

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

ELUCIDATIONS

OF

DR. HAMPDEN'S

THEOLOGICAL STATEMENTS.



OXFORD,

PRINTED BY W. BAXTER.

SOLD BY J. H. PARKER ; AND BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON,
LONDON.

1836.

ELUCIDATIONS,

&c.

It may be fairly asked of any resident of this place, who at this time directs attention to Dr. Hampden's works, why he has not done so in the considerable interval which has elapsed since their publication. The present writer's plain answer to this demand would be, that he had hoped to have been spared the necessity of an invidious task which pertained more to others than to himself; to those who were less connected by College ties with the Author in question. He felt that he had no call of office or station that way, and that he could not put himself forward without an apology for so doing. Even now he cannot persuade himself to put his name in the title-page, though he makes no secret of it to those who choose to enquire.

At the present juncture, many persons are asking each other, and trying to determine for themselves, what the theological views of Dr. Hampden precisely are. It is much to be regretted they did not turn their thoughts to this matter sooner, especially considering the call made on them last Spring to do so.

The omission, however, must be attributed, in addition to other causes, to the particular form and character of his Lectures, and the condensed and abstract style which their extent of subject may have rendered necessary.

The consideration of these peculiarities has given rise to the following pages, in which it is not attempted to contravene any of Dr. Hampden's positions, but to exhibit them, as far as he has stated them, and that with as much fairness as may be attainable by one who has his own opinion about them. This attempt may perchance assist the judgments of those who are in doubt as to his doctrines, and may explain the earnestness of those who condemn them.

1. *Concerning Doctrinal Truths.*

HERE first it is necessary to explain Dr. H.'s views concerning Theological Statements.

He considers that the only belief necessary for a Christian, as such, is belief that the Scripture is the word of God; that no statement whatever, even though correctly deduced from the text of Scripture, is part of the revelation; that no right conclusions about theological truth can be drawn from Scripture; that Scripture itself is a mere record of historical facts; that it contains no dogmatic statements, such as those about the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, Justification, &c.; that theological statements, though natural and unavoidable, are in all cases but human opinions; that even the juxtaposition of the actual sentences of Scripture, is a human deduction; that an individual is not abstractedly the worse for being a Unitarian; that it does not follow that another is worse because I should be worse for being so; that, though a deduction be correct, logical, and true, yet a denial of it must not be pronounced to be more than an error of judgment; that infinite theories may be formed about the text of Scripture, but that they ought not to be made of public importance to Christian communities, badges of fellowship, reasons for separation, and the like; that the Articles of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are merely human opinions, scholastic, allowing of change,

unwarrantable when imposed, and, in fact, the produce of a mistaken philosophy; and that the Apostles' Creed is defensible only when considered as a record of historical facts.

“1. Whilst we agree in the canon of Scripture, in the very words for the most part from which we learn what are the objects of faith, we suffer disunion to spread among us, through the various interpretations suggested by our own reasonings on the admitted facts of Scripture. We introduce theories of the Divine Being and attributes, theories of human nature and of the universe, principles drawn from the various branches of human philosophy, into the body itself of revealed wisdom.”—*Observ.* p. 7.

“In religion, properly so called, few Christians, if any—I speak of course of pious minds—really differ. All acknowledge with nearly unanimous assent, I believe, the great original facts of the Bible. . . . When I look at the reception by the Unitarians both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of divine facts the name of Christians.”—*Observ.* p. 19.

“No conclusions of human reasoning, however correctly deduced, however logically sound, are properly religious truths, or such as strictly and necessarily belong to human salvation through Christ.”—*Observ.* p. 8.

“Pious opinions, it must be observed, are not parts of revelation.”—*Observ.* p. 14.

“2. The whole revelation contained in them [our Scriptures], so far as it is revelation, consists of *matter of fact*.”—*Observ.* p. 13.

“I do not mean that no right conclusions whatever result from the truths of Scripture: but I confine the assertion to intellectual, or speculative, or theological truth, as distinct from moral.”—*Observ.* p. 12.

“ I shall only briefly touch here on a fundamental characteristic of the Christian Scriptures, which totally precludes all deduction of speculative conclusions concerning religious truth.”—*Observ.* p. 13.

“ Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are no doctrines. What we read there is matter of fact: either fact nakedly set forth as it occurred, or fact explained and elucidated by the light of inspiration cast upon it. . . . If any part of Scripture contains *doctrinal* statements, it will at any rate be supposed to be the epistolary. But even this part, if accurately considered, will not be found an exception. . . . Let the inveterate idea that the Epistles are the doctrinal portion of Scripture, be for awhile banished from the mind; . . . for my part, I cannot doubt but that the decision will be in favour of the *practical* character of them. The speculating theologian will perhaps answer by adducing text after text from an Epistle, in which he will contend that some dogmatic truth . . . is asserted. But “ what is the chaff to the wheat ? ” I appeal, from the logical criticism of the Apostle’s words to their apostolical spirit, from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching, and entreating, and persuading. And I ask, whether it is likely that an Apostle would have adopted the form of an epistolary communication for imparting mysterious propositions to disciples with whom he enjoyed the opportunity of personal intercourse; and to whom he had already “ declared the whole counsel of God ; ” whether in preaching Christ he would have used a method of communicating truth, which implies some scientific application of language, an analysis at least of propositions into their terms, in order to its being rightly understood ? ”
B. L. p. 374.

“ Pious opinions, indeed, we may form; it is hardly possible practically to avoid exercising the mind in reasoning and speculating on the given truths of Scripture. Such indeed are the doctrinal statements of our Articles. I may wish there were

less of dogmatism in them. Still I cannot but approve them for the piety that pervades them.”—*Observ.* p. 14.

“There can be no rational doubt that man is in a degraded disadvantageous condition, that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God to produce a restoration of man, that He brought life and immortality to light by His coming, that He died on the cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification, that the Holy Ghost came by his promise to abide with His Church, miraculously assisting the Apostles in the first institution of it, and ever since that period interceding with the hearts of believers. These and other truths connected with them are not collected merely from *texts* or *sentences* of Scripture, they are parts of its records. Infinite theories” [that is, it would appear, such as the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, &c.] “may be raised upon them; but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were.”—*B. L.* p. 390.

3. “Dogmas of Theology then, *as such*, are human authorities. But do I mean to say by this, that they are unimportant to religion, or that they are essentially wrong, foreign to true religion, and inconsistent with it? I wish rather to establish their importance and proper truth, as distinct from the honour and verity of the simple Divine Word.”—*B. L.* p. 375.

4. “The collection itself of scriptural expressions into one body of statement amounts to a human exposition of the doctrine. An artificial construction is given to them, which they have not in the Scripture itself,” &c.—*Observ.* p. 10.

5. “Other communions are not necessarily in error or heresy, because we hold them to be so; but viewing their opinions as erroneous, we must guard against them, as feeling that we should ourselves be heretical and profane, if we should change and adopt such opinions. For example, as believers in a real Atonement for sin, &c. Thus again to a Trinitarian, &c.”—*Vide infra.* *Observ.* p. 26.

6. "Opinions on religious matters are regarded as identical with the objects of faith; and the zeal which belongs to dissentients in the latter, is transferred to the guiltless differences of fallible judgments."—Observ. p. 7.

7. "In truth, I say, it [theological opinion] ought not to exist. Theological opinion, as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge, ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian."—Observ. p. 21.

"If I can establish this point [that no conclusions of human reasoning, however correctly deduced, are properly religious truths, &c. *vid. supra*], it will be seen in great measure how far a conscientious and zealous earnestness for "the faith once delivered to the saints" justifies our sectarian animosities and our party exclusions."—Observ. p. 18.

8. "If it be admitted that the notions on which their [the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds'] several expressions are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural; it must be remembered, that they do not impress those notions on the faith of the Christian, as matters of affirmative belief. They only use the terms of ancient theories of philosophy, theories current in the schools at the time when they were written, to exclude others *more obviously* (sic) injurious to the simplicity of the Faith."—B. L. p. 378.

"I do not presume to say that alteration is actually required. I am merely addressing myself to the general question, as to the capacity of improvement in Church Creeds and Articles, with the view of suggesting a right theory of the subject. To deny the essential variableness of such documents, is to admit an human authority to a parity with the authority of Inspiration."—B. L. p. 381.

"The Apostles' Creed states nothing but facts. The transition is immense from this to the scholastic speculations involved in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. Both these last, indeed, are logical definitions of the high subject of

which they treat, differing from each other only in point of comprehensiveness and exactness.”—B. L. p. 544.

“We then proceed to contend for these unrevealed representations of the wisdom of God, as if it were that very wisdom as it stands forth confessed in His own living oracles. ‘The wisdom that is from above’ is at once ‘pure’ and ‘gentle.’ Surely it has no resemblance to that dogmatical and sententious wisdom which theological controversy has created.”—Observ. p. 8.

Remarks on the above.

ARTICLE VI. “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.*” On the other hand, Dr. H. says, “*No conclusions of human reasoning*, however correctly deduced, . . . are properly religious truths, or such as strictly and necessarily *belong to human salvation* through Christ.”

On this Dr. H. observes, that “it by no means follows, that what can be *proved out of Scripture* must *therefore* be truth of revelation.”

He accounts for the clause in the Article, by alleging the intention of our Reformers thereby to prevent “the inroads of tradition or any human authority.”

He then urges against himself the objection, that “a truth of Scripture cannot be stated otherwise than in the form of a *conclusion* from Scripture.” He replies, that though it be expressed in Scripture language,

it is still a human exposition of the doctrine, and that he thinks the employing technical terms preferable to employing terms of Scripture. Vid. Observ. p. 8—10.

So far Dr. H. brings forward and disposes of objections to his doctrine. But there is still a desideratum in his statement. Language such as he has used, is frequent in the mouths of Socinians and others. These religionists urge, after his manner, that all doctrine is matter of opinion, varying according to the character of individual minds. We wait for him then to complete his view, and to draw the line between himself and them, lest Churchmen perchance who listen to him, turn Socinians before he is aware of their danger. He says, that it is a matter of opinion, whether a man believe in the Divinity of Christ or not. Now, supposing hearers of his were to take up with Socinianism, would he be *earnest* in reclaiming them or not? If he was earnest, which one should expect, would not this imply that he *did* think it a difference whether or not a man were a Socinian; and would he not, in the present imperfect development of his views, expose himself to the retort, “Trinitarianism, belief in the Atonement, &c., are necessary for you, but not for us: do not judge us, we can be humble-minded without them, we believe the facts of Scripture,” &c.? This is not here urged as an *objection* to his views, which are not sufficiently brought out to enable us formally to judge of them on this point, but by way of comparing them with those of others “whose theology he strongly dislikes,” and showing our claim on him for an *explanation*. A particular theory is common

to him and certain Socinians ; *where* and *how* does he part company with them ?

With a view of illustrating this point, it may be well to quote the words of one who, starting from the very theory maintained by Dr. Hampden, has recently become a convert to Socinianism. Had the writer of these pages that author's works at hand, he might quote still more apposite passages.

“ You must frequently have observed the hopelessness of the attempts which are constantly made to establish various points of Christian doctrine by logical arguments, founded on detached texts of Scripture. You must have seen regular collections of passages, selected with the utmost patience, and arranged into classes with the greatest ingenuity. Most works on controversial divinity are attempts of this kind to draw some abstract proposition as the unquestionable result of the various expressions of Scripture upon the given subject. You cannot but have observed, moreover, how short all such attempts fall of the intended object,” &c.—*Mr. Blanco White on Heresy.*

“ As we cannot approach the objective truth of such convictions [*i. e.* of things beyond the reach of our senses] beyond or out of our intellect, all our moral duties to truth, (where moral duties are concerned, as is the case with religious truths,) are due to the only truth we can reach, *i. e.* the conviction of our own minds. But it is here that the fatal mistake takes place. The pride of the religious enthusiast takes up his subjective truth as the divine objective truth itself. On other subjects, if contradiction made him angry and impatient, he would be more or less ashamed of showing it. Not so in the present case. He indulges his most violent passions under the character of zeal for God and His truth ; his natural desire of ruling over others appears in

the shape of a vehement concern in the preservation of the assent of the mass of the people to the orthodox, i. e. his own opinions. Because he is sure he is right, he positively denies that those who contradict him *can be* sure they are right, &c.”—*Mr. Blanco White, Law of Libel.*

Or take again the parallel words of Hoadley, who died indeed in the communion, nay, in the high places, of our Church, yet on the present Bishop of London’s authority^a, must be considered a Socinian.

“ Though many persons may mistake in their different apprehensions concerning the sense of these words,” [those in which the faith was once delivered,] “ yet we may be sure, *whilst we retain these words*, that we retain what *God himself has seen fit should be delivered* and transmitted to us as the best conveyance, all things considered, of the faith required of us. This I mean particularly with regard to those articles of belief which are properly Christian. . . . By contending for the faith as it was once delivered to the saints in the New Testament, we shall only press upon men the *receiving what it has pleased God to deliver*, but shall avoid a great evil of enforcing upon them the *consequences* which we ourselves see, or think we see, to follow from the doctrines first delivered. . . . The just consequences from any truth are certainly equally true with that truth from which they follow; and it is as certain that to him who sees them to follow, or thinks he sees them, they are as truths, and may justly be maintained as such. But they are not so to others who see them not in the same light. Nor can they be made necessary to be believed by others, till those others themselves discover their relation to the primitive truths of Religion.”—*Sermon on Contending for the Faith*, vol. iii. p. 714.

^a Answer to Butler, p. 31.

2. *Doctrine of the Trinity.*

As to the doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. H. holds that Scripture contains certain phenomena concerning the dealings of the Supreme Being with man, which, when compared together, are remarkable and startling, and irresistibly force upon the mind that there is *some* mystery in the divine nature; but what that mystery is, or that it is the very mystery which the catholic doctrine of the Trinity expresses, is, he considers, not revealed. The catholic doctrine is one out of the infinite theories which may be raised upon the facts of Scripture, and the Athanasian Creed is in its origin the view of a party in the church. Again: it is not scriptural or necessary to insist upon the numerical or real unity of the Supreme Being; since He is not revealed as one in Himself, but as one contrasted with the gods of polytheism. On the whole, that it is an abuse of Scripture to attempt thus to deduce a theology at all, i. e. a knowledge of God in respect of His nature, attributes, &c.

1. "One fact is clear through all this labyrinth of variations which theological creeds have exhibited; that there is some extraordinary communication concerning the Divine Being, in those Scriptural notices of God, which have called forth the curiosity of thinking men in all ages. To me it matters little what opinion on the subject has been prior, has been advocated by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most popular, most extensive in its reception. All differences

of this kind belong to the history of the human mind, as much as to theology, and affect not the broad basement of fact on which the manifold forms of speculation have taken their rise. The only ancient, only catholic truth is the scriptural fact. Let us hold that fast in its depth and breadth . . . and we can neither be Sabellians, or Tritheists, or Socinians.”—B. L. p. 149.

“Historically regarded, they [Dr. H.’s discussions] evidence the reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. But let us not identify this reality with the theories couched under a logical phraseology. I firmly and devoutly believe that word, which has declared the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our technical language is based?”—B. L. p. 150.

2. “When I look at the reception by the Unitarians both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of divine facts, the name of Christians.”—*Observ.* p. 20.

“Thus, again, to the Trinitarian, the consequences of rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity must consistently be regarded as dangerous. But he has no right to extend his anathema beyond himself to one who has unhappily not embraced the same view of Scripture truth.”—*Observ.* p. 27.

3. “It appears to me that the silence respecting the individual author” [of the Athanasian Creed] “was designed, or at least his name was forgotten, in the wish to give a higher authority to the document; and that its reception by us in its present form . . . is an evidence of the triumph of a party in the Church, thus declaring their authoritative judgment under the sanction of a name, which expressed in itself every thing hostile to Arianism.”—B. L. p. 105.

4. “No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a

real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation; and that no scheme of Unitarianism can solve the whole of the phenomena which Scripture records. But I am also as fully sensible, that there is a mystery attached to the subject, which is not a mystery of God. Take, for instance, the notion of the Divine Unity. We are apt to conceive that the Unity must be understood numerically; that we may reason from the notion of Unity to the properties of the Divine Being. But is this a just notion of the Unity of God? . . . Surely the revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity, but practically to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought out. . . . Now were this view of the revelation of the Divine Unity strictly maintained, would it not greatly abate the repugnance often felt at the admission of a Trinity in Unity? . . . To deny a Trinity would then be felt the same as to assert that, because polytheism was false, therefore no new manifestation of God, not resulting from the negation of polytheism, can be true.”—B. L. p. 146.

5. “To the Christian speculator, under such a method” [the scholastic], “these principles would of course be sought no where else but in the Divine Being himself . . . His nature and attributes, so far as they were explained by the light of reason or revealed by the illumination of Scripture, would alone present to the inquirer that immobility and eternity, and absolute priority of truth, of which he was in quest.”—B. L. p. 78.

“Its [the scholastic system’s] principles . . . were to be drawn from the nature of the Divine Being, as the only sure ground on which a divine and universal philosophy could fix its first steps.”—B. L. p. 79.

“If now we regard the Scriptures in the way of the Schoolmen, as having God for their proper subject, instead of reading them as a divine history of man, we naturally neglect the analogies of time and circumstances. The immutability

of the Divine Being, in the contemplation of whom we are then exclusively engaged, is the prevailing object of our inquiry. Our business is to collect into one theory every scattered intimation of the Divine Being and attributes. If, on the contrary, we take the nature and condition of man under Divine Providence as the great subject of our sacred books, we are as naturally led to study the facts recorded in the Scripture in their real historical place," &c.—B. L. p. 89.

"Eager to erect their theology into a philosophy of the Divine Being, they were comparatively indifferent to the humbler truths which lay in the walk of man's every-day life."—B. L. p. 93.

"The scholastic philosophy had for its basis a theoretic knowledge of the Divine Being; a knowledge of God as the highest cause of all things, the primary being in the order of the universe." [It is added in a note,] "Thus, too, not only in the decrees of the Council of Trent, but in our own Articles, the doctrines on this head occupy the first place . . . The Fathers of the Church of England, even in shaking off the spiritual bonds of Rome, were tacitly influenced by the discipline in which their minds had been trained."—B. L. p. 99.

Remarks on the above.

It will be seen from the foregoing passages that Dr. H. considers the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by himself, to be but one out of the infinite theories which might be formed from the facts of the Scripture revelation. Now it is not here denied that men of subtle minds may be able to combine this scepticism of the intellect with devotion of the heart to the Ever-Blessed Trinity; but will men of common understand-

ings, if provided with no explanation or limitation of this view, be able to say in faith, “ O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, three Persons, one God, have mercy, &c ?” or “ To whom [Christ] with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be &c ?” or “ Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith ; which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly : *and the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity ?*” Here then we demand some *explanation* for the sake of Dr. H.’s hearers and readers.

Let it not be thought invidious, if recourse is again had to the writings of professed Socinians, by way of illustrating the unguarded nature of Dr. H.’s statements. It is not at all hereby insinuated that he himself agrees with them in their peculiar errors ; but it is necessary that a Christian University should have some safeguard against Socinians sheltering themselves behind, and using the authority of, Dr. H., which in the present state of his published teaching they might well do, were they inclined,—a safeguard, on the other hand, lest unlearned hearers, unintentionally, and from the fulness of their confidence in Dr. H., find themselves precipitated into the depths of that heresy which Antiquity calls “ a god-denying apostasy.”

The author already quoted, in a work published before he discovered his own Socinianism, introduces a pattern character speaking thus on his death-bed. “ I believe in God the Creator of this world as my Father. I believe his *moral character* (for in regard to

his relations to man I cannot find a better expression) to be that which Jesus Christ his *Son in the sublimest sense*, has revealed to the world. I also believe in his 'Spirit' which helpeth our infirmities; for 'it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure;' not to save us from working, but to aid us in working out our salvation with fear and trembling." *Second Travels of Irish Gentleman*, vol. ii. p. 206.

This author has since confessed, that at the time of writing this he was really a Unitarian or Socinian, though he had not yet brought home the fact to himself. Now, on recurring to the extract above quoted, p. 8, beginning, "There can be no rational doubt," &c., is it not plain that we have a right to demand from Dr. H. some line of separation between him and the above-cited author^a? The quotations from Dr. Hampden, under the following head, give additional reason for this demand.

^a The clause "died on the cross for our sins," &c. will be noticed presently.

3. *Doctrine of the Incarnation.*

Dr. Hampden conceives, that the orthodox doctrine on this subject is grounded on a confused philosophy ; that a chief excellence of that particular theory lies in its consistency ; on the other hand, that the Unitarian is as dogmatic as the orthodox believer ; that in this lies his essential fault ; that, as such, he is morally wrong, not in that he holds Christ to be a mere man, but because he makes any opinion at all on the subject a reason of separation.

“ The discussions on the Incarnation were, in like manner, partly physical, partly logical. It was attempted to be explained, in what way the Son might be said to be generated of the Father ; whether out of the substance of God, or out of a common divinity, of which each participates, or by division of the Paternal substance, as a portion severed from the Father ; whether further, He is the Son of God by nature, or necessity, or will, or predestination, or adoption. The confusion of principles of different sciences in these promiscuous inquiries is sufficiently apparent. But it was by such a philosophy that the orthodox language was settled, declaring the Son begotten, before all worlds, of *one substance* (sic) with the Father.”—B. L. p. 137.

“ The excellence of the orthodox theory, we may observe, consisted in its excluding from that definition all ideas imported from the physical speculations, and reducing it to perfect consistency with the original theory of the Divine Procession. It brought the inquirer back to the point from which he set out, to acknowledge the simple divine personality

of the Saviour, that he was the Word made flesh.”—B. L. p. 139.

“ In the theory of the Incarnation, certain distinctions in Christ were the data ; and the problem was to find a common idea in which they should agree.”—B. L. p. 479.

“ I would take the extreme case of the Unitarians : I would say to them ; Why do you take so much pains to convince the world, that you do not agree with the mass of professing Christians in believing in the same sense, “ one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God, and Father of all ? Is it not, that you identify your religion with your dogmas, that you transfer the natural partiality of your own minds for certain principles to the broad outlines of Scripture truth, and dissent from your brethren in the faith, because they will not assent to your metaphysical conclusions ? For when I look at the reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those, who acknowledge this basis of divine facts, the name of Christians. I allude to the case of the Unitarian more particularly, because in the ordinary view, he is regarded as more liberal, as less exclusive in his creed, than members of other Christian communions. And I wish it to be considered whether he is not, on the other hand, as dogmatic as any other religionist ; perhaps the most so of all, so far as he insists, beyond all others, on applying a positive sense to passages and expressions, which revelation leaves in the darkness of the clouds surrounding the Divine Presence. Putting him, however, on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh with himself, whether it is not *theological dogmatism*, and not *religious belief* properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent. But I am not intending to condemn him more than other Christians, on this ground ; I select his case, by way of illustration, as an extreme one.

The principle itself is the common fault of us all. In all communions it works its mischief; and without accusing individuals, I propose only to accuse the principle itself, the confusion of theological conclusions and opinions with religion, with a view to its correction by us all.”—*Observ.* p. 19.

4. *Doctrine of the Atonement.*

Dr. Hampden considers that the term Atonement, in its true practical sense, expresses a certain phenomenon in human nature, viz. that it cannot be at peace without the consciousness of Atonement made for its sins; that to this phenomenon of our nature's remorse at its own sin, Scripture opposes a parallel fact, the perfect righteousness of Christ, which it connects with our unrighteousness, and hence Christ is emphatically called our Atonement; that Atonement in a wider sense expresses the general law of Divine Providence under which this instance of God sending His Son falls, which is also called Mediation; but that in Scripture it means nothing but the simple history of Christ's mercy, and we must not theorize upon it; that it does not imply any changing of God's purpose towards man in consequence; that it was converted by Scholasticism into the philosophy of expiation, which depressed the mind, or into a theory of commutation; that it is a real Atonement; that we must not suppose that another may not be humbleminded who disbelieves it, merely because such would be our case.—Perhaps it is impossible to do justice to Dr. Hampden's meaning under this head in any words but his own.

“ In collecting the truth from observations on the natural world, our business is to search and hunt out *what is the fact*, (sic) . . . but in learning the truth of God from

Scripture, we have the facts laid before us; they are entirely out of the reach of our investigation, and are at once by the word of the Spirit mercifully stated to us, in forms of expression calculated to impress them on our hearts, and enforce them on our belief and conduct. For instance, the great fact that God sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world that the world by him should be saved, what powers of investigation, however clear-sighted or however lofty, could ever have discovered? Reason may surmise the truth, so far as it is included in a general law of Divine Providence, expressed under the term mediation or atonement, of which it is a transcendent instance. But this is not to reach the fact itself. The necessity, then, of the case clearly requires, that the facts of which our scriptural information consists shall be fully made known to us, so far as it is necessary for us to *know* them, by the page itself of Scripture. This evidently is that blessing of Christianity to the poor. It appeals to no philosophical powers for the estimate of its simple facts," &c.—*Observ.* p. 17.

“It is to be remarked, however, how strongly the inefficacy of repentance to wipe away guilt, and restore the sinner to his lost state, has impressed the minds of those who have thought on human nature with any depth of philosophy. It is of little purpose to urge the natural placability of the Divine Being, his mercy, his willingness to receive the penitent. God no doubt is abundantly placable, merciful, and forgiving; still the fact remains. The heart seeks for reparation and satisfaction; its longings are that its sins may be no more remembered, that the characters in which it is written may be blotted out. Hence the congeniality to its feelings of the notion of atonement. The fact is, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of atonement made. The word atonement, in its true practical sense, expresses this indisputable fact. . . . This material and invincible difficulty of the case, the Scripture revelation has met with a parallel fact.

It has said, we have no hope in ourselves; that looking to ourselves we cannot expect happiness; and at the same time has fixed our attention on a Holy One, who did no sin, whose perfect righteousness it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose strength it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically said to be our atonement; not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our *own hearts* may not condemn us.”—B. L. p. 251.

“The bane of this philosophy of expiation was, not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it depressed the power of man too low. The ecclesiastical power stood between the heart and heaven; atonement was converted into a theory of commutation,” &c.—B. L. p. 253.

“Other communions are not necessarily in error or heresy, because we hold them to be so; but viewing their opinions as erroneous, we must guard against them, as feeling that we should ourselves be heretical and profane, if we should change and adopt such opinions. For example, as believers in a real Atonement for sin, we may justly feel shocked at the thought which imputes any merit to man, and regard, as a sinful pride in ourselves, the absence of that self-abasement in the sight of God, which is peculiarly impressed on us by this holy truth. But we must not conclude of another, who shuts out of his creed this cardinal doctrine, that he must therefore be proud and self-righteous; for, with all his heterodoxy of language, he *may* be more humble in spirit than many who are more dogmatically correct in their enunciation of the doctrine.”—Observ. p. 26.

Remarks on the above.

Article II. says, that Christ “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 the actual sins of men." But Dr. H. says, "Christ is emphatically said to be our atonement, *not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man* by what Christ has done ; but that we *may know that we* have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our own *hearts* may not condemn us." His view of Christ's sacrifice is, that, since we have by nature a keen sense of guilt, and will not believe that God loves us till we see some token of His love, He sent His Son into the world as such a token, to live and die as a man for our sakes ; and this is a proof and pledge to us of His love, but nothing more. In no sense is His death revealed as an expiation made towards God the Father, an appeasing of His wrath, &c. Now, if this is Dr. H.'s meaning, I ask, *in what sense* does he understand the words of the Article above quoted ? If according to their natural construction, then I ask, *in what sense* does he understand his own words which follow them ? Dr. H.'s readers have a claim on him for an explanation.

But this is not all ; for here again, by a great infelicity, Dr. H. has expressed himself after the manner of Socinus and his school. The extracts which follow from their writings are made, not for an instant with a view of implying that Dr. H. himself agrees with them, but to show that any one who did not know of his published assurances to the contrary, would have a right to consider that Dr. H. did agree with those misbelievers in a capital article of their misbelief.

Let us first turn to F. Socinus's Disputation De Jesu Christo Servatore, part i. ch. viii.

“ We are then reconciled to God through Christ; God exhorting us, through him and his representatives the Apostles, to be willing to be reconciled to him, and offering us freely pardon of our sins: but not Christ making Him propitious towards us, and paying to Him our debts.”

Vide also Crellius in answer to Grotius de Satisfactione Christi, cap. vii.^b

The following passage is from Slichtingius's comment on the Romans.

“ *We are reconciled to God; viz. by God Himself, who has reconciled us unto Himself, that is, has converted to Himself us who were in mind and works without any cause, nay, after the experience of numberless benefits, averse to Him; has altogether extinguished in our minds the hatred of Him; and instead has kindled a most fervent love for Him, by the death of His Son, viz. in the act of giving Him up to death for our sins, &c. . . . We see in this passage, [2 Cor. v. 19—21.] that Christ died not while God was angry and at enmity with the world, but the world with God; therefore the death of Christ did not effect the reconciliation of God to the world, but that of the world to God^c.*”

^a “ Reconciliati igitur sumus Deo per Christum, Deo per ipsum, et per ejus vicarios Apostolos hortante, ut sibi reconciliari velimus, delictorumque veniam nobis ultro offerente: non autem Christo illum nobis placante, et illi debita nostra persolvente.” Biblioth. Fratr. Polon. vol. ii, p. 138.

^b Ibid. vol. v. p. 146.

^c “ *Reconciliati sumus Deo.* Nempe ab ipso Deo, qui nos sibi reconciliavit, id est animo et factis sine ullâ causâ à se aversos, imo innumeris beneficiis affectos, ad se convertit, odium sui in animis nostris penitus extinxit, amorem vero sui ardentissimum accendit per mortem Filii sui, dum scilicet illum in mortem pro peccatis nostris tradit, &c. . . . Videmus hic non

What makes this coincidence the more unfortunate is, that it is Dr. H.'s practice in writing, too frequently to omit any clear allusion to the *death* of Christ as our Redeemer even in such formal statements of doctrine as ought to contain it. *E. g.*

“ [Scripture] has fixed our attention on a Holy One, who did no sin, whose perfect *righteousness* it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose *strength* it has brought to the evil of our weakness.”—B. L. p. 252.

Again :

“ Take the truth simply, and what does it mean, but that God is infinitely just and merciful, visiting iniquities to the third and fourth generation, and yet showing mercy to thousands; that we cannot please Him by our works, or our sacrifices, or our prayers, but yet we can *do all* things, by Christ strengthening us, *working for us, offering Himself for us, praying for us.*”—B L. p. 254.

Here is doubtless a much stronger wording than in the former extract, still it is a very guarded and reserved statement of the doctrine of the Atonement, as must be admitted. He uses many phrases, but the notion of Christ's cross, passion, death, or the like, does not occur. What can be the meaning of this? Is it done on purpose? Dr. H. is not here accused of this, but hearers and readers who do not know him, will be sure so to interpret his silence. What will be the effect of this upon others? Is it not

Deum mundo, sed mundum Deo fuisse iufensum et inimicum cum Christus moreretur, proinde per mortem Christi non id esse actum, ut Deus mundo, sed ut mundus Deo reconciliaretur.” Ibid. vol. vi. p. 201.

by such suppression on the part of teachers, that unbelief or half-belief is mainly propagated? Is not Locke claimed as a Socinian upon less grounds?

Again :

“ There can be no rational doubt that man is in a degraded disadvantageous condition, that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God, to produce a restoration of man, that He brought life and immortality to light by His coming, *that He died on the cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification, &c.*”—B. L. p. 390.

Here is every thing we can desire, that is, *in our sense of the words*, for they are from Scripture ; but let it be observed, it is nothing more than what a Socinian would say, as admitting the canonical authority of St. Paul's Epistles. It will be asked, “ What can one desire more ? ” Just thus much more ; proof which we may show to the whole world, not for our own satisfaction, that Dr. H. says something more than a Socinian ; proof that he attaches some definite sense to Scripture, and that that is the Church's sense. People at a distance cannot be the better for our private knowledge of him in Oxford.

Once more :

“ The great fact, that God sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world, *that the world by Him should be saved*, what powers of investigation, however clear sighted, or however lofty, could ever have discovered? Reason may surmise the truth, so far as it is included in a general law of Divine Providence, expressed under the term Mediation or *Atonement*, of which it is a transcendent instance.”—Observ. p. 18.

This extract admits of several remarks. First, let it be observed, that the Atonement is called a *law* of Divine Providence, under which Christ's coming falls. Next, it is synonymous with *Mediation*. And further it is interpreted to be "God's sending His Son into the world, that the *world by Him should be saved.*" Vague all of it, and in Scripture language. It is the kindest thing to say of such a passage, that it is very loosely and inaccurately worded. An unfair person, or a stranger, would not doubt of its accuracy, but impute a worse defect.

5. *The Sacraments.*

Dr. Hampden does not deny that a blessing is *connected* with the reception of the Sacraments, (whether as a condition, or an act of obedience, he does not explain ;) but he denies that they are channels and instruments of Divine grace. What he chiefly opposes is, what is commonly called their mystical influence, i. e. a virtue parallel to physical efficiency in visible things, but belonging to an order of things, and directed by laws, about which we know nothing. He denies that the baptismal water is the medium in God's hand of cleansing the soul, considering the notion to have arisen from the belief in magic, prevalent in the first ages of the Church. He holds the same of the Holy Eucharist, and states the received doctrine to have been derived from the same source as that of the remaining five Sacraments adopted by the Church of Rome.

“ The theory of the Sacraments, on which I now enter, proceeds on the same view of human salvation. It is an account of the application of the Passion of Christ to the healing of the soul, a collection of remedial measures by which its languors and infirmities may be relieved and strengthened. The Incarnation of Christ is regarded as the primary efficient cause of health to the soul: dispensed by the several Sacraments as the instrumental and secondary causes. As the Incarnation itself was an union of the Divine Word with human nature, so the Sacraments, according to the theoretic view of the Scholastic philosophy, were mystical

unions of words with sensible things, by which the real presence of Christ was both signified and applied to the soul of man, the visible channels through which virtue was conveyed from Christ himself to his mystical body, the Church. . . . Theologians have not been content to rest on the simple fact of the Divine Ordinance, appointing certain external rites as essential parts of Divine Service on the part of man, available to the blessing of the receiver; but they have treated the Sacraments as effusions of the virtue of Christ, physically quickening and strengthening the soul, in a manner analogous to the invigoration of the body by salutary medicine.”—B. L. p. 311.

“The general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence. The maxim of Augustine, “Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum,” appears to be in fact an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms to the subject of religion. The miracles themselves, indeed, of our Saviour were supposed to act in this manner, even by those who did not impute them to the agency of evil. His word or His touch was sought for by persons acknowledging in faith the reality of his mission. . . . Our Saviour, whose condescension was shown even to the prejudices of his faithful followers, often accompanied the working of his miracles with significant actions. In the instance of the woman, indeed, . . . He is described as having perceived that some one had touched Him, by the fact that *virtue* had gone out of Him; a mode of speaking, characteristic of the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another.”—B. L. p. 315.

“The definition, indeed, given in the Catechism of the Church of England, is exactly what the Scholastic theory suggests; so far, at least, as the language of it characterizes the nature of a sacrament. It is in the subsequen

application of this definition, that the Church of England has modified and improved on the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine, whilst the idea itself is preserved, as being part of the very texture of technical theology.”—B. L. p. 313.

“It is a real and true presence which he [Ratramm] asserts; the virtue of Christ acting in the way of efficacious assistance to the receiver of the Sacrament. The Church of England doctrine of the Sacrament, it is well known, is founded on the views given by this author.”—B. L. p. 320.

Remarks on the above.

This head may be dismissed with the following quotations from our formularies.

ARTICLE XXV.—“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 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.”

“*In such* only as worthily receive the same, they *have a wholesome effect or operation.*”

ARTICLE XXVIII.—“The body of Christ is *given, taken, and eaten* in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.”

BAPTISMAL SERVICE.—“Ye have brought this child here to be *baptized*. Ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, *to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost*, to give him the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life,” &c.

“Almighty, everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, *did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood . . . sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.*”

CATECHISM.—“ What are the *benefits* whereof we are partakers thereby [by the Lord's Supper]? The *strengthening and refreshing* of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.”

COMMUNION SERVICE.—“ Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that *our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body*, and our souls washed through his most precious blood.”

6. *Doctrine of Original Sin.*

The following is Dr. H.'s comment upon the 9th Article, the Latin text of which is here subjoined :—
 “Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium, et depravatio naturæ, cujuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati: qua fit, ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet; ad malum suâ naturâ propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat, unde in unoquoque nascentium iram Dei atque damnationem meretur.”

“Original Sin, accordingly, is always defined by the Schoolmen in negative terms, as a want of original justice, “carentia justitiæ originalis;” or an inordinateness of the desires; or, as in our 9th Article, a fault and depravation of nature, “vitium ac depravatio naturæ.” The last indeed *is the most truly technical description of it*; expressing, accurately, the peculiarity of the *theory*, on which the doctrinal statement of original sin has been founded.”

“This *theory* of the evil of the world involved also other theories of the same logical philosophy. . . . This occasioned the introduction of the term *propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. And the *theory*, as thus stated, would be the logical correspondent to the doctrine of grace. . . . The Pelagians, however, were not satisfied with this account of the matter. Admitting that evil existed in the world, and that the transgression of Adam had been injurious to his posterity, *they still denied its transmission in the way of an hereditary*

taint. . . . He [Pelagius] contended . . . that the first sin was hurtful to the human race not by *propagation*, but by *example*. . . . Though the language of the Pelagians did not adequately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice; *we must allow, I think, that their grounds were right, so far as they attempted to give a moral account of the fact; and that their opponents were wrong, so far as they attempted to give a physical or material account of it.*—B. L. p. 221.

“It is probable then that Pelagius and Celestius intended only to oppose this *material theory*; and to explain the fact of human sinfulness, as I have said, on moral grounds. *In the fact itself, as appears, they did not differ from the orthodox: so far that they were acquitted of heresy both at Rome and at Jerusalem. But the acute logic of the African divines traced their explanations to the consequences; and their influence was interposed to maintain the uniformity of doctrine in the Church.*”—B. L. p. 230.

7. *Doctrine concerning the Soul.*

“This notion of the *separate existence of the soul* has so incorporated itself with Christian Theology, that we are apt at this day to regard a belief in it as essential to orthodox doctrine. Even in maintaining that such a belief is not essential to Christianity, I may incur the appearance of impugning a vital truth of religion. *I cannot however help viewing this popular belief as a remnant of scholasticism.* I feel assured that the truth of the Resurrection does not depend on such an assumption; that the life and immortality of man, as resting on Christ raised from the dead, is a certain fact in the course of Divine Providence; whatever may be the theories of the soul, and of its connexion with the body.”—B. L. p. 310.

8. *Doctrine of Morals.*

To enter into Dr. Hampden's view of Moral Philosophy would be beside the purpose of these pages, were it not that he introduces the subject into his Bampton Lectures. It may then be briefly observed, that he considers the science of morals to be in itself as independent of religion as physics; that it is conversant with certain laws of the human mind; that these rest ultimately upon *fact*; that a man may fulfil the moral law without religion; that religion has reference only to one part of our functions as men; that, if cultivated by itself, it will injuriously engross the whole man; that it is a comfort and enjoyment, but must not be made every thing; that it induces resignation, abstraction, indolence, and requires moral philosophy as its counterpoise.

“It will, I think, appear, that 'Theology and Ethics are entirely distinct in their nature; in the principles, I mean, on which they are based.'—B. L. p. 264.

“The term obligation is a religious one; introduced into morality by that peculiar connexion, which the speculative Theology of the Schools established, between religion and morality.”—B. L. p. 297.

“Morality then, it should be observed, is the science of our own internal nature. It ascertains all those principles by which we are actuated in our sentiments and conduct, and establishes the general law in which they all agree. Its office is throughout one of discovery.”—B. L. p. 299.

“ So independent is the science of Ethics, of the support and the ennobling which it receives from religion, that it would be nothing strange or objectionable in a Revelation, were we to find embodied in its language much of the false Ethical Philosophy, which systems may have established.”—B. L. p. 302.

“ Holiness, separation from the world, devotion, stillness of the thoughts and the affections, are the means of Religion: Ethics are all activity, all business. Neither will answer the purpose of the other: both are indispensable to the perfection and happiness of human nature.”—B. L. p. 302.

“ We find Moral Philosophy among ourselves consigned rather to the pulpit than to the chair of the Professor. . . . It may be enough to refer to the Moral and Metaphysical discussions of Samuel Clarke, as contained in his Sermons at the Boyle Lecture, and to the Moral Philosophy of Butler, as delivered in his Sermons at the Rolls’ Chapel. It appears indeed, that Paley’s views of Moral Science were originally developed in the same form. A circumstance which has strengthened the prejudice against an independent Moral Philosophy is the fact that the great deistical writers of our country, as Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, set themselves to the proof of the independence of Ethics on Religion; whilst Cudworth and Clarke, and others have vindicated the intimate connexion between theological and ethical principles. . . . Both Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke have shown, and I think unanswerably, that the principles of morality are founded in our nature, independently of any system of religious belief, and are in fact obligatory even on the atheist.”—M. L. p. 15—18.

“ I intend, in asserting the independence of moral obligation on any religious sanction, to refer, in evidence of this position, to the indisputable instances which have appeared of an upright tenor of life, of the duties belonging to the various relations of life, correctly performed by those, who have

wanted the higher inducements to right conduct, resulting from the profession of a better creed. . . . Many Christians are . . . virtuous on principles of mere morality, and not through Christian love and faith; for even the Atheist, extreme as his case is, may feel himself under some obligations of virtue, so far as he may perceive that virtue is his interest in the present world.”—M. L. pp. 20—22.

“This opinion of the dependence of moral theory on religious truth is, in fact, a remnant of the philosophy of the Middle Ages.”—M. L. p. 23.

“Some of the early Fathers of the Church have characterized Christianity in contrast with heathen systems as a ‘philosophy of life.’ . . . They might have seen that Christianity interferes not with the principles of human conduct, that its burthen and theme are *salvation* (sic), and not the mere art of happy living.”—M. L. pp. 23—25.

“Another circumstance which has operated against the independent study of Moral Philosophy is the fact. . . . that Christian writers have not only thrown into the shade all mere moral excellence, by placing it in disadvantageous comparison with the principle of Christian Faith, but also by exaggeration of the misery of the present life, have argued the weakness and insufficiency of human philosophy for the guidance of life. . . . They have been prone to overstate the argument for the future state of retribution held forth by Christianity. . . . They have not been content with the positive fact that virtue is rewarded to a certain extent in the present state. . . . Probably their tone of thought on moral subjects was drawn originally from Stoicism, . . . but so far as Stoicism was received as a moral guide, it would suggest stern and melancholy views of the present condition of things. It loved to pourtray its wise men indifferent to the course of the world. . . . The good which Moral Philosophy promises is, under the fairest representation of it, remote and contingent. It demands a series of actions, a

continued cultivation of our moral sensibilities. It presupposes, no less than religion, a disposition to believe its promises, and to look patiently for its good."—M. L. p. 29—31.

“Religion sums up all its practical energy in the one quality of Resignation. It takes by the hand those feelings of the heart which look heavenward. Its divine ambition is to loosen the ties which bind us to the present narrow scene of earthly duties, and to fix our thoughts and desires on the invisible spiritual world. . . . It is essentially abnegation of self, of present endearments, of the world around us, of our own power. . . . It works on the heart by faith, hope, love, patience; means which in themselves divert us from confidence in our own activity, and so far check that activity. That Religion, in *itself alone* (sic), tends to this extreme, is evidenced in the lives of devotees, who have sought an entire abstractedness from society, and endeavoured to realize its sublime influence in their hearts, by stilling every thought into passiveness and repose. We are not to blame such persons for being too religious, for perverting and misrepresenting Religion by excess. Their fault is, that they suffer their minds to imbibe it *exclusively* (sic); that they leave no room for their own nature to develop itself; converting what was given for their comfort and encouragement into a sublime luxury and a holy pastime. The religious instincts of the heart were surely never meant to absorb the whole man, according to the designs of Him, who implanted also both private and social affections in our nature. . . . Thus Religion and Morality are as two forces, sustaining the equilibrium of our nature. If either existed without the other, we should be carried away into a devious course.”—M. L. p. 96—98.

9. *Positive Statements.*

There is so much in Dr. Hampden of a merely negative nature, from the necessary line of his argument, that it is right, before concluding, to select some of his *positive* statements in favour of those views which are generally received.

He is a believer in the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, (as we might be sure beforehand from his position in the University, and the Subscriptions it involves,) and considers them influential on conduct ; though he does not believe them as revealed truths, but as unrevealed opinions, and pious deductions, which he has no right to impose upon others. He has no wish to abolish formularies of doctrine, as such, considering them accidentally useful *pro re natâ* in resisting arbitrary theories of Scripture on the other side ; and though he thinks our own formularies more dogmatic than is necessary, and might wish to modify or improve them, he has no hope of ever dispensing with them, both because the restlessness of speculation will never allow of it, and because we are so accustomed to them that change would lead to serious consequences. Moreover, he thinks they are to be maintained while they exist ; and that neglect of this duty is latitudinarianism.

1. " By virtue of those very theological opinions, to which I have declared my assent in admitting the Articles of the Church of England, I have signified my denial and exclusion

of opinions, which I think injurious to Christian truth, and derogatory to the character of a true Church of Christ.”—*Observ.* p. 25.

“ I, for one, would contend as zealously against Arian or Socinian doctrines as the most strenuous alarmist on the present occasion, though not, perhaps, in the same manner or with the same weapons; and I should be also strongly opposed to the removal of all Subscription on the part of the Clergy.”—*Postscr.* to *Observ.* p. 13.

“ As believers in a real atonement for sin, we may justly feel shocked at the thought which imputes any merit to man,” &c.—*Observ.* p. 26.

“ I think every one who has watched the progress of his mind in theological studies, will confess to this fact in his own case; his difficulties in admitting the Articles have gradually diminished; he has seen, more and more, the reasons of them. For my part, I declare such to have been the result on my own mind, and so far from experiencing any objection to the Articles from an increased acquaintance with them by the prosecution of theological study, I have found my disposition to receive them increase from this very circumstance, that I see more fully the reasons of the statements contained in them.”—*Postscr.* to *Observ.* p. 9.

“ So long as the terms of our communion are what they are, as honest men, we must uphold them and teach them. To accommodate them” [i. e. in our teaching] “to different sects, would be virtually to abandon them. . . . If theological views could have no influence on conduct, like propositions in mathematics, the method might be pursued of simply laying before hearers the different opinions on each point, without expressing our own judgment. But as this is not the case, as questions of this kind are of serious practical influence, we must do our best to prevent any evil, either from unsettled opinion generally, or from any particular opinion that we have reason to think wrong.”—*Observ.* p. 34.

2. "Pious opinions, it must be observed," [such as "the doctrinal statements of our Articles"] "are not parts of revelation."—*Observ.* p. 14.

"Whilst we agree in the canon of Scripture, in the very words, for the most part, from which we learn what are the objects of faith, we suffer disunion to spread among us, through the various interpretations suggested by our own reasonings on the admitted facts of Scripture."—*Observ.* p. 7.

"Because I have laid down what I conceive to be the true *theory* of all Articles, and have shown that such statements are essentially variable in their nature, let it not be supposed immediately, that I have questioned the immutability of *religious truth* in itself. My statement applies only to the dogmas or formal propositions which have been devised to define and declare that truth. Let the two statements be kept quite distinct.—Christian truth" [i. e. the *facts* of Scripture? or, the unknown *objective* truth?] "is immutable; doctrinal forms are mutable."—*Postscr. to Observ.* p. 11.

"Wherever speculative truth is involved, there must be presupposed an opening for improvement."—*Observ.* p. 22.

3. "Orthodoxy was forced to speak the divine truth in the terms of heretical speculation, if it were only to guard against the novelties which the heretic had introduced. It was the necessity of the case that compelled the orthodox, as themselves freely admit, to employ a phraseology, by which, as experience proves, the naked truth of God has been overborne and obscured."—*B. L.* p. 376.

"Pious opinions, indeed, we may form. . . . Such, indeed, are the doctrinal statements of our Articles. I may wish there were less of dogmatism in them; still I cannot but approve them for the piety which pervades them."—*Observ.* p. 14. *Vid.* also p. 22.

"I love and admire the Church of England, because I conceive it to be constituted on the right basis of religious

communion ; neither dogmatic in its spirit, though the wording of its formularies may often carry the sound of dogmatism nor intolerant and sectarian in its zeal," &c.—*Observ.* p. 22.

“To exclude theological opinion from religious profession, to endeavour to sweep away the accumulation of ages, would be but the vain attempt suddenly to change the face of the world. Our next best alternative is to modify it, to correct its improper application, and so to obviate its mischievous effects. In truth, I say, it ought not to exist, &c.”—*Observ.* p. 21.

“The theory which I have endeavoured to establish is the very reverse of that system which would emasculate religion by reducing it to mere generalities. I would bring men to think more of the real substance of their religion, and less of its abstractions. I would have them regard it as it is embodied in the life and blood of the Gospel itself, not as it appears in the phantasmagoria of controversial statement.”—*Postscr. to Observ.* p. 14.

“To expect, therefore, that all sects should formally and ostensibly pull down their barriers of separation, and combine in one common mass under the Christian name, seems hopeless, if we are to judge from what is known of human nature. But may not that gentle, and enlightened, and spiritual toleration of dissenting opinions, &c. . . . insensibly work a blessed change in the minds and hearts of those who are now estranged from us ?”—*Observ.* p. 29.

“The agreement of a community in certain views of Scripture facts is presupposed. The problem before the dogmatic theologian is to preserve that agreement entire, to guard it from a latitudinarianism which would virtually annul it, and to prevent its dissolution by innovators, either within or without the religious society.”—*B. L.* p. 383.

“It appears to me, then, that the occasion for Articles will probably never cease. Were the realism of the human mind

a transient phenomenon, peculiar to one age or one species of philosophy, and not, as is the fact, an instinctive propensity of our intellectual nature, then it might be supposed, that the unsoundness of a metaphysical and logical theology being once fully admitted, the cumbrous machinery might be removed, and the sacred truth allowed to stand forth to view in its own attractive simplicity. But such a result seems rather to be wished and prayed for by a sanguine piety, than reckoned upon in the humbling calculations of human experience. In the mean time it were well to retain, amid all its confessed imperfections, a system of technical theology, by which we are guarded, in some measure, from the exorbitance of religious enthusiasm."—B. L. p. 380. ✓

Conclusion.

Dr. H.'s views then seem at length to issue in the following theory: that there is one and one only truth, that that truth is the record of facts, historical and moral, contained in the text of Scripture; that whatever is beyond that text, even to the classifying of its sentences, is human opinion, and unrevealed; that, though a thoughtful person cannot help forming opinions and theories upon the Scripture record, and is bound to act upon and confess those opinions which he considers to be true, yet he has no right to identify his own opinion on any point, however sacred in itself, with the facts of the revealed history, or to assume that a belief in it is necessary for the salvation of another, or to impose it as a condition of union with another; that, though he considers he cannot be more sure of being right than another, and does not hold his own opinions to be more pious than another's, and will not pronounce heretical opinions (so called) to be dangerous to any being in the world, except to those who do *not* hold them, yet he himself firmly believes the Church's dogmatic statements concerning the Trinity, &c. and at a proper season would contend as zealously against Arian or Socinian doctrines, as those who think that in the case of others belief in them is of importance to eternal salvation; and this, though he considers those statements, as

such, and so far forth as they are distinct from those Scripture facts, which Arians and Socinians hold as religiously as himself, to be “ a system of technical theology by which we are guarded” only “ in some measure from the exórbitance of theoretic enthusiasm,” a system of phrases borrowed from those who differ from us, and useful only in excluding *their* use of them.

It may be excused the present writer, in the wording of these last remarks, to have shown his own sense of the theology which has occasioned them. What may be the issue of the present anxious conflict of opinion in this place, He will order according to His wisdom, who has promised that all things shall work together for good for those who love Him. But should it end in the appointment of Dr. H. to the Theological Chair, he believes that ten years hence, those who are in no way protesting against his appointment now, would, if then alive, feel they had upon them a responsibility greater than has been incurred by Members of this University for many centuries.

THE END.

[The text in this section is extremely faint and illegible due to the quality of the scan. It appears to be a multi-paragraph letter or document.]

THE END