of the effects which an attachment to their writings had upon the principles and reasonings of the Fathers of the Christian Church. Revised by H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 4s.

TWO FORMS OF PRAYER OF THE TIME OF QUEEN ELIZABETH. Now First Reprinted. Demy 8vo. 6d.

"From 'Collections and Notes' 1867-1876, by W. Carew Hazlitt (p. 340), we learn that—'A very remarkable volume, in the original vellum cover, and containing 25 Forms of Prayer of the reign of Elizabeth, each with the autograph of Humphrey Dyson, has lately fallen into the hands of my friend Mr H. Pyne. It is mentioned specially in the Preface to the Par-

ker Society's volume of Occasional Forms of Prayer, but it had been lost sight of for 200 years.' By the kindness of the present possessor of this valuable volume, containing in all 25 distinct publications, I am enabled to reprint in the following pages the two Forms of Prayer supposed to have been lost."—*Extract from the PREFACE.*

SELECT DISCOURSES, by JOHN SMITH, late Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge. Edited by H. G. WILLIAMS, B.D. late Professor of Arabic. Royal 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"The 'Select Discourses' of John Smith, collected and published from his papers after his death, are, in my opinion, much the most considerable work left to us by this Cambridge School [the Cambridge Platonists]. They have a right to a place in English literary history."—MR MATTHEW ARNOLD, in the *Contemporary Review*.

"Of all the products of the Cambridge School, the 'Select Discourses' are perhaps the highest, as they are the most accessible and the most widely appreciated...and indeed no spiritually thoughtful mind can read them unmoved. They carry us so directly into an atmosphere of divine philosophy, luminous

with the richest lights of meditative genius... He was one of those rare thinkers in whom largeness of view, and depth, and wealth of poetic and speculative insight, only served to evoke more fully the religious spirit, and while he drew the mould of his thought from Plotinus, he vivified the substance of it from St Paul."—Principal TULLOCH, *National Theology in England in the 17th Century*.

"We may instance Mr Henry Griffin Williams's revised edition of Mr John Smith's 'Select Discourses,' which have won Mr Matthew Arnold's admiration, as an example of worthy work for an University Press to undertake."—*Times*.

THE HOMILIES, with Various Readings, and the Quotations from the Fathers given at length in the Original Languages. Edited by G. E. CORRIE, D.D., Master of Jesus College. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

DE OBLIGATIONE CONSCIENTIÆ PRÆLECTIONES decem Oxonii in Schola Theologica habitæ a ROBERTO SANDERSON, SS. Theologiæ ibidem Professore Regio. With English Notes, including an abridged Translation, by W. WHEWELL, D.D. late Master of Trinity College. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ARCHBISHOP USHER'S ANSWER TO A JESUIT, with other Tracts on Popery. Edited by J. SCHOLEFIELD, M.A. late Regius Professor of Greek in the University. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

WILSON'S ILLUSTRATION OF THE METHOD OF explaining the New Testament, by the early opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ. Edited by T. TURTON, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Ely. Demy 8vo. 5s.

LECTURES ON DIVINITY delivered in the University of Cambridge, by JOHN HEY, D.D. Third Edition, revised by T. TURTON, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Ely. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 15s.

ARABIC, SANSKRIT AND SYRIAC.

POEMS OF BEHÁ ED DÍN ZOHEIR OF EGYPT. With a Metrical Translation, Notes and Introduction, by E. H. PALMER, M.A., Barrister-at-Law of the Middle Temple, late Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, formerly Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. 2 vols. Crown 4to.

Vol. I. THE ARABIC TEXT. 10s. 6d.; cloth extra. 15s.

Vol. II. ENGLISH TRANSLATION. 10s. 6d.; cloth extra. 15s.

"We have no hesitation in saying that in both Prof. Palmer has made an addition to Oriental literature for which scholars should be grateful; and that, while his knowledge of Arabic is a sufficient guarantee for his mastery of the original, his English compositions are distinguished by versatility, command of language, rhythmical cadence, and, as we have

remarked, by not unskilful imitations of the styles of several of our own favourite poets, living and dead."—*Saturday Review*.

"This sumptuous edition of the poems of Behá-ed-din Zoheir is a very welcome addition to the small series of Eastern poets accessible to readers who are not Orientalists."—*Academy*.

THE CHRONICLE OF JOSHUA THE STYLITE, composed in Syriac A.D. 507 with an English translation and notes, by W. WRIGHT, LL.D., Professor of Arabic. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

"Die lehrreiche kleine Chronik Josuas hat nach Assemani und Martin in Wright einen dritten Bearbeiter gefunden, der sich um die Emendation des Textes wie um die Erklärung der Realien wesentlich verdient gemacht hat . . . Ws. Josua-Ausgabe ist eine sehr dankenswerte Gabe und besonders empfehlenswert als

ein Lehrmittel für den syrischen Unterricht; es erscheint auch gerade zur rechten Zeit, da die zweite Ausgabe von Roedigers syrischer Chrestomathie im Buchhandel vollständig vergriffen und diejenige von Kirsch-Bernstein nur noch in wenigen Exemplaren vorhanden ist."—*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*.

KALILAH AND DIMNAH, OR, THE FABLES OF BIDPAI; being an account of their literary history, together with an English Translation of the same, with Notes, by I. G. N. KEITH-FALCONER, M.A., Trinity College, formerly Tyrwhitt's Hebrew Scholar. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

NALOPÁKHYĀNAM, OR, THE TALE OF NALA; containing the Sanskrit Text in Roman Characters, followed by a Vocabulary in which each word is placed under its root, with references to derived words in Cognate Languages, and a sketch of Sanskrit Grammar. By the late Rev. THOMAS JARRETT, M.A. Trinity College, Regius Professor of Hebrew. Demy 8vo. 10s.

NOTES ON THE TALE OF NALA, for the use of Classical Students, by J. PEILE, M.A., Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor of Christ's College. Demy 8vo. 12s.

CATALOGUE OF THE BUDDHIST SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS in the University Library, Cambridge. Edited by C. BENDALL, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College. Demy 8vo. 12s.

"It is unnecessary to state how the compilation of the present catalogue came to be placed in Mr Bendall's hands; from the character of his work it is evident the selection was judicious, and we may fairly congratulate

those concerned in it on the result. . . Mr Bendall has entitled himself to the thanks of all Oriental scholars, and we hope he may have before him a long course of successful labour in the field he has chosen."—*Athenæum*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS, &c. (See also pp. 24—27.)

SOPHOCLES: The Plays and Fragments, with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose, by R. C. JEBB, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow.

Part I. *Oedipus Tyrannus.* Demy 8vo. 15s.

"Of his explanatory and critical notes we can only speak with admiration. Thorough scholarship combines with taste, erudition, and boundless industry to make this first volume a pattern of editing. The work is made complete by a prose translation, upon pages alternating with the text, of which we may say shortly that it displays sound judgment and taste, without sacrificing precision to poetry of expression."—*The Times*.

"This larger edition he has deferred these many years for reasons which he has given in his preface, and which we accept with entire satisfaction, as we have now the first portion of a work composed in the fullness of his powers and with all the resources of fine erudition and laboriously earned experience...We will confidently aver, then, that the edition is neither tedious nor long: for we get in one compact volume such a cyclopædia of instruction, such a variety of helps to the full comprehension of the poet, as not so many years ago would have needed a small library, and all this instruction and assistance given, not in a dull and pedantic way, but in a style of singular clearness and

vivacity. In fact, one might take this edition with him on a journey, and, without any other help whatever, acquire with comfort and delight a thorough acquaintance with the noblest production of, perhaps, the most difficult, yet possessed at the same time of an immortal charm for one who has mastered him, as Mr Jebb has, and can feel so subtly perfection of form and language...We await with lively expectation the continuation, and completion of Mr Jebb's great task, and it is a fortunate thing that his power of work seems to be as great as the style is happy in which the work is done."—*The Athenæum*.

"An edition which marks a definite advance, which is whole in itself, and brings a mass of solid and well-wrought material such as future constructors will desire to adapt, is definitive in the only applicable sense of the term, and such is the edition of Professor Jebb. No man is better fitted to express in relation to Sophocles the mind of the present generation."—*The Saturday Review*.

AESCHYLI FABULAE.—IKETIΔEΣ XOHΦOPOI IN LIBRO MEDICEO MENDOSE SCRIPTAE EX VV. DD. CONIECTURIS EMENDATIUS EDITAE cum Scholiis Graecis et brevi adnotatione critica, curante F. A. PALEY, M.A., LL.D.
Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS. With a Translation in English Rhythm, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. **New Edition Revised.** By BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D., Regius Professor of Greek. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"One of the best editions of the masterpiece of Greek tragedy."—*Athenæum*.

"It is needless to multiply proofs of the

value of this volume alike to the poetical translator, the critical scholar, and the ethical student."—*Saturday Review*.

THE THEÆTETUS OF PLATO with a Translation and Notes by the same Editor. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ARISTOTLE.—ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ. ARISTOTLE'S PSYCHOLOGY, in Greek and English, with Introduction and Notes, by EDWIN WALLACE, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. 18s.

"In an elaborate introduction Mr Wallace collects and correlates all the passages from the various works of Aristotle bearing on these points, and this he does with a width of learning that marks him out as one of our foremost Aristotelic scholars, and with a critical acumen that is far from common."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"The notes are exactly what such notes ought to be,—helps to the student, not mere displays of learning. By far the more valuable parts of the notes are neither critical nor literary, but philosophical and expository of the thought, and of the connection of thought, in the treatise itself. In this relation the notes are invaluable. Of the translation, it may be said that an English reader may fairly master by means of it this great treatise of Aristotle."—*Spectator*.

"M. Wallace a mis à profit tous les travaux

de ses devanciers, et il nous semble avoir réussi le premier dans l'interprétation de certains passages qui avaient jusque-là résisté aux efforts de tous les commentateurs."—*Revue Philologique*.

"Wallace's Bearbeitung der Aristotelischen Psychologie ist das Werk eines denkenden und in allen Schriften des Aristoteles und grösstenteils auch in der neueren Literatur zu denselben belebten Mannes... Der schwächste Teil der Arbeit ist der kritische... Aber in allen diesen Dingen liegt auch nach der Absicht des Verfassers nicht der Schwerpunkt seiner Arbeit, sondern... Und so sei schliesslich noch einmal das Ganze von Wallace's Arbeit im ganzen genommen als ein wertvolles Hilfsmittel für das Studium der bearbeiteten Schrift auf das wärmste empfohlen."—Prof. Susemihl in *Philologische Wochenschrift*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse,
Ave Maria Lane.

ARISTOTLE.—ΠΕΡΙ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΤΗΝΗΣ. THE FIFTH BOOK OF THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE.
 Edited by HENRY JACKSON, M.A., Litt. D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 6s.

"It is not too much to say that some of the points he discusses have never had so much light thrown upon them before. . . . Scholars

will hope that this is not the only portion of the Aristotelian writings which he is likely to edit."—*Athenæum*.

ARISTOTLE. THE RHETORIC. With a Commentary by the late E. M. COPE, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, revised and edited by J. E. SANDYS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St John's College, Cambridge, and Public Orator. With a biographical Memoir by the late H. A. J. MUNRO, Litt. D. 3 Vols., Demy 8vo. Now reduced to 21s. (*originally published at 31s. 6d.*)

"This work is in many ways creditable to the University of Cambridge. If an English student wishes to have a full conception of what is contained in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, to Mr Cope's edition he must go."—*Academy*.

"Mr Sandys has performed his arduous duties with marked ability and admirable tact. . . . In every part of his work—revising, supplementing, and completing—he has done exceedingly well."—*Examiner*.

A SELECTION OF GREEK INSCRIPTIONS, with Introductions and Annotations by E. S. ROBERTS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Gonville and Caius College. [*In the Press.*]

PINDAR. OLYMPIAN AND PYTHIAN ODES. With Notes Explanatory and Critical, Introductions and Introductory Essays. Edited by C. A. M. FENNELL, Litt. D., late Fellow of Jesus College. Crown 8vo. 9s.

"Mr Fennell deserves the thanks of all classical students for his careful and scholarly edition of the Olympian and Pythian odes. He brings to his task the necessary enthusiasm for his author, great industry, a sound judgment, and, in particular, copious and minute learning

in comparative philology."—*Athenæum*.
 "Considered simply as a contribution to the study and criticism of Pindar, Mr Fennell's edition is a work of great merit."—*Saturday Review*.

THE ISTHMIAN AND NEMEAN ODES. By the same Editor. Crown 8vo. 9s.

" . . . As a handy and instructive edition of a difficult classic no work of recent years surpasses Mr Fennell's 'Pindar.'"—*Athenæum*.

"This work is in no way inferior to the previous volume. The commentary affords

valuable help to the study of the most difficult of Greek authors, and is enriched with notes on points of scholarship and etymology which could only have been written by a scholar of very high attainments."—*Saturday Review*.

PRIVATE ORATIONS OF DEMOSTHENES, with Introductions and English Notes, by F. A. PALEY, M.A. Editor of Aeschylus, etc. and J. E. SANDYS, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of St John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge.

PART I. Contra Phormionem, Lacritum, Pantaenetum, Boeotum de Nomine, Boeotum de Dote, Dionysodorum. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"Mr Paley's scholarship is sound and accurate, his experience of editing wide, and if he is content to devote his learning and abilities to the production of such manuals as these, they will be received with gratitude throughout the higher schools of the country. Mr Sandys is deeply read in the German

literature which bears upon his author, and the elucidation of matters of daily life, in the delineation of which Demosthenes is so rich, obtains full justice at his hands. . . . We hope this edition may lead the way to a more general study of these speeches in schools than has hitherto been possible."—*Academy*.

PART II. Pro Phormione, Contra Stephanum I. II.; Nicostratum, Cononem, Calliclem. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"It is long since we have come upon a work evincing more pains, scholarship, and varied research and illustration than Mr Sandys's contribution to the 'Private Orations of De-

mosthenes.'"—*Saturday Review*.
 ". the edition reflects credit on Cambridge scholarship, and ought to be extensively used."—*Athenæum*.

DEMOSTHENES AGAINST ANDROTION AND AGAINST TIMOCRATES, with Introductions and English Commentary, by WILLIAM WAYTE, M.A., late Professor of Greek, University College, London. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PLATO'S PHÆDO, literally translated, by the late E. M. COPE, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, revised by HENRY JACKSON, Litt. D., Fellow of Trinity College. Demy 8vo. 5s.

THE TYPES OF GREEK COINS. By PERCY GARDNER, M.A., F.S.A., Disney Professor of Archæology. With 16 Autotype plates, containing photographs of Coins of all parts of the Greek World. Impl. 4to. Cloth extra, £1. 11s. 6d.; Roxburgh (Morocco back), £2. 2s.

"Professor Gardner's book is written with such lucidity and in a manner so straightforward that it may well win converts, and it may be distinctly recommended to that omnivorous class of readers—'men in the schools.' The history of ancient coins is so interwoven with and so vividly illustrates the history of ancient States, that students of Thucydides and Herodotus cannot afford to neglect Professor Gardner's introduction to Hellenic numismatics."—*Saturday Review*.

'The Types of Greek Coins' is a work which

is less purely and dryly scientific. Nevertheless, it takes high rank as proceeding upon a truly scientific basis at the same time that it treats the subject of numismatics in an attractive style and is elegant enough to justify its appearance in the drawing-room . . . Sixteen autotype plates reproduce with marvellous reality more than six hundred types of picked specimens of coins in every style, from the cabinets of the British Museum and other collections.—*Athenæum*.

THE BACCHAE OF EURIPIDES. With Introduction, Critical Notes, and Archæological Illustrations, by J. E. SANDYS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St John's College, Cambridge, and Public Orator. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

"Of the present edition of the *Bacchæ* by Mr Sandys we may safely say that never before has a Greek play, in England at least, had fuller justice done to its criticism, interpretation, and archæological illustration, whether for the young student or the more advanced scholar. The Cambridge Public Orator may be said to have taken the lead in issuing a complete edition of a Greek play, which is destined perhaps to gain redoubled favour now that the study of ancient monuments has been applied to its illustration."—*Saturday Review*.

"The volume is interspersed with well-executed woodcuts, and its general attractiveness of form reflects great credit on the University Press. In the notes Mr Sandys has more than sustained his well-earned reputation as a careful and learned editor, and shows consider-

able advance in freedom and lightness of style. . . . Under such circumstances it is superfluous to say that for the purposes of teachers and advanced students this handsome edition far surpasses all its predecessors."—*Athenæum*.

"It has not, like so many such books, been hastily produced to meet the momentary need of some particular examination; but it has employed for some years the labour and thought of a highly finished scholar, whose aim seems to have been that his book should go forth *totus teres atque rotundus*, armed at all points with all that may throw light upon its subject. The result is a work which will not only assist the schoolboy or undergraduate in his tasks, but will adorn the library of the scholar."—*The Guardian*.

ESSAYS ON THE ART OF PHEIDIAS. By C. WALDSTEIN, M.A., Phil. D., Reader in Classical Archæology in the University of Cambridge. Royal 8vo. With Illustrations. [*In the Press*].

M. TULLI CICERONIS AD. M. BRUTUM ORATOR. A revised text edited with Introductory Essays and with critical and explanatory notes, by J. E. SANDYS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St John's College, and Public Orator. Demy 8vo. [*Nearly ready*].

M. TULLI CICERONIS DE FINIBUS BONORUM ET MALORUM LIBRI QUINQUE. The text revised and explained; With a Translation by JAMES S. REID, M.L., Litt. D., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College. 3 Vols. [*In the Press*].
VOL. III. Containing the Translation. Demy 8vo. 8s.

M. T. CICERONIS DE OFFICIIS LIBRI TRES, with Marginal Analysis, an English Commentary, and copious Indices, by H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 9s.

"Dr Holden has issued an edition of what is perhaps the easiest and most popular of Cicero's philosophical works, the *de Officiis*, which, especially in the form which it has now

assumed after two most thorough revisions, leaves little or nothing to be desired in the fullness and accuracy of its treatment alike of the matter and the language."—*Academy*.

M. TULLI CICERONIS PRO C. RABIRIO [PERDVELLIONIS REO] ORATIO AD QVIRITES With Notes Introduction and Appendices by W. E. HEITLAND MA, Fellow and Lecturer of St John's College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

M. TULLII CICERONIS DE NATURA DEORUM
 Libri Tres, with Introduction and Commentary by JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A., late Professor of Moral Philosophy at King's College, London, together with a new collation of several of the English MSS. by J. H. SWAINSON, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. I. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. Vol. II. 12s. 6d.

VOL. III. *Nearly ready.*

"Such editions as that of which Prof. Mayor has given us the first instalment will doubtless do much to remedy this undeserved neglect. It is one on which great pains and much learning have evidently been expended, and is in every

way admirably suited to meet the needs of the student . . . The notes of the editor are all that could be expected from his well-known learning and scholarship."—*Academy*.

P. VERGILI MARONIS OPERA cum Prolegomenis
 et Commentario Critico pro Syndicis Preli Academici edidit BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, S.T.P., Graecae Linguae Professor Regius. Extra Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL PAPERS. By Sir W. THOMSON, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. Collected from different Scientific Periodicals from May 1841, to the present time. Vol. I. Demy 8vo. 18s. Vol. II. 15s. [Volume III. *In the Press.*

"Wherever exact science has found a follower Sir William Thomson's name is known as a leader and a master. For a space of 40 years each of his successive contributions to knowledge in the domain of experimental and mathematical physics has been recognized as marking a stage in the progress of the subject. But, unhappily for the mere learner, he is no writer of text-books. His eager fertility overflows into the nearest available journal . . . The papers in this volume deal largely with the subject of the dynamics of heat. They begin with two or three articles which were in part written at the age of 17, before the author had commenced residence as an undergraduate in Cambridge. . . . No student of mechanical engineering, who aims at the higher levels of his profession, can afford to be ignorant of the principles and methods set forth in these great memoirs . . . The article on the absolute measurement of electric and galvanic quantities (1851) has

borne rich and abundant fruit. Twenty years after its date the International Conference of Electricians at Paris, assisted by the author himself, elaborated and promulgated a series of rules and units which are but the detailed outcome of the principles laid down in these papers."—*The Times*.

"We are convinced that nothing has had a greater effect on the progress of the theories of electricity and magnetism during the last ten years than the publication of Sir W. Thomson's reprint of papers on electrostatics and magnetism, and we believe that the present volume is destined in no less degree to further the advancement of physical science. We owe the modern dynamical theory of heat almost wholly to Joule and Thomson, and Clausius and Rankine, and we have here collected together the whole of Thomson's investigations on this subject, together with the papers published jointly by himself and Joule."—*Glasgow Herald*.

MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL PAPERS, by GEORGE GABRIEL STOKES, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., Fellow of Pembroke College, and Lucasian Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge. Reprinted from the Original Journals and Transactions, with Additional Notes by the Author. Vol. I. Demy 8vo. 15s. VOL. II. 15s. [VOLUME III. *In the Press.*

"The volume of Professor Stokes's papers contains much more than his hydrodynamical papers. The undulatory theory of light is treated, and the difficulties connected with its application to certain phenomena, such as aberration, are carefully examined and resolved. Such difficulties are commonly passed over with scant notice in the text-books. . . . Those to whom difficulties like these are real stumbling-blocks will still turn for enlightenment to Professor Stokes's old, but still fresh and still

necessary, dissertations. There nothing is slurred over, nothing extenuated. We learn exactly the weaknesses of the theory, and the direction in which the completer theory of the future must be sought for. The same spirit pervades the papers on pure mathematics which are included in the volume. They have a severe accuracy of style which well befits the subtle nature of the subjects, and inspires the completest confidence in their author."—*The Times*.

THE SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF THE LATE PROF. J. CLERK MAXWELL. Edited by W. D. NIVEN, M.A. In 2 vols. Royal 4to. [In the Press.]

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

A TREATISE ON NATURAL PHILOSOPHY. By Sir W. THOMSON, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, and P. G. TAIT, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. Part I. Demy 8vo. 16s. Part II. Demy 8vo. 18s.

"In this, the second edition, we notice a large amount of new matter, the importance of which is such that any opinion which we could

form within the time at our disposal would be utterly inadequate."—*Nature*.

ELEMENTS OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY. By Professors Sir W. THOMSON and P. G. TAIT. Part I. Demy 8vo. *Second Edition*. 9s.

A SHORT HISTORY OF GREEK MATHEMATICS.

By J. GOW, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A TREATISE ON THE THEORY OF DETERMINANTS and their applications in Analysis and Geometry, by ROBERT FORSYTH SCOTT, M.A., of St John's College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 12s.

"This able and comprehensive treatise will be welcomed by the student as bringing within his reach the results of many important re-

searches on this subject which have hitherto been for the most part inaccessible to him."—*Athenæum*.

HYDRODYNAMICS, a Treatise on the Mathematical Theory of the Motion of Fluids, by HORACE LAMB, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 12s.

THE ANALYTICAL THEORY OF HEAT, by JOSEPH FOURIER. Translated, with Notes, by A. FREEMAN, M.A., Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 16s.

"It is time that Fourier's masterpiece, *The Analytical Theory of Heat*, translated by Mr Alex. Freeman, should be introduced to those English students of Mathematics who do not follow with freedom a treatise in any language but their own. It is a model of mathematical reasoning applied to physical phenomena, and is remarkable for the ingenuity of the analytical

process employed by the author."—*Contemporary Review*, October, 1878.

"There cannot be two opinions as to the value and importance of the *Théorie de la Chaleur*. . . It is still the text-book of Heat Conduction, and there seems little present prospect of its being superseded, though it is already more than half a century old."—*Nature*.

DIOPHANTOS OF ALEXANDRIA; a Study in the History of Greek Algebra. By T. L. HEATH, B.A., Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ELECTRICAL RESEARCHES OF THE Honourable HENRY CAVENDISH, F.R.S. Written between 1771 and 1781. Edited from the original manuscripts in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, K.G., by the late J. CLERK MAXWELL, F.R.S. Demy 8vo. 18s.

"Every department of editorial duty appears to have been most conscientiously performed; and it must have been no small satis-

faction to Prof. Maxwell to see this goodly volume completed before his life's work was done."—*Athenæum*.

AN ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON QUATERNIONS.

By P. G. TAIT, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. *Second Edition*. Demy 8vo. 14s.

THE MATHEMATICAL WORKS OF ISAAC BARROW, D.D. Edited by W. WHEWELL, D.D. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

AN ATTEMPT TO TEST THE THEORIES OF CAPILLARY ACTION by FRANCIS BASHFORTH, B.D., and J. C. ADAMS, M.A., F.R.S. Demy 4to. £1. 1s.

NOTES ON QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS. Concise and Explanatory. By H. J. H. FENTON, M.A., F.I.C., F.C.S., Demonstrator of Chemistry in the University of Cambridge. Cr. 4to. 7s. 6d.

- A HISTORY OF THE MATHEMATICAL THEORY OF ELASTICITY, from Galilei to the present time. By the late I. TODHUNTER, D. Sc., F.R.S., edited and completed by KARL PEARSON, M.A. [*In the Press.*]
- A TREATISE ON THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF CHEMISTRY, by M. M. PATTISON MUIR, M.A., Fellow and Prælector in Chemistry of Gonville and Caius College. Demy 8vo. 15s.
- “Properly to review this excellent book on philosophical chemistry I should have to ask for half-a-dozen pages of the Academy. To give a notion of its scope and of its treatment of the important topics discussed in its 470 pages, I might quote the Preface in its entirety, and give a *précis* of the table of contents. . . . The value of the book as a digest of the historical developments of chemical thought is immense.”—*Academy.*
- A TREATISE ON THE PHYSIOLOGY OF PLANTS, by S. H. VINES, M.A., Fellow of Christ’s College. [*Nearly ready.*]
- THE FOSSILS AND PALÆONTOLOGICAL AFFINITIES OF THE NEOCOMIAN DEPOSITS OF UPWARE AND BRICKHILL with Plates, being the Sedgwick Prize Essay for the Year 1879. By W. KEEPING, M.A., F.G.S. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- A CATALOGUE OF BOOKS AND PAPERS ON PROTOZOA, CÆLENTERATES, WORMS, and certain smaller groups of animals, published during the years 1861—1883, by D’ARCY W. THOMPSON, B.A., Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- COUNTERPOINT. A Practical Course of Study, by Professor Sir G. A. MACFARREN, M.A., Mus. Doc. Fifth Edition, revised. Demy 4to. 7s. 6d.
- ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS made at the Observatory of Cambridge by the late Rev. JAMES CHALLIS, M.A., F.R.S., F.R.A.S. For various Years, from 1846 to 1860.
- ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS from 1861 to 1865. Vol. XXI. Royal 4to. 15s. From 1866 to 1869. Vol. XXII. Royal 4to. [*Nearly ready.*]
- A CATALOGUE OF THE COLLECTION OF BIRDS formed by the late H. E. STRICKLAND, now in the possession of the University of Cambridge. By O. SALVIN, M.A. Demy 8vo. £1. 1s.
- A CATALOGUE OF AUSTRALIAN FOSSILS (including Tasmania and the Island of Timor), Stratigraphically and Zoologically arranged, by R. ETHERIDGE, Jun., F.G.S., Acting Palæontologist, H.M. Geol. Survey of Scotland. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- “The work is arranged with great clearness, consulted by the author, and an index to the and contains a full list of the books and papers genera.”—*Saturday Review.*
- ILLUSTRATIONS OF COMPARATIVE ANATOMY, VERTEBRATE AND INVERTEBRATE, for the Use of Students in the Museum of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- A SYNOPSIS OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE BRITISH PALÆOZOIC ROCKS, by the Rev. ADAM SEDGWICK, M.A., F.R.S., and FREDERICK M^cCOY, F.G.S. One vol., Royal 4to. Plates, £1. 1s.
- A CATALOGUE OF THE COLLECTION OF CAMBRIAN AND SILURIAN FOSSILS contained in the Geological Museum of the University of Cambridge, by J. W. SALTER, F.G.S. With a Portrait of PROFESSOR SEDGWICK. Royal 4to. 7s. 6d.
- CATALOGUE OF OSTEOLOGICAL SPECIMENS contained in the Anatomical Museum of the University of Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d.

LAW.

AN ANALYSIS OF CRIMINAL LIABILITY. By E. C. CLARK, LL.D., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Cambridge, also of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"Prof. Clark's little book is the substance of lectures delivered by him upon those portions of Austin's work on jurisprudence which deal with the 'operation of sanctions' . . .

Students of jurisprudence will find much to interest and instruct them in the work of Prof. Clark."—*Athenæum*.

PRACTICAL JURISPRUDENCE, a Comment on AUSTIN. By E. C. CLARK, LL.D. Regius Professor of Civil Law. Crown 8vo. 9s.

"Damit schliesst dieses inhaltreiche und nach allen Seiten anregende Buch über Prac-

tical Jurisprudence."—König. *Cent. abblatt für Rechtswissenschaft*.

A SELECTION OF THE STATE TRIALS. By J. W. WILLIS-BUND, M.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-Law, Professor of Constitutional Law and History, University College, London. Crown 8vo. Vols. I. and II. In 3 parts. Now reduced to 30s. (*originally published at 46s.*)

"Mr Willis-Bund has edited 'A Selection of Cases from the State Trials' which is likely to form a very valuable addition to the standard literature . . . There can be no doubt, therefore, of the interest that can be found in the State trials. But they are large and unwieldy, and it is impossible for the general reader to come across them. Mr Willis-Bund has therefore done good service in making a selection that is in the first volume reduced to a commodious form."—*The Examiner*.

"This work is a very useful contribution to that important branch of the constitutional history of England which is concerned with the growth and development of the law of treason, as it may be gathered from trials before the ordinary courts. The author has very wisely distinguished these cases from those of impeachment for treason before Parliament, which he proposes to treat in a future volume under the general head 'Proceedings in Parliament.'"—*The Academy*.

"This is a work of such obvious utility that the only wonder is that no one should have undertaken it before . . . In many respects therefore, although the trials are more or less abridged, this is for the ordinary student's purpose not only a more handy, but a more useful

work than Howell's."—*Saturday Review*.

"But, although the book is most interesting to the historian of constitutional law, it is also not without considerable value to those who seek information with regard to procedure and the growth of the law of evidence. We should add that Mr Willis-Bund has given short prefaces and appendices to the trials, so as to form a connected narrative of the events in history to which they relate. We can thoroughly recommend the book."—*Law Times*.

"To a large class of readers Mr Willis-Bund's compilation will thus be of great assistance, for he presents in a convenient form a judicious selection of the principal statutes and the leading cases bearing on the crime of treason . . . For all classes of readers these volumes possess an indirect interest, arising from the nature of the cases themselves, from the men who were actors in them, and from the numerous points of social life which are incidentally illustrated in the course of the trials. On these features we have not dwelt, but have preferred to show that the book is a valuable contribution to the study of the subject with which it professes to deal, namely, the history of the law of treason."—*Athenæum*.

Vol. III. *In the Press.*

THE FRAGMENTS OF THE PERPETUAL EDICT OF SALVIUS JULIANUS, collected, arranged, and annotated by BRYAN WALKER, M.A., LL.D., Law Lecturer of St John's College, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"In the present book we have the fruits of the same kind of thorough and well-ordered study which was brought to bear upon the notes to the Commentaries and the Institutes . . . Hitherto the Edict has been almost inaccessible to the ordinary English student, and

such a student will be interested as well as perhaps surprised to find how abundantly the extant fragments illustrate and clear up points which have attracted his attention in the Commentaries, or the Institutes, or the Digest."—*Law Times*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF JUSTINIAN'S DIGEST. Containing an account of its composition and of the Jurists used or referred to therein, together with a full Commentary on one Title (*de usufructu*), by HENRY JOHN ROBY, M.A., formerly Prof. of Jurisprudence, University College, London. Demy 8vo. 18s.

"Not an obscurity, philological, historical, or legal, has been left unsifted. More informing aid still has been supplied to the student of the Digest at large by a preliminary account, covering nearly 300 pages, of the mode of composition of the Digest, and of the jurists whose decisions and arguments constitute its substance. Nowhere else can a clearer view be obtained of the personal succession by which the tradition of Roman legal science was sus-

tained and developed. Roman law, almost more than Roman legions, was the backbone of the Roman commonwealth. Mr Roby, by his careful sketch of the sages of Roman law, from Sextus Papirius, under Tarquin the Proud, to the Byzantine Bar, has contributed to render the tenacity and durability of the most enduring polity the world has ever experienced somewhat more intelligible."—*The Times*.

THE COMMENTARIES OF GAIUS AND RULES OF ULPIAN. (New Edition, revised and enlarged.) With a Translation and Notes, by J. T. ABDY, LL.D., Judge of County Courts, late Regius Professor of Laws in the University of Cambridge, and BRYAN WALKER, M.A., LL.D., Law Lecturer of St John's College, Cambridge, formerly Law Student of Trinity Hall and Chancellor's Medallist for Legal Studies. Crown 8vo. 16s.

"As scholars and as editors Messrs Abdy and Walker have done their work well . . . For one thing the editors deserve special commendation. They have presented Gaius to the reader with few notes and those merely by

way of reference or necessary explanation. Thus the Roman jurist is allowed to speak for himself, and the reader feels that he is really studying Roman law in the original, and not a fanciful representation of it."—*Athenæum*.

THE INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN, translated with Notes by J. T. ABDY, LL.D., and BRYAN WALKER, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo. 16s.

"We welcome here a valuable contribution to the study of jurisprudence. The text of the *Institutes* is occasionally perplexing, even to practised scholars, whose knowledge of classical models does not always avail them in dealing with the technicalities of legal phraseology. Nor can the ordinary dictionaries be expected to furnish all the help that is wanted. This translation will then be of great use. To

the ordinary student, whose attention is distracted from the subject-matter by the difficulty of struggling through the language in which it is contained, it will be almost indispensable."—*Spectator*.

"The notes are learned and carefully compiled, and this edition will be found useful to students."—*Law Times*.

SELECTED TITLES FROM THE DIGEST, annotated by B. WALKER, M.A., LL.D. Part I. *Mandati vel Contra*. Digest XVII. 1. Crown 8vo. 5s.

"This small volume is published as an experiment. The author proposes to publish an annotated edition and translation of several books of the Digest if this one is received with favour. We are pleased to be able to say that

Mr Walker deserves credit for the way in which he has performed the task undertaken. The translation, as might be expected, is scholarly."—*Law Times*.

— Part II. *De Adquirendo rerum dominio* and *De Adquirenda vel amittenda possessione*. Digest XLI. 1 and 11. Crown 8vo. 6s.

— Part III. *De Conditionibus*. Digest XII. 1 and 4—7 and Digest XIII. 1—3. Crown 8vo. 6s.

GROTIUS DE JURE BELLII ET PACIS, with the Notes of Barbeyrac and others; accompanied by an abridged Translation of the Text, by W. WHEWELL, D.D. late Master of Trinity College. 3 Vols. Demy 8vo. 12s. The translation separate, 6s.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

HISTORY.

LIFE AND TIMES OF STEIN, OR GERMANY AND PRUSSIA IN THE NAPOLEONIC AGE, by J. R. SEELEY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, with Portraits and Maps. 3 Vols. Demy 8vo. Now reduced to 30s. (*originally published at 48s.*)

"DR BUSCH's volume has made people think and talk even more than usual of Prince Bismarck, and Professor Seeley's very learned work on Stein will turn attention to an earlier and an almost equally eminent German statesman. It has been the good fortune of Prince Bismarck to help to raise Prussia to a position which she had never before attained, and to complete the work of German unification. The frustrated labours of Stein in the same field were also very great, and well worthy to be taken into account. He was one, perhaps the chief, of the illustrious group of strangers who came to the rescue of Prussia in her darkest hour, about the time of the inglorious Peace of Tilsit, and who laboured to put life and order into her dispirited army, her impoverished finances, and her inefficient Civil Service. Stein strove, too, —no man more,—for the cause of unification when it seemed almost folly to hope for success. Englishmen will feel very pardonable pride at seeing one of their countrymen undertake to write the history of a period from the investigation of which even laborious Germans are apt to shrink."—*Times*.

"In a notice of this kind scant justice can be done to a work like the one before us; no short *résumé* can give even the most meagre

notion of the contents of these volumes, which contain no page that is superfluous, and none that is uninteresting. . . . To understand the Germany of to-day one must study the Germany of many yesterdays, and now that study has been made easy by this work, to which no one can hesitate to assign a very high place among those recent histories which have aimed at original research."—*Athenæum*.

"The book before us fills an important gap in English—nay, European—historical literature, and bridges over the history of Prussia from the time of Frederick the Great to the days of Kaiser Wilhelm. It thus gives the reader standing ground whence he may regard contemporary events in Germany in their proper historic light. . . . We congratulate Cambridge and her Professor of History on the appearance of such a noteworthy production. And we may add that it is something upon which we may congratulate England that on the especial field of the Germans, history, on the history of their own country, by the use of their own literary weapons, an Englishman has produced a history of Germany in the Napoleonic age far superior to any that exists in German."—*Examiner*.

THE GROWTH OF ENGLISH INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE. By W. CUNNINGHAM, M.A., late Deputy to the Knightbridge Professor in the University of Cambridge. With Maps and Charts. Crown 8vo. 12s.

"He is, however, undoubtedly sound in the main, and his work deserves recognition as the result of immense industry and research in a field in which the labourers have hitherto been comparatively few."—*Scotsman*.

"Mr Cunningham is not likely to disappoint any readers except such as begin by mistaking the character of his book. He does not promise, and does not give, an account of the

dimensions to which English industry and commerce have grown. It is with the process of growth that he is concerned; and this process he traces with the philosophical insight which distinguishes between what is important and what is trivial. He thus follows with care, skill, and deliberation a single thread through the maze of general English history."—*Guardian*.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE ROYAL INJUNCTIONS OF 1535, by JAMES BASS MULLINGER, M.A. Demy 8vo. (734 pp.), 12s.

"We trust Mr Mullinger will yet continue his history and bring it down to our own day."—*Academy*.

"He has brought together a mass of instructive details respecting the rise and progress, not only of his own University, but of all the principal Universities of the Middle Ages. . . . We hope some day that he may con-

tinue his labours, and give us a history of the University during the troublous times of the Reformation and the Civil War."—*Athenæum*.

"Mr Mullinger's work is one of great learning and research, which can hardly fail to become a standard book of reference on the subject. . . . We can most strongly recommend this book to our readers."—*Spectator*.

Part II. From the Royal Injunctions of 1535 to the Accession of Charles the First. Demy 8vo. 18s.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES OF GREEK HISTORY.

Accompanied by a short narrative of events, with references to the sources of information and extracts from the ancient authorities, by CARL PETER. Translated from the German by G. CHAWNER, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of King's College, Cambridge. Demy 4to. 10s.

"As a handy book of reference for genuine students, or even for learned men who want to lay their hands on an authority for some par-

ticular point as quickly as possible, the *Tables* are useful."—*Academy*.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES OF ROMAN HISTORY.

By the same.

[*Preparing.*]

HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE OF ST JOHN THE

EVANGELIST, by THOMAS BAKER, B.D., Ejected Fellow. Edited by JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Fellow of St John's. Two Vols. Demy 8vo. 24s.

"To antiquaries the book will be a source of almost inexhaustible amusement, by historians it will be found a work of considerable service on questions respecting our social progress in past times; and the care and thoroughness with which Mr Mayor has discharged his editorial functions are creditable to his learning and industry."—*Athenæum*.

"The work displays very wide reading, and it will be of great use to members of the college and of the university, and, perhaps, of still greater use to students of English history, ecclesiastical, political, social, literary and academical, who have hitherto had to be content with 'Dyer.'"—*Academy*.

HISTORY OF NEPĀL, translated by MUNSHĪ SHEW

SHUNKER SINGH and PANDIT SHRĪ GUNĀNAND; edited with an Introductory Sketch of the Country and People by Dr D. WRIGHT, late Residency Surgeon at Kāthmāndū, and with facsimiles of native drawings, and portraits of Sir JUNG BAHĀDUR, the KING OF NEPĀL, &c. Super-royal 8vo. **Now reduced to 10s. 6d.** (*originally published at 21s.*)

"The Cambridge University Press have done well in publishing this work. Such translations are valuable not only to the historian but also to the ethnologist; . . . Dr Wright's Introduction is based on personal inquiry and observation, is written intelligently and candidly, and adds much to the value of the

volume. The coloured lithographic plates are interesting."—*Nature*.

"The history has appeared at a very opportune moment. The volume...is beautifully printed, and supplied with portraits of Sir Jung Bahadour and others, and with excellent coloured sketches illustrating Nepaulese architecture and religion."—*Examiner*.

SCHOLAE ACADEMICAE: some Account of the Studies

at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse; Author of "Social Life at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century." Demy 8vo. **Now reduced to 10s. 6d.** (*originally published at 15s.*)

"The general object of Mr Wordsworth's book is sufficiently apparent from its title. He has collected a great quantity of minute and curious information about the working of Cambridge institutions in the last century, with an occasional comparison of the corresponding state of things at Oxford. . . . To a great extent it is purely a book of reference, and as such it will be of permanent value for the historical knowledge of English education and learning."—*Saturday Review*.

"Only those who have engaged in like labours will be able fully to appreciate the sustained industry and conscientious accuracy discernible in every page. . . . Of the whole volume it may be said that it is a genuine service rendered to the study of University history, and that the habits of thought of any writer educated at either seat of learning in the last century will, in many cases, be far better understood after a consideration of the materials here collected."—*Academy*.

THE ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY OF THE UNI-

VERSITY AND COLLEGES OF CAMBRIDGE, by the late Professor WILLIS, M.A. With numerous Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Continued to the present time, and edited by JOHN WILLIS CLARK, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

[*Nearly ready.*]

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A CATALOGUE OF ANCIENT MARBLES IN GREAT BRITAIN, by Prof. ADOLF MICHAELIS. Translated by C. A. M. FENNELL, Litt. D., late Fellow of Jesus College. Royal 8vo. Roxburgh (Morocco back), £2. 2s.

"The object of the present work of Michaelis is to describe and make known the vast treasures of ancient sculpture now accumulated in the galleries of Great Britain, the extent and value of which are scarcely appreciated, and chiefly so because there has hitherto been little accessible information about them. To the loving labours of a learned German the owners of art treasures in England are for the second time indebted for a full description of their rich possessions. Waagen gave to the private collections of pictures the advantage of his inspection and cultivated acquaintance with art, and now Michaelis performs the same office for the still less known private hoards of antique sculptures for which our country is so remarkable. The book is beautifully executed, and with its few handsome plates, and excellent indexes, does much credit to the Cambridge Press. It has not been printed in

German, but appears for the first time in the English translation. All lovers of true art and of good work should be grateful to the Syndics of the University Press for the liberal facilities afforded by them towards the production of this important volume by Professor Michaelis."—*Saturday Review*.

"Ancient Marbles' here mean relics of Greek and Roman origin which have been imported into Great Britain from classical soil. How rich this island is in respect to these remains of ancient art, every one knows, but it is equally well known that these treasures had been most inadequately described before the author of this work undertook the labour of description. Professor Michaelis has achieved so high a fame as an authority in classical archaeology that it seems unnecessary to say how good a book this is."—*The Antiquary*.

LECTURES ON TEACHING, delivered in the University of Cambridge in the Lent Term, 1880. By J. G. FITCH, M.A., Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools. Crown 8vo. New Edition. 5s.

"The lectures will be found most interesting, and deserve to be carefully studied, not only by persons directly concerned with instruction, but by parents who wish to be able to exercise an intelligent judgment in the choice of schools and teachers for their children. For ourselves, we could almost wish to be of school age again, to learn history and geography from some one who could teach them after the pattern set by Mr Fitch to his audience. . . . But perhaps Mr Fitch's observations on the general conditions of school-work are even more important than what he says on this or that branch of study."—*Saturday Review*.

"It comprises fifteen lectures, dealing with such subjects as organisation, discipline, examining, language, fact knowledge, science, and methods of instruction; and though the lectures make no pretension to systematic or exhaustive treatment, they yet leave very little of the ground uncovered; and they combine in an admirable way the exposition of sound principles with practical suggestions and illustrations which are evidently derived from wide and varied experience, both in teaching and in examining."—*Scotsman*.

"As principal of a training college and as a Government inspector of schools, Mr Fitch has got at his fingers' ends the working of primary education, while as assistant commissioner to the late Endowed Schools Commission he has seen something of the machinery of our higher schools. . . . Mr Fitch's book covers so wide a field and touches on so many burning questions that we must be content to recommend it as the best existing *vade mecum* for the teacher. . . . He is always sensible, always judicious, never wanting in tact. . . . Mr Fitch is a scholar; he pretends to no knowledge that he does not possess; he brings to his work the ripe experience of a well-stored mind, and he possesses in a remarkable degree the art of exposition."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

"Therefore, without reviewing the book for the second time, we are glad to avail ourselves of the opportunity of calling attention to the re-issue of the volume in the five-shilling form, bringing it within the reach of the rank and file of the profession. We cannot let the occasion pass without making special reference to the excellent section on 'punishments' in the lecture on 'Discipline.'"—*School Board Chronicle*.

THE LITERATURE OF THE FRENCH RENAISSANCE. An Introductory Essay. By A. A. TILLEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE DIPLOMATIC CORRESPONDENCE OF EARL GOWER, English Ambassador at the court of Versailles from June 1790 to August 1792. From the originals in the Record Office with an introduction and Notes, by O. BROWNING, M.A. [*Nearly ready*].

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane:

- STATUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE and for the Colleges therein, made published and approved (1878—1882) under the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877. With an Appendix. Demy 8vo. 16s.
- GRADUATI CANTABRIGIENSES: SIVE CATALOGUS exhibens nomina eorum quos ab Anno Academico Admissionum MDCCC usque ad octavum diem Octobris MDCCCLXXXIV gradu quocunque ornavit Academia Cantabrigiensis, e libris subscriptionum desumptus. Cura HENRICI RICHARDS LUARD S. T. P. Coll. SS. Trin. Socii atque Academiae Registrarii. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- THE WOODCUTTERS OF THE NETHERLANDS during the last quarter of the Fifteenth Century. In three parts. I. History of the Woodcutters. II. Catalogue of their Woodcuts. III. List of the Books containing Woodcuts. By WILLIAM MARTIN CONWAY. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- A GRAMMAR OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE. By Prof. WINDISCH. Translated by Dr NORMAN MOORE. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- STATUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. With some Acts of Parliament relating to the University. Demy 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- ORDINANCES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. Demy 8vo., cloth. 7s. 6d.
- TRUSTS, STATUTES AND DIRECTIONS affecting (1) The Professorships of the University. (2) The Scholarships and Prizes. (3) Other Gifts and Endowments. Demy 8vo. 5s.
- COMPENDIUM OF UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS, for the use of persons in Statu Pupillari. Demy 8vo. 6d.
- CATALOGUE OF THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS preserved in the University Library, Cambridge. By Dr S. M. SCHILLER-SZINESSY. Volume I. containing Section I. *The Holy Scriptures*; Section II. *Commentaries on the Bible*. Demy 8vo. 9s.
Volume II. *In the Press*.
- A CATALOGUE OF THE MANUSCRIPTS preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 5 Vols. 10s. each.
- INDEX TO THE CATALOGUE. Demy 8vo. 10s.
- A CATALOGUE OF ADVERSARIA and printed books containing MS. notes, preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge. 3s. 6d.
- THE ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS IN THE LIBRARY OF THE FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM, Catalogued with Descriptions, and an Introduction, by WILLIAM GEORGE SEARLE, M.A., late Fellow of Queens' College, and Vicar of Hockington, Cambridgeshire. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- A CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE GRACES, Documents, and other Papers in the University Registry which concern the University Library. Demy 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- CATALOGUS BIBLIOTHECÆ BURCKHARDTIANÆ.
Demy 4to. 5s.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.

GENERAL EDITOR: THE VERY REVEREND J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D.,
DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

THE want of an Annotated Edition of the BIBLE, in handy portions, suitable for School use, has long been felt.

In order to provide Text-books for School and Examination purposes, the CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS has arranged to publish the several books of the BIBLE in separate portions at a moderate price, with introductions and explanatory notes.

The Very Reverend J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough, has undertaken the general editorial supervision of the work, assisted by a staff of eminent coadjutors. Some of the books have been already edited or undertaken by the following gentlemen:

- Rev. A. CARR, M.A., *late Assistant Master at Wellington College.*
 Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., *late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.*
 Rev. S. COX, *Nottingham.*
 Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., *Professor of Hebrew, Edinburgh.*
 The Ven. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., *Archdeacon of Westminster.*
 Rev. C. D. GINSBURG, LL.D.
 Rev. A. E. HUMPHREYS, M.A., *late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, M.A., *Fellow of Trinity College, Regius Professor of Hebrew.*
 Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A., *late Professor at St David's College, Lampeter.*
 Rev. J. R. LUMBY, D.D., *Norrisian Professor of Divinity.*
 Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D., *Warden of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.*
 Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., *late Fellow of Trinity College, Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.*
 Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D., *Head Master of the Leys School, Cambridge.*
 Rev. E. H. PEROWNE, D.D., *Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St Asaph.*
 The Ven. T. T. PEROWNE, M.A., *Archdeacon of Norwich.*
 Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., *Master of University College, Durham.*
 The Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., *Dean of Wells.*
 Rev. W. SIMCOX, M.A., *Rector of Weyhill, Hants.*
 W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A., *Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic.*
 Rev. H. D. M. SPENCE, M.A., *Hon. Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.*
 Rev. A. W. STREANE, M.A., *Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.*

"The modesty of the general title of this series has, we believe, led many to misunderstand its character and underrate its value. The books are well suited for study in the upper forms of our best schools, but not the less are they adapted to the wants of all Bible students who are not specialists. We doubt, indeed, whether any of the numerous popular commentaries recently issued in this country will be found more serviceable for general use."—*Academy.*

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse,
Ave Maria Lane.

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS & COLLEGES.

Continued.

Now Ready. Cloth, Extra Fcap. 8vo.

- THE BOOK OF JOSHUA. By the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D.
With 2 Maps. 2s. 6d.
- THE BOOK OF JUDGES. By the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A.
With Map. 3s. 6d.
- THE FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL. By the Rev. Professor
KIRKPATRICK, M.A. With Map. 3s. 6d.
- THE SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL. By the Rev. Professor
KIRKPATRICK, M.A. With 2 Maps. 3s. 6d.
- THE BOOK OF JOB. By the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D. 5s.
- THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. By the Very Rev. E. H.
PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells. 5s.
- THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH. By the Rev. A. W. STREANE,
M.A. With Map. 4s. 6d.
- THE BOOK OF HOSEA. By Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D. 3s.
- THE BOOKS OF OBADIAH AND JONAH. By Archdeacon
PEROWNE. 2s. 6d.
- THE BOOK OF MICAH. By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D.
1s. 6d.
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MATTHEW. By the
Rev. A. CARR, M.A. With 2 Maps. 2s. 6d.
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK. By the Rev.
G. F. MACLEAR, D.D. With 4 Maps. 2s. 6d.
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE. By Archdeacon
F. W. FARRAR. With 4 Maps. 4s. 6d.
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN. By the Rev.
A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D. With 4 Maps. 4s. 6d.
- THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. Professor
LUMBY, D.D. With 4 Maps. 4s. 6d.
- THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By the Rev. H. C. G.
MOULE, M.A. 3s. 6d.
- THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. By the Rev.
J. J. LIAS, M.A. With a Map and Plan. 2s.
- THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. By the
Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. 2s.
- THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Archdeacon FARRAR.
3s. 6d.
- THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF ST JAMES. By the Very Rev.
E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells. 1s. 6d.
- THE EPISTLES OF ST PETER AND ST JUDE. By the
same Editor. 2s. 6d.
- THE EPISTLES OF ST JOHN. By the Rev. A. PLUMMER,
M.A., D.D. 3s. 6d.

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS & COLLEGES.

Continued.

Preparing.

- THE BOOK OF GENESIS. By Professor ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A.
 THE BOOKS OF EXODUS, NUMBERS AND DEUTERONOMY. By the Rev. C. D. GINSBURG, LL.D.
 THE FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF KINGS. By the Rev. Prof. LUMBY, D.D.
 THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL. By the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D.
 THE BOOKS OF HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH. By Archdeacon PEROWNE.
 THE EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS AND PHILEMON. By the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A.
 THE BOOK OF REVELATION. By the Rev. W. SIMCOX, M.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE GREEK TESTAMENT
FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES,

with a Revised Text, based on the most recent critical authorities, and English Notes, prepared under the direction of the General Editor,

THE VERY REVEREND J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D.,
DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

Now Ready.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MATTHEW. By the Rev. A. CARR, M.A. With 4 Maps. 4s. 6d.

"With the 'Notes,' in the volume before us, we are much pleased; so far as we have searched, they are scholarly and sound. The quotations from the Classics are apt; and the references to modern Greek form a pleasing feature."—*The Churchman*.

"Copious illustrations, gathered from a great variety of sources, make his notes a very valuable aid to the student. They are indeed remarkably interesting, while all explanations on meanings, applications, and the like are distinguished by their lucidity and good sense."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK. By the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D. With 3 Maps. 4s. 6d.

"The Cambridge Greek Testament, of which Dr Maclear's edition of the Gospel according to St Mark is a volume, certainly supplies a want. Without pretending to compete with the leading commentaries, or to embody very much original research, it forms a most satisfactory introduction to the study of the New Testament in the original. . . Dr Maclear's introduction contains all that is known of St Mark's life, with references to passages in the New Testament in which he is mentioned; an account of the circumstances in which the Gospel was composed, with an estimate of the influence of St Peter's teaching upon St Mark; an excellent sketch of the special characteristics of this Gospel; an analysis, and a chapter on the text of the New Testament generally. . . The work is completed by three good maps."—*Saturday Review*.

"The Notes, which are admirably put together, seem to contain all that is necessary for the guidance of the student as well as a judicious selection of passages from various sources illustrating scenery and manners."—*Academy*.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST LUKE. By Archdeacon FARRAR. With 4 Maps. 6s.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN. By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D. With 4 Maps. 6s.

"A valuable addition has also been made to 'The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools,' Dr Plummer's notes on 'the Gospel according to St John' are scholarly, concise, and instructive, and embody the results of much thought and wide reading."—*Expositor*.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. Prof. LUMBY, D.D., with 4 Maps. 6s.

THE EPISTLES OF ST JOHN. By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D. [In the Press.]

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

THE PITT PRESS SERIES.

I. GREEK.

THE ANABASIS OF XENOPHON, BOOKS I. III. IV. and V. With a Map and English Notes by ALFRED PRETOR, M.A., Fellow of St Catharine's College, Cambridge; Editor of *Persius* and *Cicero ad Atticum* Book I. 2s. each.

"In Mr Pretor's edition of the *Anabasis* the text of Kühner has been followed in the main, while the exhaustive and admirable notes of the great German editor have been largely utilised. These notes deal with the minutest as well as the most important difficulties in construction, and all questions of history, antiquity, and geography are briefly but very effectually elucidated."—*The Examiner*.

"We welcome this addition to the other books of the *Anabasis* so ably edited by Mr Pretor. Although originally intended for the use of candidates at the university local examinations, yet this edition will be found adapted not only to meet the wants of the junior student, but even advanced scholars will find much in this work that will repay its perusal."—*The Schoolmaster*.

"Mr Pretor's '*Anabasis of Xenophon, Book IV.*' displays a union of accurate Cambridge scholarship, with experience of what is required by learners gained in examining middle-class schools. The text is large and clearly printed, and the notes explain all difficulties. . . . Mr Pretor's notes seem to be all that could be wished as regards grammar, geography, and other matters."—*The Academy*.

BOOKS II. VI. and VII. By the same Editor. 2s. 6d. each.

"Another Greek text, designed it would seem for students preparing for the local examinations, is '*Xenophon's Anabasis, Book II.*, with English Notes, by Alfred Pretor, M.A. The editor has exercised his usual discrimination in utilising the text and notes of Kühner, with the occasional assistance of the best hints of Schneider, Vollbrecht and Macmichael on critical matters, and of Mr R. W. Taylor on points of history and geography. . . . When Mr Pretor commits himself to Commentator's work, he is eminently helpful. . . . Had we to introduce a young Greek scholar to Xenophon, we should esteem ourselves fortunate in having Pretor's text-book as our chart and guide."—*Contemporary Review*.

THE ANABASIS OF XENOPHON, by A. PRETOR, M.A.,
Text and Notes, complete in two Volumes. 7s. 6d.

AGESILAUS OF XENOPHON. The Text revised with Critical and Explanatory Notes, Introduction, Analysis, and Indices. By H. HAILSTONE, M.A., late Scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Editor of *Xenophon's Hellenics*, etc. 2s. 6d.

ARISTOPHANES—RANAE. With English Notes and Introduction by W. C. GREEN, M.A., late Assistant Master at Rugby School. 3s. 6d.

ARISTOPHANES—AVES. By the same Editor. *New Edition*. 3s. 6d.

"The notes to both plays are excellent. Much has been done in these two volumes to render the study of Aristophanes a real treat to a boy instead of a drudgery, by helping him to understand the fun and to express it in his mother tongue."—*The Examiner*.

ARISTOPHANES—PLUTUS. By the same Editor. 3s. 6d.

EURIPIDES. HERCULES FURENS. With Introductions, Notes and Analysis. By J. T. HUTCHINSON, M.A., Christ's College, and A. GRAY, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College. 2s.

"Messrs Hutchinson and Gray have produced a careful and useful edition."—*Saturday Review*.

THE HERACLEIDÆ OF EURIPIDES, with Introduction and Critical Notes by E. A. BECK, M.A., Fellow of Trinity Hall. 3s. 6d.

London: C. J. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse,
Ave Maria Lane.

LUCIANI SOMNIUM CHARON PISCATOR ET DE LUCTU, with English Notes by W. E. HEITLAND, M.A., Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. New Edition, with Appendix. 3s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF ARISTOTLE. Edited by E. WALLACE, M.A. (See p. 30.)

PLUTARCH'S LIVES OF THE GRACCHI. With Introduction, Notes and Lexicon by Rev. HUBERT A. HOLDEN, M.A., LL.D., sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Editor of Plutarch's Themistocles, etc. 6s.

II. LATIN.

M. T. CICERONIS DE AMICITIA. Edited by J. S. REID, M.L., Litt. D., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. New Edition, with Additions. 3s. 6d.

"Mr Reid has decidedly attained his aim, namely, 'a thorough examination of the Latinity of the dialogue.' . . . The revision of the text is most valuable, and comprehends sundry acute corrections. . . . This volume, like Mr Reid's other editions, is a solid gain to the scholarship of the country."—*Athenæum*.

"A more distinct gain to scholarship is Mr Reid's able and thorough edition of the *De Amicitia* of Cicero, a work of which, whether we regard the exhaustive introduction or the instructive and most suggestive commentary, it would be difficult to speak too highly. . . . When we come to the commentary, we are only amazed by its fulness in proportion to its bulk. Nothing is overlooked which can tend to enlarge the learner's general knowledge of Ciceronian Latin or to elucidate the text."—*Saturday Review*.

M. T. CICERONIS CATO MAJOR DE SENECTUTE.

Edited by J. S. REID, M.L., Litt. D. 3s. 6d.

"The notes are excellent and scholarlike, adapted for the upper forms of public schools, and likely to be useful even to more advanced students."—*Guardian*.

M. T. CICERONIS ORATIO PRO ARCHIA POETA.

Edited by J. S. REID, M.L., Litt. D. Revised Edition. 2s.

"It is an admirable specimen of careful editing. An Introduction tells us everything we could wish to know about Archias, about Cicero's connexion with him, about the merits of the trial, and the genuineness of the speech. The text is well and carefully printed. The notes are clear and scholar-like. . . . No boy can master this little volume without feeling that he has advanced a long step in scholarship."—*The Academy*.

M. T. CICERONIS PRO L. CORNELIO BALBO ORATIO. Edited by J. S. REID, M.L., Litt. D. 1s. 6d.

"We are bound to recognize the pains devoted in the annotation of these two orations to the minute and thorough study of their Latinity, both in the ordinary notes and in the textual appendices."—*Saturday Review*.

M. T. CICERONIS PRO P. CORNELIO SULLA ORATIO. Edited by J. S. REID, M.L., Litt. D. 3s. 6d.

"Mr Reid is so well known to scholars as a commentator on Cicero that a new work from him scarcely needs any commendation of ours. His edition of the speech *Pro Sulla* is fully equal in merit to the volumes which he has already published. . . . It would be difficult to speak too highly of the notes. There could be no better way of gaining an insight into the characteristics of Cicero's style and the Latinity of his period than by making a careful study of this speech with the aid of Mr Reid's commentary. . . . Mr Reid's intimate knowledge of the minutest details of scholarship enables him to detect and explain the slightest points of distinction between the usages of different authors and different periods. . . . The notes are followed by a valuable appendix on the text, and another on points of orthography; an excellent index brings the work to a close."—*Saturday Review*.

M. T. CICERONIS PRO CN. PLANCIO ORATIO.

Edited by H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 4s. 6d.

"As a book for students this edition can have few rivals. It is enriched by an excellent introduction and a chronological table of the principal events of the life of Cicero; while in its appendix, and in the notes on the text which are added, there is much of the greatest value. The volume is neatly got up, and is in every way commendable."—*The Scotsman*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

M. T. CICERONIS IN Q. CAECILIUM DIVINATIO ET IN C. VERREM ACTIO PRIMA. With Introduction and Notes by W. E. HEITLAND, M.A., and HERBERT COWIE, M.A., Fellows of St John's College, Cambridge. 3s.

M. T. CICERONIS ORATIO PRO L. MURENA, with English Introduction and Notes. By W. E. HEITLAND, M.A., Fellow and Classical Lecturer of St John's College, Cambridge. **Second Edition, carefully revised.** 3s.

"Those students are to be deemed fortunate who have to read Cicero's lively and brilliant oration for L. Murena with Mr Heitland's handy edition, which may be pronounced 'four-square' in point of equipment, and which has, not without good reason, attained the honours of a second edition."—*Saturday Review*.

M. T. CICERONIS IN GAIUM VERREM ACTIO PRIMA. With Introduction and Notes. By H. COWIE, M.A., Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. 1s. 6d.

M. T. CICERONIS ORATIO PRO T. A. MILONE, with a Translation of Asconius' Introduction, Marginal Analysis and English Notes. Edited by the Rev. JOHN SMYTH PURTON, B.D., late President and Tutor of St Catharine's College. 2s. 6d.

"The editorial work is excellently done."—*The Academy*.

M. T. CICERONIS SOMNIUM SCIPIONIS. With Introduction and Notes. By W. D. PEARMAN, M.A., Head Master of Potsdam School, Jamaica. 2s.

P. OVIDII NASONIS FASTORUM LIBER VI. With a Plan of Rome and Notes by A. SIDGWICK, M.A., Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1s. 6d.

"Mr Sidgwick's editing of the Sixth Book of Ovid's *Fasti* furnishes a careful and serviceable volume for average students. It eschews 'construes' which supersede the use of the dictionary, but gives full explanation of grammatical usages and historical and mythical allusions, besides illustrating peculiarities of style, true and false derivations, and the more remarkable variations of the text."—*Saturday Review*.

"It is eminently good and useful. . . . The Introduction is singularly clear on the astronomy of Ovid, which is properly shown to be ignorant and confused; there is an excellent little map of Rome, giving just the places mentioned in the text and no more; the notes are evidently written by a practical schoolmaster."—*The Academy*.

GAI IULI CAESARIS DE BELLO GALLICO COMMENT. I. II. III. With Maps and English Notes by A. G. PESKETT, M.A., Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. 3s.

"In an unusually succinct introduction he gives all the preliminary and collateral information that is likely to be useful to a young student; and, wherever we have examined his notes, we have found them eminently practical and satisfying. . . . The book may well be recommended for careful study in school or college."—*Saturday Review*.

"The notes are scholarly, short, and a real help to the most elementary beginners in Latin prose."—*The Examiner*.

— BOOKS IV. AND V. AND BOOK VII. by the same Editor. 2s. each.

— BOOK VI. AND BOOK VIII. by the same Editor. 1s. 6d. each.

P. VERGILI MARONIS AENEIDOS LIBRI I., II., III., IV., V., VI., VII., VIII., IX., X., XI., XII. Edited with Notes by A. SIDGWICK, M.A., Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. 1s. 6d. each.

"Much more attention is given to the literary aspect of the poem than is usually paid to it in editions intended for the use of beginners. The introduction points out the distinction between primitive and literary epics, explains the purpose of the poem, and gives an outline of the story."—*Saturday Review*.

"Mr Arthur Sidgwick's 'Vergil, Aeneid, Book XII.' is worthy of his reputation, and is distinguished by the same acuteness and accuracy of knowledge, appreciation of a boy's difficulties and ingenuity and resource in meeting them, which we have on other occasions had reason to praise in these pages."—*The Academy*.

"As masterly in its clearly divided preface and appendices as in the sound and independent character of its annotations. . . . There is a great deal more in the notes than mere compilation and suggestion. . . . No difficulty is left unnoticed or unhandled."—*Saturday Review*.

"This edition is admirably adapted for the use of junior students, who will find in it the result of much reading in a condensed form, and clearly expressed."—*Cambridge Independent Press*.

BOOKS VII. VIII. in one volume. 3s.

BOOKS IX. X. in one volume. 3s.

BOOKS X., XI., XII. in one volume. 3s. 6d.

QUINTUS CURTIUS. A Portion of the History.

(ALEXANDER IN INDIA.) By W. E. HEITLAND, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of St John's College, Cambridge, and T. E. RAVEN, B.A., Assistant Master in Sherborne School. 3s. 6d.

"Equally commendable as a genuine addition to the existing stock of school-books is *Alexander in India*, a compilation from the eighth and ninth books of Q. Curtius, edited for the Pitt Press by Messrs Heitland and Raven. . . . The work of Curtius has merits of its own, which, in former generations, made it a favourite with English scholars, and which still make it a popular text-book in Continental schools. . . . The reputation of Mr Heitland is a sufficient guarantee for the scholarship of the notes, which are ample without being excessive, and the book is well furnished with all that is needful in the nature of maps, indexes, and appendices."—*Academy*.

M. ANNAEI LUCANI PHARSALIAE LIBER

PRIMUS, edited with English Introduction and Notes by W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. and C. E. HASKINS, M.A., Fellows and Lecturers of St John's College, Cambridge. 1s. 6d.

"A careful and scholarlike production."—*Times*.

"In nice parallels of Lucan from Latin poets and from Shakspeare, Mr Haskins and Mr Heitland deserve praise."—*Saturday Review*.

BEDA'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, BOOKS

III., IV., the Text from the very ancient MS. in the Cambridge University Library, collated with six other MSS. Edited, with a life from the German of EBERT, and with Notes, &c. by J. E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Professor of Latin, and J. R. LUMBY, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity. Revised edition. 7s. 6d.

"To young students of English History the illustrative notes will be of great service, while the study of the texts will be a good introduction to Mediæval Latin."—*The Nonconformist*.

"In Bede's works Englishmen can go back to *origines* of their history, unequalled for form and matter by any modern European nation. Prof. Mayor has done good service in rendering a part of Bede's greatest work accessible to those who can read Latin with ease. He has adorned this edition of the third and fourth books of the 'Ecclesiastical History' with that amazing erudition for which he is unrivalled among Englishmen and rarely equalled by Germans. And however interesting and valuable the text may be, we can certainly apply to his notes the expression, *La sauce vaut mieux que le poisson*. They are literally crammed with interesting information about early English life. For though ecclesiastical in name, Bede's history treats of all parts of the national life, since the Church had points of contact with all."—*Examiner*.

BOOKS I. and II. *In the Press*.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

III. FRENCH.

LE BOURGEOIS GENTILHOMME, Comédie-Ballet en Cinq Actes. Par J.-B. POQUELIN DE MOLIÈRE (1670). With a life of Molière and Grammatical and Philological Notes. By the Rev. A. C. CLAPIN, M.A., St John's College, Cambridge, and Bachelier-ès-Lettres of the University of France. 1s. 6d.

LA PICCIOLA. By X. B. SAINTINE. The Text, with Introduction, Notes and Map, by the same Editor, 2s.

LA GUERRE. By MM. ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN. With Map, Introduction and Commentary by the same Editor. 3s.

LAZARE HOCHE—PAR ÉMILE DE BONNECHOSE. With Three Maps, Introduction and Commentary, by C. COLBECK, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Assistant Master at Harrow School. 2s.

LE VERRE D'EAU. A Comedy, by SCRIBE. With a Biographical Memoir, and Grammatical, Literary and Historical Notes. By the same Editor.

"It may be national prejudice, but we consider this edition far superior to any of the series which hitherto have been edited exclusively by foreigners. Mr Colbeck seems better to understand the wants and difficulties of an English boy. The etymological notes especially are admirable. . . . The historical notes and introduction are a piece of thorough honest work."—*Journal of Education*.

HISTOIRE DU SIÈCLE DE LOUIS XIV PAR VOLTAIRE. Part I. Chaps. I.—XIII. Edited with Notes Philological and Historical, Biographical and Geographical Indices, etc. by GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A. Univ. Gallic., Officier d'Académie, Assistant Master of Harrow School, and G. W. PROTHERO, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. 2s. 6d.

"Messrs Masson and Prothero have, to judge from the first part of their work, performed with much discretion and care the task of editing Voltaire's *Siècle de Louis XIV* for the 'Pitt Press Series.' Besides the usual kind of notes, the editors have in this case, influenced by Voltaire's 'summary way of treating much of the history,' given a good deal of historical information, in which they have, we think, done well. At the beginning of the book will be found excellent and succinct accounts of the constitution of the French army and Parliament at the period treated of."—*Saturday Review*.

— Part II. Chaps. XIV.—XXIV. With Three Maps of the Period. By the same Editors. 2s. 6d.

— Part III. Chap. XXV. to the end. By the same Editors. 2s. 6d.

M. DARU, par M. C. A. SAINTE-BEUVE, (Causeries du Lundi, Vol. IX.). With Biographical Sketch of the Author, and Notes Philological and Historical. By GUSTAVE MASSON. 2s.

LA SUITE DU MENTEUR. A Comedy in Five Acts, by P. CORNEILLE. Edited with Fontenelle's Memoir of the Author, Voltaire's Critical Remarks, and Notes Philological and Historical. By GUSTAVE MASSON. 2s.

LA JEUNE SIBÉRIENNE. LE LÉPREUX DE LA CITÉ D'AOSTE. Tales by COUNT XAVIER DE MAISTRE. With Biographical Notice, Critical Appreciations, and Notes. By G. MASSON. 2s.

LE DIRECTOIRE. (Considérations sur la Révolution Française. Troisième et quatrième parties.) Par MADAME LA BARONNE DE STAËL-HOLSTEIN. With a Critical Notice of the Author, a Chronological Table, and Notes Historical and Philological, by G. MASSON, B.A., and G. W. PROTHERO, M.A. Revised and enlarged Edition. 2s.

"Prussia under Frederick the Great, and France under the Directory, bring us face to face respectively with periods of history which it is right should be known thoroughly, and which are well treated in the Pitt Press volumes. The latter in particular, an extract from the world-known work of Madame de Staël on the French Revolution, is beyond all praise for the excellence both of its style and of its matter."—*Times*.

DIX ANNÉES D'ÉXIL. LIVRE II. CHAPITRES I—8. Par MADAME LA BARONNE DE STAËL-HOLSTEIN. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author, a Selection of Poetical Fragments by Madame de Staël's Contemporaries, and Notes Historical and Philological. By GUSTAVE MASSON and G. W. PROTHERO, M.A. Revised and enlarged edition. 2s.

FRÉDÉGONDE ET BRUNEHAUT. A Tragedy in Five Acts, by N. LEMERCIER. Edited with Notes, Genealogical and Chronological Tables, a Critical Introduction and a Biographical Notice. By GUSTAVE MASSON. 2s.

LE VIEUX CÉLIBATAIRE. A Comedy, by COLLIN D'HARLEVILLE. With a Biographical Memoir, and Grammatical, Literary and Historical Notes. By the same Editor. 2s.

"M. Masson is doing good work in introducing learners to some of the less-known French play-writers. The arguments are admirably clear, and the notes are not too abundant."—*Academy*.

LA MÉTROMANIE, A Comedy, by PIRON, with a Biographical Memoir, and Grammatical, Literary and Historical Notes. By the same Editor. 2s.

LASCARIS, OU LES GRECS DU XV^E. SIÈCLE, Nouvelle Historique, par A. F. VILLEMAM, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author, a Selection of Poems on Greece, and Notes Historical and Philological. By the same Editor. 2s.

LETTRES SUR L'HISTOIRE DE FRANCE (XIII—XXIV.). Par AUGUSTIN THIERRY. By GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A. and G. W. PROTHERO, M.A. With Map. 2s. 6d.

IV. GERMAN.

DIE KARAVANE von WILHELM HAUFF. Edited with Notes by A. SCHLOTTMANN, Ph. D. 3s. 6d.

CULTURGESCHICHTLICHE NOVELLEN, von W. H. RIEHL, with Grammatical, Philological, and Historical Notes, and a Complete Index, by H. J. WOLSTENHOLME, B.A. (Lond.). 4s. 6d.

ERNST, HERZOG VON SCHWABEN. UHLAND. With Introduction and Notes. By H. J. WOLSTENHOLME, B.A. (Lond.), Lecturer in German at Newnham College, Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

ZOPF UND SCHWERT. Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen von KARL GUTZKOW. With a Biographical and Historical Introduction, English Notes, and an Index. By the same Editor. 3s. 6d.

"We are glad to be able to notice a careful edition of K. Gutzkow's amusing comedy 'Zopf und Schwert' by Mr H. J. Wolstenholme. . . . These notes are abundant and contain references to standard grammatical works."—*Academy*.

Goethe's Knabenjahre. (1749—1759.) GOETHE'S BOYHOOD: being the First Three Books of his Autobiography. Arranged and Annotated by WILHELM WAGNER, Ph. D., late Professor at the Johanneum, Hamburg. 2s.

HAUFF. DAS WIRTHSHAUS IM SPESSART. Edited by A. SCHLOTTMANN, Ph. D., late Assistant Master at Uppingham School. 3s. 6d.

DER OBERHOF. A Tale of Westphalian Life, by KARL IMMERMANN. With a Life of Immermann and English Notes, by WILHELM WAGNER, Ph. D., late Professor at the Johanneum, Hamburg. 3s.

A BOOK OF GERMAN DACTYLIC POETRY. Arranged and Annotated by the same Editor. 3s.

Der erste Kreuzzug (THE FIRST CRUSADE), by FRIEDRICH VON RAUMER. Condensed from the Author's 'History of the Hohenstaufen', with a life of RAUMER, two Plans and English Notes. By the same Editor. 2s.

"Certainly no more interesting book could be made the subject of examinations. The story of the First Crusade has an undying interest. The notes are, on the whole, good."—*Educational Times*.

A BOOK OF BALLADS ON GERMAN HISTORY. Arranged and Annotated by the same Editor. 2s.

"It carries the reader rapidly through some of the most important incidents connected with the German race and name, from the invasion of Italy by the Visigoths under their King Alaric, down to the Franco-German War and the installation of the present Emperor. The notes supply very well the connecting links between the successive periods, and exhibit in its various phases of growth and progress, or the reverse, the vast unwieldy mass which constitutes modern Germany."—*Times*.

DER STAAT FRIEDRICH'S DES GROSSEN. By G. FREYTAG. With Notes. By the same Editor. 2s.

"Prussia under Frederick the Great, and France under the Directory, bring us face to face respectively with periods of history which it is right should be known thoroughly, and which are well treated in the Pitt Press volumes."—*Times*.

GOETHE'S HERMANN AND DOROTHEA. With an Introduction and Notes. By the same Editor. Revised edition by J. W. CARTMELL, M.A. 3s. 6d.

"The notes are among the best that we know, with the reservation that they are often too abundant."—*Academy*.

Das Jahr 1813 (THE YEAR 1813), by F. KOHLRAUSCH. With English Notes. By W. WAGNER. 2s.

V. ENGLISH.

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TEACHING. By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A., Head Master of Uppingham School, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. New Edition. 4s. 6d.

"Any attempt to summarize the contents of the volume would fail to give our readers a taste of the pleasure that its perusal has given us."—*Journal of Education*.

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS, Bishop of the Moravians. His Life and Educational Works, by S. S. LAURIE, A.M., F.R.S.E., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. Second Edition, revised. 3s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF ARISTOTLE. Compiled by EDWIN WALLACE, M.A., LL.D. (St Andrews), late Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. Third Edition Enlarged. 4s. 6d.

"A judicious selection of characteristic passages, arranged in paragraphs, each of which is preceded by a masterly and perspicuous English analysis."—*Scotsman*.

"Gives in a comparatively small compass a very good sketch of Aristotle's teaching."—*Sat. Review*.

THREE LECTURES ON THE PRACTICE OF EDUCATION. Delivered in the University of Cambridge in the Easter Term, 1882, under the direction of the Teachers' Training Syndicate. 2s.

London: C. F. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

GENERAL AIMS OF THE TEACHER, AND FORM MANAGEMENT. Two Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge in the Lent Term, 1883, by F. W. FARRAR, D.D. Archdeacon of Westminster, and R. B. POOLE, B.D. Head Master of Bedford Modern School. 1s. 6d.

MILTON'S TRACTATE ON EDUCATION. A facsimile reprint from the Edition of 1673. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer. 2s.

"A separate reprint of Milton's famous letter to Master Samuel Hartlib was a desideratum, and we are grateful to Mr Browning for his elegant and scholarly edition, to which is prefixed the careful *résumé* of the work given in his 'History of Educational Theories.'—*Journal of Education*.

LOCKE ON EDUCATION. With Introduction and Notes by the Rev. R. H. QUICK, M.A. 3s. 6d.

"The work before us leaves nothing to be desired. It is of convenient form and reasonable price, accurately printed, and accompanied by notes which are admirable. There is no teacher too young to find this book interesting; there is no teacher too old to find it profitable."—*The School Bulletin, New York*.

THE TWO NOBLE KINSMEN, edited with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. Professor SKEAT, M.A., formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. 3s. 6d.

"This edition of a play that is well worth study, for more reasons than one, by so careful a scholar as Mr Skeat, deserves a hearty welcome."—*Athenæum*.

"Mr Skeat is a conscientious editor, and has left no difficulty unexplained."—*Times*.

BACON'S HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY VII. With Notes by the Rev. J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity; late Fellow of St Catharine's College. 3s.

SIR THOMAS MORE'S UTOPIA. With Notes by the Rev. J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D. 3s. 6d.

"To Dr Lumby we must give praise unqualified and unstinted. He has done his work admirably. . . . Every student of history, every politician, every social reformer, every one interested in literary curiosities, every lover of English should buy and carefully read Dr Lumby's edition of the 'Utopia.' We are afraid to say more lest we should be thought extravagant, and our recommendation accordingly lose part of its force."—*The Teacher*.

"It was originally written in Latin and does not find a place on ordinary bookshelves. A very great boon has therefore been conferred on the general English reader by the managers of the *Pitt Press Series*, in the issue of a convenient little volume of *More's Utopia* not in the original Latin, but in the quaint *English Translation thereof made by Raphe Robynson*, which adds a linguistic interest to the intrinsic merit of the work. . . . All this has been edited in a most complete and scholarly fashion by Dr J. R. Lumby, the Norrisian Professor of Divinity, whose name alone is a sufficient warrant for its accuracy. It is a real addition to the modern stock of classical English literature."—*Guardian*.

MORE'S HISTORY OF KING RICHARD III. Edited with Notes, Glossary and Index of Names. By J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D. Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; to which is added the conclusion of the History of King Richard III. as given in the continuation of Hardyng's Chronicle, London, 1543. 3s. 6d.

A SKETCH OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY FROM THALES TO CICERO, by JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A., late Professor of Moral Philosophy at King's College, London. 3s. 6d.

"Professor Mayor contributes to the Pitt Press Series *A Sketch of Ancient Philosophy* in which he has endeavoured to give a general view of the philosophical systems illustrated by the genius of the masters of metaphysical and ethical science from Thales to Cicero. In the course of his sketch he takes occasion to give concise analyses of Plato's Republic, and of the Ethics and Politics of Aristotle; and these abstracts will be to some readers not the least useful portions of the book."—*The Guardian*.

[Other Volumes are in preparation.]

London: C. J. CLAY & SON, Cambridge University Press Warehouse,
Ave Maria Lane.

University of Cambridge.

LOCAL EXAMINATIONS.

Examination Papers, for various years, with the *Regulations for the Examination*. Demy 8vo. 2s. each, or by Post, 2s. 2d.

Class Lists, for various years, Boys 1s., Girls 6d.

Annual Reports of the Syndicate, with Supplementary Tables showing the success and failure of the Candidates. 2s. each, by Post 2s. 3d.

HIGHER LOCAL EXAMINATIONS.

Examination Papers for various years, to which are added the *Regulations for the Examination*. Demy 8vo. 2s. each, by Post 2s. 2d.

Class Lists, for various years. 1s. By post, 1s. 2d.

Reports of the Syndicate. Demy 8vo. 1s., by Post 1s. 2d.

LOCAL LECTURES SYNDICATE.

Calendar for the years 1875—9. Fcap. 8vo. cloth. 2s.; for 1875—80. 2s.; for 1880—81. 1s.

TEACHERS' TRAINING SYNDICATE.

Examination Papers for various years, to which are added the *Regulations for the Examination*. Demy 8vo. 6d., by Post 7d.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER.

Published by Authority.

Containing all the Official Notices of the University, Reports of Discussions in the Schools, and Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical, Antiquarian, and Philological Societies. 3d. weekly.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION PAPERS.

These Papers are published in occasional numbers every Term, and in volumes for the Academical year.

VOL. XII. Parts 160 to 176. PAPERS for the Year 1882—83, 15s. cloth.

VOL. XIII. „ 177 to 195. „ „ 1883—84, 15s. cloth.

Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examinations.

Papers set in the Examination for Certificates, July, 1882. 1s. 6d.

List of Candidates who obtained Certificates at the Examinations held in 1883 and 1884; and Supplementary Tables. 6d.

Regulations of the Board for 1885. 9d.

Report of the Board for the year ending Oct. 31, 1884. 1s.

Studies from the Morphological Laboratory in the University of Cambridge. Edited by ADAM SEDGWICK, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. II. Part I. Royal 8vo. 10s.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SON,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.



