

## ARTICLE IX.

*Of Original, or Birth-Sin.*

*De Peccati Originali.*

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.

PECCATUM originale 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 sua natura propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat, unde in unoquoque nascentium, iram Dei, atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis hæc naturæ depravatio. Qua fit, ut affectus carnis, Græce *φρόνημα σαρκός* (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium carnis interpretantur) legi Dei non subjiciatur et quanquam renatis et credentibus, nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in se rationem habere concupiscentiam, fateatur Apostolus.

### SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THE origin of evil in the world has, from very early times, been a subject of speculation among philosophers and divines. What the Jewish opinions on the question may have been, is not easy to decide. The rite of circumcision, as administered to infants, may have been understood as showing that infants were born in sin, and had need of the circumcision of the Spirit, to make them partakers of the promises of God. The custom among the Jews to baptize (as well as to circumcise) all proselytes, whether men, women, or children, may seem to indicate that they looked on all, even from their birth, as naturally unclean, and needing a laver or cleansing, before admission to the privileges of their Church.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the account of this custom at length in Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*, *Intro.*

That the early fathers of the Christian Church held the universality of human corruption, there can be but little question. A history of infant baptism is also a history of the doctrine of original sin, baptism being for the remission of sin.<sup>1</sup> If there were no original sin, infants could have no need to be baptized. Hence Wall, in his *History of Baptism*, has brought together, with great labour and fidelity, passages from the earliest writers, showing their belief in the original infection of our nature from Adam. It is not to be expected that the fathers would speak as clearly on this point before, as after the rise of Pelagianism. But a fair inspection of the passages thus cited will convince us that the doctrine was held, almost as clearly as is expressed in our own Article, from the very earliest times of the Church.<sup>2</sup>

For examples of the language of the fathers we may take the following passages: "Besides the evil," says Tertullian,<sup>3</sup> "which the soul contracts from the intervention of the wicked spirit, there is an antecedent, and, in a certain sense, natural evil arising from its corrupt origin. For, as we have already observed, the corruption of our nature is another nature, having its proper god and father, namely, the author of that corruption."

Cyprian, and the council of sixty-six bishops with him (A. D. 253), in their *Epistle to Fidus*, use the following words: "If then the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterwards come to believe, forgiveness of sins, and no person is kept off from baptism and this grace, how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly born, has no sin save that, being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened; who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own but other's sins that are forgiven him?"<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mark i. 4. Acts xxii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> See especially the quotations from Clem. Rom. i. pp. 47, 48; Justin Martyr, pp. 64, 68; Tertullian, p. 95; Origen, p. 121; Cyprian, p. 182. Compare Bishop Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 75; *Tertullian*, p. 325.

<sup>3</sup> Malum igitur animæ, præter quod ex obventu spiritus nequam superstruitur, ex originis vitio antecedit, naturale quodammodo. Nam, ut diximus, naturæ corruptio alia natura est, habens suum Deum et patrem, ipsum scilicet corruptionis auctorem. — *De Anima*, c. 41; Bp. Kaye, p. 326. See also cap. 40: Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur,

donec in Christo recenseatur; tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur.

<sup>4</sup> Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et a baptismo atque a gratia nemo prohibetur; quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod, secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit? qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit. quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata. — Cyprian. *Epist. 64 ad Fidum*. Wall, i. p. 128.

On this, however, as on other articles of faith, there arose heresies from very early times. In the second century, about A. D. 180, Florinus, a presbyter of the Church of Rome, taught that God was the author of evil. This man had been a friend of Irenæus, and a disciple of Polycarp's. A fragment of a letter from Irenæus addressed to him, in which Irenæus combats his peculiar error, is preserved by Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> The Marcionites had, before this, taught the doctrine of two principles, the one of good and the other of evil; and it has been thought probable that it was in opposition to this that Florinus fell into the opposite heresy, and that, in maintaining the sole sovereignty of God, he was led to make Him the author of sin.<sup>2</sup>

The Gnostic heretics in general attributed the origin of sin to matter, which they considered as essentially evil. Colorbasus, we are told,<sup>3</sup> and Priscillian held, that men's actions were influenced by the stars.<sup>4</sup> The Manichees, like the Marcionites before them, but more systematically, taught the eternal existence of two opposite and antagonistic principles, to the one of which they attributed the origin of evil.<sup>5</sup>

The great Origen, though using freely those passages of Scripture, which speak of man's natural corruption, and of his being born in sin,<sup>6</sup> yet, from his peculiar theory of the preëxistence of human souls, could scarcely hold that man's sinfulness was derived from the first sin of Adam. His theory was, that all souls of men have existed in a former state and are confined in bodies, and placed in circumstances, according to their conduct in that former state; and that the bodies, which they now have, are more or less gross according to the qualities of their former crimes.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 20. See Heylyn, *Historia Quinquarticularis*, ch. i.; Beaven's *Irenæus*, p. 24; also Augustin. *Hæres.* 66, Tom. VIII. p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Lardner's *Hist. of Heretics*, ch. x. § x. Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, ch. vii.

<sup>3</sup> Augustin. *De Hæres.* 15.

<sup>4</sup> Augustin. *De Hæres.* 70; Adstruunt etiam fatalibus stellis homines colligatos.

<sup>5</sup> See Mosheim, Cent. III. Pt. II. ch. v. The Manichees are said to have taught that "sin was a substance." And Saturninus and the Manichees are said to have taught that sin was in man "a natura, non a culpa," which accounts for the language of the fathers against them, *e. g.* Theodoret, *Dial.* i. : ἡ ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἐστὶ τῆς φύσεως ἀλλὰ τῆς κακῆς προαιρέσεως. See Suicer, i. p. 208. The Manichees did not consider sin to lie in a depravation of the whole natural actions and

thoughts of man, but in an evil constitution of a portion of his nature, which they traced to that principle whom they considered as the creator of all the evil in the universe.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, the passage quoted by Wall, i. p. 121.

<sup>7</sup> See Dupin, *Ecclæs. Hist.* Cent. III. Art. *Origen*. See also a good, though popular, account of Origen's opinions in the *Biography of the Early Church*, by the Rev. R. W. Evans.

Origen has very generally been charged with semi-Pelagianism, and with being the forerunner of the Pelagian heretics. It is very difficult to judge clearly and impartially about his opinions. A variety of causes tend to obscure them. It is, however, certain that at times he speaks most clearly of all men being born in sin, and needing purification. For example,

In the beginning of the fifth century, a very important heresy sprang up, which called forth more decidedly the sentiments of the Church on this doctrine. Pelagius was a monk residing at Rome, but of British extraction, his name, in his own country, being probably Morgan. Cœlestius, another monk, a native of Ireland, and Julianus, a bishop, were his chief allies. His heresy was spread abroad about A. D. 410, the year that Rome was taken by the Goths. Cœlestius, having endeavored to take priest's orders at Carthage, was accused by Paulinus, a deacon of that Church, of holding several false opinions. About the same time, St. Augustine wrote his first treatise against the same errors. Pelagius had retired into Palestine, whither Augustine sent Orosius, a Spanish presbyter, to accuse him before a synod of bishops at Jerusalem. Here, and at Diospolis, he was acquitted without censure. But in the year 416, two Councils, one at Carthage and another at Milevis, condemned the Pelagian opinions. Innocent, bishop of Rome, was written to by the Councils, and agreed in their decision. But in the year 417 he was succeeded by Zosimus, who, gained over by the ambiguous confession of the Pelagians, and being himself a great admirer of Origen, pronounced in their favour. Augustine, however, with the African bishops, persevered in their opposition; and Zosimus, yielding to their representations, changed his mind and condemned with great severity Pelagius and Cœlestius. They were again finally condemned at the third general council at Ephesus, which met to consider the tenets of Nestorius.<sup>1</sup>

The doctrines charged against Cœlestius at the Council of Carthage (A. D. 412) were —

“That Adam was created mortal, and would have died, whether he had sinned or not. That the sin of Adam hurt only himself, and not all mankind. That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall. That a man may be without sin, and keep God's commandments, if he will.”<sup>2</sup>

Augustine could not speak more plainly than the following: —

Quod si placet audire quid etiam alii sancti de ista nativitate senserint, audi David dicentem: *In iniquitatibus, inquit, conceptus sum et in peccatis peperit me mater mea: ostendens quod quæcumque anima in carne nascitur, iniquitatis et peccati sorde polluitur: et propterea dictum esse illud quod jam superius memoravimus, quia nemo mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei sit vita ejus. Adli his etiam potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit, cum baptisma Ecclesiæ pro remissione peccatorum detur, secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam*

*etiam parvulis baptismum dari; cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur. — Origen. Homil. in Levitic. VIII. num. 3.*

<sup>1</sup> See the history of Pelagius and Pelagianism given by Wall, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, 1. ch. XIX.; Mosheim, Cent. v. Pt. II. ch. v.; Neander, IV. pp. 299-362. Also the History of Pelagianism given in the Preface to the tenth volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine's works.

<sup>2</sup> Wall, 1. p. 357.

Pelagius himself sent a creed to Innocent, in which he avoids a clear statement concerning original sin, but distinctly asserts, that, though we all need the help of God, we can all keep God's laws, if we will. The principal apponents of Pelagius were Augustine, Jerome, and Fulgentius.<sup>1</sup>

The controversies thus called forth were not soon allayed. A new sect soon arose from the former one, called Semi-Pelagians, whose opinions concerning original sin were not so objectionable as those of Pelagius, but who ascribed far too much to the unassisted strength of the human will.<sup>2</sup>

The sentiments of Pelagius found considerable favour in his native island of Britain, and caused many and grievous troubles to the Church there. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, were sent over to Britain by the Gallican Church, to confute the growing heresy, and had great success, if we may credit ancient accounts, in opposing both the temporal and spiritual enemies of the Church.<sup>3</sup> The famous Dewi, or St. David, was afterwards greatly distinguished for the zeal and ability with which he opposed the prevailing error and aided in its overthrow. Especially at the Council of Llanddewi Brefi in Cardiganshire, his eloquence and arguments are said to have availed to the silencing of his adversaries, and the establishing of his own celebrity. He was hereupon unanimously erected primate, the aged Dyvrig (Dubritius) resigning in his favour; and he afterwards called another synod at Caerleon, where his exertions were rewarded by the extermination of the heresy.<sup>4</sup>

The schoolmen, in the Middle Ages, as might have been expected, debated much concerning the subject of original sin. *Original Righteousness* they seem to have considered something superadded to the original nature of man, not a part of that nature. According to Luther's statement of their opinions, it was "an ornament added to man, as a wreath upon a maiden's hair is an ornament bestowed on her, and not a part of herself."<sup>5</sup> Original sin, therefore, was the loss or privation of original righteousness, and man

<sup>1</sup> The Pelagians endeavoured to prove that some of the ancient fathers, especially of the Greek Church, used their language, and denied the existence of sin in infants. Augustine, in his treatise *contra Julianum*, shows, in opposition to that heretic, that St. Chrysostom (whom Julian had cited in favour of Pelagianism) had in reality plainly expressed the doctrine of original sin. — Aug. *Contra Julianum*, Lib. I. cap. VI. Vol. X. p. 509. Wall, I. p. 416.

<sup>2</sup> See below, under Article X.

<sup>3</sup> Bede, *Hist. Lib. I. cap. XVII. — XXII.* Stillingfleet's *Orig. Britan.* ch. IV. Collier's *Ecc. Hist.* Book I.

<sup>4</sup> Gildas Cambrensis. Rees's *Welsh Saints*, p. 193. Usher, *Brit. Ecc. Antiq.* c. v. xiii. Williams's *Antiq. of the Cymry*, pp. 134, 287.

<sup>5</sup> Luther, *Op. vi.* p. 38, ap. Laurence *Bampton Lectures*, p. 56.

was an object of God's displeasure, not as possessing what was offensive to God, but as wanting in that which was pleasing to Him. The body was infected by the fall, whether from the poison of the forbidden fruit, or from whatever cause; but the soul suffered only as deprived of that which Adam possessed, the presence of God and supernatural righteousness, and as having the *imputation of sin* derived from Adam.<sup>1</sup> The infection of the body was indeed *fomes peccati*, a fuel which might be kindled into sin; but the soul contracted *guilt* from imputation of Adam's guilt, not sin from the inheritance of Adam's sin, though deprived of primitive righteousness, a quality dependent on the presence and indwelling of God. St. Augustine had doubted whether the soul as well as the body was derived from the parents, and so contracted sin from them. But the schoolmen, deciding that the soul came direct from God, of necessity were led to deny a direct derivation of sin to the soul, confining its pollution to the body, which then infects the soul; and so they made the defect of the soul to consist in an absence of good, rather than in presence and dominion of evil.<sup>2</sup>

In the Council of Trent there was much discussion of the doctrine of the fathers and schoolmen on this article; after which the following decrees were finally determined on: (1) That Adam by transgressing lost holiness and justice, incurred the wrath of God, death, thralldom to the devil, and was infected both in soul and body. (2) That Adam derived to his posterity death of body, and sin of soul. (3) That sin, transmitted by generation, not by imitation, can be abolished by no remedy but the death of Christ, and that the merit of Christ is applied to children in baptism, as well as to adults. (4) That newly-born children ought to be baptized, as having contracted sin from Adam. (5) That by the grace of baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, and that all is removed which hath the true and proper nature of sin. And though the concupiscence remaining is called by the Apostle sin,

<sup>1</sup> See Laurence, Sermon. III. pp. 56-59, and note 2, p. 252.

The fathers appear, almost with one consent, to have held that original righteousness consisted both of natural innocence and of the grace of God vouchsafed to Adam. The one was lost simultaneously with the other. Indeed, the one could not exist without the other. Original righteousness, therefore, according to the primitive teaching, was not only defect of sin, but also the presence of God's Spirit. At the fall, God's

Spirit was forfeited, and primeval innocence lost at the same time. See this proved, with his usual learning and clearness of reasoning, by Bp. Bull, *Works*, II. Disc. v. Oxf. 1827. Bp. Bull gives strong reasons for believing this to be both the universal belief of the primitive Church and the doctrine of the sacred Scriptures themselves.

<sup>2</sup> Sarpi, Council of Trent, p. 163. Neander, VIII. pp. 184-198, gives a very interesting account of the scholastic discussions on Original Sin.

the Synod declared that it was not true and proper sin, but was so termed because it ariseth from sin and inclineth to it.<sup>1</sup>

The point on which these decrees differed from the Ninth Article of our Church, is in the entire cancelling of original sin in baptism. According to the Scholastic definition, that original sin consisted in the deprivation of original righteousness, the Council of Trent determined, that in baptism the soul was restored pure into the state of innocency, though the punishments which follow sin be not removed. This all the fathers expounded by saying that the perfection of Adam consisted in an infused quality, which adorned the soul, made it perfect and acceptable to God, and exempted the body from mortality. And God, for the merit of Christ, giveth unto those that are regenerated by baptism another quality called justifying grace, which, wiping out every blemish in the soul, maketh it pure, as was that of Adam; yea, in some it worketh greater effects than original righteousness, but only it worketh no effect on the body, whereby mortality and other natural defects are not removed.<sup>2</sup>

The Lutherans in this respect differed materially from the fathers of the Council; especially in maintaining that concupiscence had the nature of sin, and that the infection, though not the imputation of sin, remained in the baptized and regenerate.<sup>3</sup>

The second article of the Augsburg Confession, which is the principal confession of faith of the Lutheran divines, is evidently the source from which our own ninth Article was derived. Without defining the nature of original righteousness,<sup>4</sup> or the mode in which Adam lost it, it declares the doctrine, that every man born naturally from Adam is born in sin, without the faith and fear of God, and with concupiscence, which disease is truly sin and

<sup>1</sup> Concupiscentiam Ecclesiam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat. — Concil. Trident. Sess. v. Sec. 5. See Anathemas in the fifth Session, Sarpi, p. 173.

A great dispute arose between the Dominicans and Franciscans, the latter insisting that the Virgin Mary should be declared free from the taint of original sin, — the Dominicans maintaining the contrary opinion. (Sarpi, p. 168.) The Council in the end declared, that it did not mean to comprehend the B. Virgin in the decree (p. 173). Augustine had before professed himself unwilling to discuss the question of the Virgin's sinful-

ness, or how far grace might have overcome sin in her, out of reverence to our Lord. (See Wall, *Infant Baptism*, i. p. 404.)

<sup>2</sup> Sarpi, p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> Ideo sic respondemus; in baptismo tolli peccatum quod ad reatum seu imputationem attinet, sed manere morbum ipsum, &c. — Melancthon. *Loc. Theolog.* p. 122, ap. Laurence, p. 268.

<sup>4</sup> The Saxon confession, however, clearly speaks of original righteousness as something beyond mere innocency, calling it — in ipsa natura hominum lux, conversio voluntatis ad deum. . . . ac fuisset homo templum Dei, &c. — *Syllabus Confessionum*, p. 246.

deserving of damnation, in all who are not born again by baptism and the Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

Calvin, speaking of original sin, says that "As the spiritual life of Adam consisted in union with his Maker, so alienation from Him was the death of his soul. When the heavenly image was obliterated in him, he did not alone sustain the punishment, but involved all his posterity in it. The impurity of the parents is so transmitted to the children that none are excepted; and that, not by imitation, but by propagation." . . . "Original sin appears to be an hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all parts of the soul, which first makes men subject to God's wrath, and then brings forth works in us which Scripture calls the works of the flesh." . . . "His destruction is to be ascribed only to man, as he obtained uprightness from God's mercy, and by his own folly fell into vanity." . . . "His sin did not spring from nature, but was an adventitious quality which happened to man, rather than a substantial propriety which from the first was created in him."<sup>2</sup>

Among Calvinistic divines in general there has been a difference concerning the first introduction of sin, chiefly as to whether Adam fell freely or by predestination of God: the sublapsarian Calvinists holding that Adam sinned of his own free will; the supralapsarians holding that God decreed that he should fall.

The chief point of difference between the two great parties which so long divided the Protestant Churches, the Calvinists and Arminians, was on the *extent* of the vitiating of our nature by the fall. The Calvinists taught that the corruption of man was so great that no spark of moral goodness was left in him; that he was utterly and totally bad and depraved; that, however amiable he might be in regard to his fellow-men, yet as regards God and godliness there was no relic of what he once was, any more than in lost spirits and damned souls. The Arminians rejected this strong view of the subject, and, admitting the great corruption of man's heart and intellect, still maintained that some remains of

<sup>1</sup> II. *De Peccato Originis.*

Item docent, quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines, secundum naturam propagati, nascantur cum peccato, hoc est sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum, et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic morbus, seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.

Damnans Pelagianos, et alios, qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum, et ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi, disputant hominem propriis viribus rationis coram Deo justificari posse. — *Confession of Augsburg.* Compare the Saxon Confession, Art. *De Peccato Originis.*

<sup>2</sup> Calvin, *Inst.* Lib. II. cap. 1, 5, 6, 8, — II.



his original condition might be traced in him; that his mind and will were indeed depraved and incapable of making any independent effort towards true godliness; but that he still differed materially from evil spirits or the spirits of the damned, having a natural conscience, and an appreciation of what is good and of good report.

The Calvinists have generally insisted much on the imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity, as the true meaning of original sin; though admitting that such imputation was accompanied with actual depravity in the heart of each individual.<sup>1</sup> Calvin himself seems rather to have held that all men were liable to condemnation, because of their own sinfulness derived from Adam, not because of the imputation of Adam's sin.<sup>2</sup>

At the time of the Reformation, the Anabaptists appear to have adopted Pelagian opinions. The article on Original Sin, in the first draught of it as set forth in 1552, begins thus: "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do now-a-days renew." Their rejection of infant baptism was of a piece, and naturally connected, with their denial of original sin.

In later times, the Socinians held on this subject thoroughly Pelagian language, and generally denied the corruption of human nature and the need of grace to turn men to godliness.

As regards the Church of England, there have been many attempts, on the one hand, to show that she used the language of the later Calvinists, on the other, to prove that she symbolized with the Arminians. The Articles were drawn up before the great Calvinistic controversy had arisen, and therefore do not use the terms of that controversy. It is pretty certain that, in this, and some of the following Articles, the English reformers symbolized with Melancthon and the Lutheran divines, whose very words in the Confession of Augsburg, or the Wirtemberg Confession, are frequently adopted in the wording of the Articles.<sup>3</sup>

There is nothing said in the Ninth Article on the imputation of Adam's guilt, though that was a favourite subject of scholastic discussion, nor of the question, whether original righteousness meant merely primitive innocence, or consisted moreover in a preternatural gift, and in the indwelling and presence of God. The

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Edwards, *On Original Sin*, Part IV. ch. III. — an able and judicious exposition of the Calvinistic view of this doctrine.

<sup>2</sup> *Atque ideo infantes quoque ipsi, dum suam secum damnationem afferunt, non*

*alieno. sed suo ipsorum vitio sunt obstricti* — Calv. *Inst.* Lib. II. cap. 1, Sect. 8; Laurence, *B. L.* Serm. III. note 8, p. 261.

<sup>3</sup> See Laurence, *B. L.* notes to Serm II., especially notes 8 and 11.

statements are quite general ; yet sufficiently guarding the truth that every man naturally engendered of Adam brings into the world a nature inclined to evil, and very far removed from the original righteousness of our first parents ; that this sinfulness of his nature deserves the wrath of God ; and that, although the condemnation due to it is remitted to all who believe and are baptized, still even in the regenerate the infection, showing itself in the way of concupiscence, remains, and has of itself the nature of sin.

The homily "On the Misery of Man," composed, or at least approved by Cranmer, breathes the same spirit. The homily on the Nativity, in the second book of homilies, drawn up some time later, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, may be referred to as expressing the doctrine of original sin in somewhat stronger language ; the divines of Elizabeth's reign having been brought into more intimate connection with the Calvinistic reformers, and sympathizing more with them, than was the case with the divines of the reign of Edward VI.

---

## SECTION II. — SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

**I**N considering the Scriptural proof of the doctrine of original sin here, it will be better to confine ourselves strictly to the statements of the Article, avoiding as much as possible those discussions which the Article itself avoids ; neither entering into the distinctions of the schoolmen, nor the disputes of the Calvinists, but resting satisfied with the plain practical ground, which our own reformers thought broad and deep enough.

The Article then may be said to embrace the five following propositions : —

I. Original sin is the fault and corruption of our nature, which infects all men.

II. It is not derived by imitation, but inherited by birth.

III. Its extent is such that by it man is very far (*quam longissime*) gone from original righteousness.

IV. It deserves God's wrath and condemnation.

V. Its infection is not entirely removed by baptism, but that infection remains even in the *renati* ; and though there is no con-

demnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet still lust or concupiscence has the nature of sin.

I. That "original sin is the fault and corruption of our nature, which infects all men," might be inferred from our general knowledge of mankind, and of the evil tempers even of childhood, if we had no express revelation of it.

In the earliest part of the Scripture history the Almighty declared, that "the imagination of man's heart was evil from his youth" (Gen. viii. 21). Job attributed man's weakness and sorrows to the fact that what was clean could not be brought from what was unclean (Job xiv. 4). David, acknowledging his own sin from his youth, confessed that he was "shapen in iniquity, and that in sin did his mother conceive him" (Ps. li. 5). Solomon declared that "there was not a just man on earth, that did good and sinned not" (Eccles. vii. 20). And Isaiah, in foretelling the sacrifice of Christ, gives as the reason for it, that "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way" (liii. 6. See also Gen. vi. 5-12. Job xv. 16. Psalm xiv. 2, 3; lviii. 3; cvi. 6, &c. Prov. xxii. 15. Jer. xvii. 5, 9.)

These and similar passages, even before the coming of the Gospel, sufficiently showed that there was an evil coextensive with our race and coeval with our birth, from which none were exempt, and which went with us from the cradle to the grave.

There are many passages in the Gospels which show that the same doctrine pervades them; as our Lord's declaration that "there is none good but One, that is God" (Matt. xix. 17); His committing Himself to no man, "for He knew what was in man" (John ii. 24, 25); His declaration that no one could enter into the Kingdom of God, "except he were born again of water and of the Spirit" (John iii. 3, 5, 6); nay, His institution of baptism, which all who would be saved must receive, showing that there was an uncleanness of nature, which needed to be washed away by grace.

But, of course, the writings of the Apostles, as being the more doctrinal portions of Scripture, treat most systematically on the subject. The whole of the earlier part of the Epistle to the Romans more especially treats of the sinfulness of man, which needs the sacrifice of Christ. The Apostle shows in the first chapter, that the *Gentiles*, notwithstanding the light of nature—the natural conscience which God had given them; and in the second chapter, that the *Jews*, although to them had been committed the oracles of God, had yet all been condemned by their own acts and

by their own Law. In the third chapter, he concludes that *all* are under sin (Rom. iii. 9), that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. iii. 23). In the fifth chapter, he shows that, from the time of Adam, "death had passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (ver. 12). In the seventh chapter throughout, he describes the natural man moved by the dictates of conscience to approve what is good, and yet constrained by a law in his members — the law of sin and death working in him — to follow what is evil. He then considers the same natural man instructed by the revealed Law of God, consenting to the Law that it was good, and yet unable to fulfil it, because of the sin that dwelleth in him, and that binds him down to do what is base: so that he even represents the Law as bringing death rather than life, as showing the good and the beautiful, as kindling some feelings of desire for better things, but still as giving no power to reach after them. And all this, which he so strikingly describes to us, he tells us results from this cause, namely, that in man, that is in his natural condition, there dwelleth no good. "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing."<sup>1</sup> In the eighth chapter, he shows how this defect of our nature is remedied; that, whereas man by himself could not please God, whereas the Law was too weak, owing to the infirmity of man's sinful nature, yet God sent His Son to save, and His Spirit to sanctify; and so those who are in the Spirit and no longer in the flesh, can fulfil the righteousness of the Law. But "the *carnal* mind is not subject to the law of God," and "they who are in the flesh" (*i. e.* in a state of nature, and not under grace) "cannot please God," Rom. viii. 8.<sup>2</sup> Just similar is St. Paul's language in his other Epistles; see, for example, Eph. iv. 22,

<sup>1</sup> Rom. vii. 18: "In my flesh," of course means in my natural and carnal state, according to the common Pauline antithesis of the flesh and the spirit. No doubt, many persons have thought that the Apostle in this chapter is speaking of his own struggles against sin still dwelling in him, when under the dominion of grace. But it has always appeared to me that the whole thread of the apostle's argument is broken, and the whole force of his reasoning destroyed by this hypothesis. The fact that he uses the first person singular need not puzzle us for a moment. It is his common habit to speak in the first person, when he means to represent himself as the type of others, of the world at large, or of others situated like himself. One sentence in the chapter, if it stood alone, would be

enough to prove that the Apostle is not describing the state and conflict of a regenerate Christian. It is in v. 14: "I am carnal, sold under sin." The redeemed Christian, "bought with a price," and delivered "from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God," can never truly be represented as still "sold under sin." Christ has made him free, "and he is free indeed."

<sup>2</sup> We must take care that by the expression, "the flesh," in Rom. vii. viii. we do not suppose the Apostle to mean the body, the material part of our being. This would be the Manichean error. It is not the body only, but the whole man, that the Scriptures speak of as infected with sin. Compare John iii. 6. Gal. v. 19, 20. 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4.

where he speaks of "the old man, which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts;" Eph. ii. 1, and Col. ii. 13, where he speaks of men, before their conversion and baptism, as having been "dead in trespasses and sin;" Eph. ii. 3, where he speaks of both Jews and Gentiles as "by nature children of wrath;" Gal. iii. 22, where he says that "the Scripture hath concluded all under sin."

We can scarcely need fuller proof that the Scriptures describe all men naturally born into the world as subject to the disease of sin.

II. We have next to prove, that "Original sin is not derived from imitation, but inherited by birth."

In the third chapter of Genesis we have an account of the fall of Adam, and the consequent curse upon him, and the ground which he was to till.

Now the old Testament speaks of the impossibility of "bringing a clean thing out of an unclean" (Job xiv. 4), and asks, "What is man, that he should be clean? Or he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" (Job xv. 14). The Psalmist, as we have seen, traces his own corruption to the fact that he was "shapen in iniquity, and conceived in sin" (Ps. li. 5). Such expressions imply that the sinfulness of parents passed to their children; and the universal taint which we have already seen to be existing, is traced to an inheritance derived from father to son.

Such, we cannot doubt, is the meaning of our Lord, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John iii. 6). He was teaching Nicodemus the need which every one had to be born again, before he could see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus marvelled that a man should be born again. Our Lord explains that a spiritual birth was needed. And why? Because "that which was born of the flesh is flesh." The flesh signifies the natural, carnal, unholy state of man, as contrasted with the holy, spiritual state of the redeemed and regenerate. Now our Lord declared that every man had need of a new birth, because "that which was born of the flesh was flesh." Man inherited by birth the flesh, — a fleshly, an unspiritual, an unholy nature; therefore he needed a new birth, a birth of the Spirit, which should make him spiritual, even as his former birth of the flesh had made him carnal. This surely sufficiently demonstrates that every man by nature was in a state of defect, and *that*, because he *inherited* defect *by birth*. He was born of parents who were carnal, and therefore he was carnal himself.

Accordingly, St. Paul treats it as a well-known truth, that "in

Adam all die " (1 Cor. xv. 22). And in the Epistle to the Romans (v. 12) he tells us, that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;" that "through the offence of one many are dead" (ver. 15); that "by one man's offence death reigned" (ver. 17); that "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation" (ver. 18); that "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (ver. 19).

It is true that the words thus cited might, if they stood alone, bear the Pelagian interpretation, that Adam brought in sin by bringing in the first example of sin, and that his children sinned after him by imitation of him, not because they derived a sinful nature from him; and so judgment passed upon all men, "because all had sinned," their own personal sins having caused their condemnation. But St. Paul expressly guards against such an interpretation, by saying (ver. 14) that "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the *similitude* of Adam's transgression." Death was the penalty, which all had paid, even before the Law of Moses came to give more fully the knowledge of sin; and it had reigned not only in those whose presumptuous wickedness resembled the sin of Adam, but even in those who had not sinned after that similitude, in infants and idiots, and such as only inherited the nature, without following the example of Adam. This doctrine corresponds with the doctrine of our Lord, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh."

Accordingly, the Apostle, when speaking of human nature in general, calls it "sinful flesh" (Rom. viii. 3). Our Lord took our nature, such as it was derived from Adam, only He was "without sin;" but because He took that nature, which was then universally corrupted, therefore St. Paul says, "He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh." And with this doctrine entirely corresponds all that the Apostles write of the corruption of men by nature, and of the change or new birth necessary for every man who is in Christ; *e. g.* "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 15). "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18). "They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh" (Rom. viii. 5). "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 7, 8). "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh" (Gal. v. 17). Again, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17).

And the sinfulness of our natural state is called "the old man;" and Christians are said to have "put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and to have put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. iv. 22-24).

Now all this language appears to prove that sin is a corruption and disease, affecting not only individuals, but the whole of human nature, so that whosoever inherits human nature inherits it so diseased. It is "the flesh," a nature debased and defiled, and whatever is born of the flesh is flesh also. Adam, we find from the second chapter of Genesis, received from God a nature free from sin, and so not subject to shame. But he defiled it with sin, and it became at once subject to shame, and then subject to death. Accordingly, when he handed down that nature to his posterity, he could not hand it down pure as he had received it; he of necessity gave it to them as he had himself made it, stained with sin, liable to shame, having the seeds of mortality, and subject to condemnation. This view of the subject explains and satisfies the language of Scripture; and no other view will. There have been popular illustrations of it, such as the comparison of the hereditary taints of disease and insanity, and other ways in which, in God's providence, the sins of the fathers are visited on the children. There have been philosophical discussions concerning the oneness of human nature, interesting in themselves, but unsuited to our limits here.<sup>1</sup> We have already seen that there have been discussions as to whether the body only, or soul and body both, are derived from the parent, and so corrupted by his sins. Even this I have not fully entered into; though it is plain that Scripture speaks of *man*, not man's body only, as corrupted and condemned. "In Adam all die." From Adam "all have sinned" (Rom. v. 12). Sin is a fault of the soul, and therefore plainly both body and soul are tainted with corruption.

III. We have next to consider the degree or extent of corruption, thus naturally inherited by all men. Does original sin *totally* corrupt all men, so that there is no spark of natural goodness left? Or are there still relics of what man once was? still, though in wreck and ruin, some faint outline of his original state of purity?

<sup>1</sup> See for example Hooker, Bk. v.; Wilberforce, *On the Incarnation*, ch. III. This was the view of St. Augustine, more fully expanded by the realists among the schoolmen.

It has been contended that the words of our Article mean both of these sides of the alternative. Calvinists appeal to the words "quam longissime," in the Latin Article, as proving that man's defection from original righteousness was to the greatest extent possible, that is to say, total and entire.<sup>1</sup> Their opponents argued that the convocation had translated these words by "very far," showing that it was intended only to express a great and serious defection of our race from godliness, not a total destruction of moral sense and feeling.

The Scriptures evidently represent natural sinfulness as very great. The Almighty, speaking of the race before the flood, said that "every imagination of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. vi. 5). Yet this might apply only to that generation, which had become so wicked as to call for signal judgment and destruction. But then, after the flood, once more God declares that "He will not again curse the ground for man's sake; *though*<sup>2</sup> the imagination of his heart be only evil from his youth" (Gen. viii. 21). This seems to be a more general proposition, indicating at least that man's heart might prove as evil after the flood as it had done before.

In the book of Job, Eliphaz the Temanite says that God "putteth no trust in His saints, and the heavens are not clean in His sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man which drinketh iniquity like water" (Job xv. 16). We must not always consider the words of Job's friends as of authority in matters of faith, since their judgment is afterwards condemned by God; and we must make allowance for the strong antithesis between *God* and *man*; yet still the passage shows that to a pious man like Job it was an argument likely to be admitted, that man was so filthy as to "drink iniquity like water."

In Jer. xvii. 9, we read, that "the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it?" It is truly argued that "desperately wicked" is an epithet stronger than the

<sup>1</sup> "The Assembly of Divines," in the year 1643, revised the first fifteen Articles with the view of making them speak more clearly the language of Calvinism. The Ninth, according to their revision, was to have stood thus:—

"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but, *together with his first sin imputed*, it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is propagated from Adam; whereby man is *wholly deprived* of original righteous-

ness," &c. And ending with "the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust is *truly and properly* sin." — Neale's *Hist. of Puritans*, v. Appendix, No. VII. London, Baynes, 1822. See also Lawrence, *B. L.* p. 196.

<sup>2</sup> "*Though*," the translation of the margin of the English version, probably expresses the  $\text{ⲓ}$  of this passage better than "*for*." The conjunction assigns the reason why God had cursed the earth, not why He would not curse it again.



original warrants. The Hebrew word *חַיִּי* signifies rather *dangerously sick*, and therefore *feeble*, and in a moral sense, *corrupted and depraved*. Yet still the passage shows that the heart of man, taken in the general, is so corrupted and depraved as to be eminently deceitful and hard to know.

To these passages from the old Testament are added the words of St. Paul, "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing," Rom. vii. 18; and then again, "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," Rom. viii. 7.

Such language undoubtedly proves the very great corruption of the human heart, so that we cannot hesitate to say with our Church, that by nature "man is very far gone from original righteousness." He is described as "dead in trespasses and sins," and therefore we ought undoubtedly to maintain that his corruption is such as to prevent him from making any efforts to recover himself and turn by his own strength to calling upon God. This is the practical part of the doctrine, and our Church goes no farther.

Those who would push the matter to its greatest length, contend that the passages above quoted show that the image of God, in which man was created, was utterly taken from him at the fall; that he thenceforth had no trace of resemblance to what he once was; and, though they may not use language so strong, the natural conclusion from that which they do use is, that in a moral point of view there is no distinction between fallen humanity and evil spirits.

Those who differ with them argue that God's image was indeed defaced by sin, and so the effect and blessing of it lost. But that that image was quite gone they consider disproved by the declaration that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man" (Gen. ix. 6), — by St. Paul's statement, that the man "is the image and glory of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7), — by St. James's reasoning, that it is inconsistent with the same mouth to bless God, and to "curse men, which are made after the similitude of God" (James iii. 9). All these passages, they say, refer to men since the fall, and therefore prove that, whatever effect the fall may have had, it cannot have wholly obliterated the image of the Almighty.

They say farther, that when St. Paul says that "in him, that is in his flesh, dwelleth no good thing," he yet adds, "that to will is present with him, but how to perform that which is good he finds not" (Rom. vii. 18); and that he all along represents man as ap-

proving of what is right, but unable to accomplish it, — as honoring the law, but not fulfilling it, — as even “delighting in the law of God after the inward man,” but finding another law ruling in his members, “which brings him into captivity to the law of sin” (Rom. vii. 22, 23). Hence, though man is captivated and subdued by sin, there must be some relic of his former state to make him see and admire what is good, though unable to follow it; and so the Apostle speaks of all men as subject to the dictates of natural conscience (Rom. ii. 14, 15), and does not hesitate to reason with unregenerate heathens, of “righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come” (Acts xxiv. 25).

These and like expressions in Scripture, it is thought, are inconsistent with the stronger language which some have used concerning human depravity; although there is fully enough to show the universal and fearful corruption of our nature, and our utter inability of ourselves to become righteous, or to move upwards towards God and goodness.

IV. We come next to consider the statement which is made in the Article, that original sin “in every person born into the world deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.” Dr. Hey thinks that the word “damnation” is not necessarily to be understood of condemnation to eternal death, but may be construed, according to the proper signification of the term, to mean merely condemnation of some kind or other. The language of the Article is undoubtedly guarded, and studiously avoids expressing anything which cannot be clearly proved from Scripture. It is possible, therefore, that this may have been its meaning. But in either sense of the word, we shall probably find fully sufficient support for the doctrine expressed.

The language of St. Paul already quoted, “in Adam all die” (1 Cor. xv. 22), “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men; for that all have sinned” (Rom. v. 12), shows that the woe denounced upon Adam, as the effect of his own sin, passed from him to his posterity, as the effect of that sinfulness which they inherited from him. Accordingly, the same Apostle calls all men “children of wrath” (Ephes. ii. 3); and that we may be sure that this is true, not only of adults who have sinned wilfully, but even of infants, who have only inherited a sinful nature, we find our Lord, when speaking of the importance of the souls of little children, and of the guardianship of angels over them, attributing the blessings of their condition to

His having delivered them from their original state, which was that of those that are *lost*. "For," said He, "the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Matt. xviii. 11). With this corresponds the before-cited passage of St. Paul: "Death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

We find therefore all men, even children, represented as "lost," as "children of wrath," as subject to, and under the reign of "death." And this is said to have been brought in by the sin of one man, even Adam, and to have "passed upon all men; for that all have sinned."

We cannot fail to infer, that, as Adam by sin became subject to wrath and death, so all men are subject to the same wrath and death, because, by having a nature in itself sinful, they are, even without the commission of actual sin, yet sinners before God, and esteemed as "having sinned."

The death which Adam brought in is clearly (in Rom. v. and 1 Cor. xv.) opposed to the life which Christ bestows. That life is spiritual; and we therefore reason that the death, which is anti-thetic to it, is spiritual too. The conclusion is, that every person born into the world has a sinful nature and a sinful heart, which, though it have not broken out in acts of sin, yet constitutes him a sinner, so that he may be said to "have sinned;" and that, on this account, he is liable to death, whether by death be meant death of the body, or death of the soul.

It appears to me that our Church takes this view of the subject, and so follows closely on the teaching of St. Paul. She has said nothing concerning that hypothesis which was current among the schoolmen, and in general has prevailed amongst the followers of St. Augustine, that Adam's sin was *imputed* to his posterity, and that, as Levi was esteemed to have paid tithes in Abraham, being "yet in the loins of his father" (Heb. vii. 9, 10), so all men are esteemed to have sinned in Adam, and thus have his act of disobedience imputed to them.<sup>1</sup> The hypothesis is ingenious as explaining the language of the Apostle, but seems scarcely to correspond with his assertion that "death passed upon all men for that all

<sup>1</sup> See Edwards, *On Original Sin*, Part iv. ch. iii. Bp. Burnet, in stating the objections to this doctrine, gives this among the rest: "It is no small prejudice against this opinion that it was so long before it first appeared in the Latin Church; that it was never received in the Greek; and that even the Western

Church, though perhaps for some ignorant ages it received it, as it did everything else very implicitly, yet has been very much divided both about this, and many other opinions related to it, or arising out of it." — Burnet on Art. ix.

*have sinned.*"<sup>1</sup> It may be said indeed that they are *esteemed* to have sinned. But the statement is simply that they "*have sinned.*" And it is much easier to understand that a being of sinful disposition should be considered as having done that to which his disposition inevitably leads him, and which he has only left undone for lack of opportunity, than it is to suppose that he should be *esteemed* to have committed an act which was really committed by another, five thousand years before his birth. At all events, where our Church leaves it, let it rest.

V. It remains only to show that the infection of original sin is not (as the Council of Trent ruled it) wholly removed by baptism, but that it remains even in the *renati*; and, though there is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet the lust or concupiscence, which remains in all men, has the nature of sin.

1. Let us first remark, that "There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized." This is plain from our Lord's words in His commission to His Apostles: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 16). It is not less plain from the language of St. Peter, who, when asked by his hearers what they should do for salvation, replied, "Repent, and be baptized"<sup>2</sup> (Acts ii. 38).

The questions which may arise concerning the baptism of young children, may properly be reserved for the Article which treats expressly of baptism. Here it is sufficient to observe that our Church, though not admitting that all *taint* of original sin is done away in baptism, yet holds that its *condemnation* is remitted. "It is certain," she says, "by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved."<sup>3</sup>

2. But, though we thus believe that the condemnation which

<sup>1</sup> The marginal translation of ἐφ' ᾧ "in whom," would much favour this hypothesis. But it needs proof that ἐφ' ᾧ will bear such a rendering. Although Augustine, taking the Latin mistranslation *in quo*, built on it something of the imputation theory, he explains it very moderately, namely, that infants sinned in Adam, because the whole human race was then contained in Adam, and would inherit his sinful nature. Quoting Rom. v. 12, he continues:—

Unde nec illud liquidè dici potest, quod peccatum Adæ etiam non peccantibus nocuit, cum Scriptura dicat, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*. Nec sic dicuntur ista aliena

peccata, tamquam omnino ad parvulos non pertineant: si quidem in Adam tunc peccaverunt, quando, in ejus naturâ illâ insitâ vi quâ eos gignere poterat, adhuc omnes illi unus fuerunt; sed dicuntur aliena, quia nondum ipsi agebant vitas proprias, sed quicquid erat in futura propagine, vita unius hominis continebat. — *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*. Lib. III. c. 7, Tom. x. p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> The same appears in express terms from Rom. viii. 1: "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Compare Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Rubric at the end of the *Baptismal Service*.

original sin deserves, is, for Christ's sake, remitted to all that believe and are baptized, and, in the case of infants dying before the commission of actual sin, is remitted on baptism alone; still we hold that the infection of that sin remains even in the *renati*. The word *renati* occurs twice in the Latin Article, and in the English Article it is translated first "regenerated," and secondly "baptized." It will be seen hereafter on what principles the Church identifies "baptized" and "regenerated;" it is sufficient for our purpose now to observe that both ideas are embraced in the word used here.

Now that the baptized and regenerate Christian is not free from the infection of original corruption, but has to fight against it, as an enemy still striving to keep him down, and, if possible, to destroy him, appears from the following considerations.

St. James urges Christians not to be in a hurry to be teachers, and gives as a reason that in many things all Christians offend: "In many things we offend all" (James iii. 2). St. Paul, speaking of his own exertions in the service of the Church, says that it will not do for him, when working for others, to neglect himself, but on the contrary, says he, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway" (1 Cor. ix. 27). He bids the Galatians, "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (Gal. vi. 1). To those who "are risen with Christ," and whom he bids to "seek those things which are above," he yet adds the warning to mortify their earthly members (that is, the members or characteristics of their old man), which he describes as "fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness;" and further bids them put off "anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication, lying," as being suitable only to the old man which they had put off, and unfitted for the new man which they had put on (Col. i. 1, 5, 8, 9). St. Peter, addressing the Church as "new-born babes" in Christ (1 Pet. ii. 2), yet exhorts them (ver. 11), "as pilgrims and strangers to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."

Now all these passages, which clearly concern baptized and regenerate Christians, prove this: that there is still left in them a liability to sin; that without much care and anxiety all will fall into sin; and that even under all circumstances, all do "offend in many things." Accordingly, St. John says of those whose "fellowship

is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ," that "if they say that they have no sin, they deceive themselves, and the truth is not in them" (1 John i. 8). Can anything account for this universally applicable language, except the fact, as stated by our Church, that the infection of original sin remains even in the regenerate or baptized?

3. Lastly, the Article asserts that "concupiscence and lust hath the nature of sin."

The Council of Trent admitted the existence of lust and concupiscence in the regenerate, and admitted that such concupiscence arose from original sin, and tended to actual sin, but denied that it was sin in itself. The English Church is here at issue with the fathers of the Council.

Her opinion on this point is defended by such passages as these: "Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof" (Rom. vi. 12), where the lusts of sin seem clearly to be spoken of as sinful. Again, Rom. vii. 7: "I had not known sin but by the Law; for I had not known lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Here lust and sin seem to be identified. Again, in Matt. v. (especially vv. 28, 29) our Lord speaks of the desire of sin as being itself sin. And in the passage quoted in the Article (Gal. v. 17), St. Paul says that "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit." Now we can hardly understand how the lusts of the natural man should be opposed to the Spirit of God, and yet be sinless. We conclude, therefore, that "lust and concupiscence hath of itself the nature of sin."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The connection between *lust* and *sin* is very apparent in the Hebrew language, which derives many of its usages from its theology. Thus **רָחַק** signifies both *desire*

and *wickedness*. In Arabic **هَوِي** is *Vastus* and *wickedness*, from **هَوِي** *cupicitas, Amor intensissimus*, from **هَوِي**

to *desire*. So in Hebrew, **רָחַק** is (1) *desire*, as in Prov. x. 3, **יְהַיֶּה רָחַק רָחֵימִים** "He withholdeth the *desire* of the wicked." (2) *wickedness*, as Ps. v. 10, **רָחֵק** **רָחֵק** "Their inward part is *very wickedness*." Where the plural form gives intensity.

## ARTICLE X.

*Of Free Will.*

*De Libero Arbitrio.*

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,<sup>1</sup> when we have that good will.<sup>2</sup>

EA est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare non possit. Quare absque gratia Dei (quæ per Christum est) nos præveniente, ut velimus, et cooperante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera faciendâ, quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valemus.

### SECTION I.—HISTORY.

THE Article on Free Will naturally follows that concerning Original Sin; and much which was said on the latter subject may be applicable to the explication of the former.

The sentiments of the Apostolical Fathers on Free Will are probably nowhere very distinctly expressed. Their writings are rather practical than controversial; and hence these topics are not very likely to be discussed in them. That they fully and plainly teach the weakness of man, and the necessity of Divine grace, cannot be questioned.

The opinions of Justin Martyr are more clearly and definitely put forth in his extant works than are those of the Apostolical Fathers. In answer to objections which the Jews urged against

<sup>1</sup> This is the reading of the copy of the Articles as set forth in 1571. In 1562 the words run "working *in* us," and such was the reading in 1552.

<sup>2</sup> The Article, as it stood in 1552, began with the words, "We have no power." The former part was prefixed in 1562 by Abp. Parker, having been taken from the Wirtemberg Confession, the words of which are:—

Quod autem nonnulli affirmant homini post lapsum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit sese, naturalibus suis

viribus et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare, haud obscure pugnat cum Apostolica doctrina et cum vero Ecclesiæ Catholiciæ consensu.

The latter part, which constituted the whole of the original Article, has adopted the language of St. Augustine:—

Sine illo vel operante ut velimus, vel cooperante cum volumus, ad bonæ pietatis opera nihil valemus.— *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, cap. 17. See Abp. Laurence, *B. L.* pp. 101, 235.

the scheme of Christian doctrine, namely, that according to it there was an inevitable necessity that Christ should suffer, and therefore a necessity and constraint laid upon the Jews to crucify Him, Justin denies that God's foreknowledge of wicked actions made Him the author of those actions. He puts no restraint upon men's wills, but foretells certain evil actions, not because He causes, but simply because He foresees them.<sup>1</sup> In like manner, in the first Apology, which was addressed to heathens, he explains that our belief in the predictions of the Prophets does not oblige us to believe that things take place according to fate; for, if men acted under a fatal necessity, one could not be praised nor another blamed.<sup>2</sup> And in the second Apology he maintains, in opposition to the Stoics, who believed in an inevitable fate (*κατ' ἐμπαρμένην ἀνάγκην πάντα γίνεσθαι*), that it is the nature of all men to have a capacity for virtue and vice; for unless there were a power of turning to either, there could be nothing praiseworthy.<sup>3</sup> Yet, with such a belief in the freedom of human choice, Justin fully maintained the necessity of Divine grace, and the impossibility of attaining salvation without the light and aid of God's Spirit.<sup>4</sup>

In the earliest ages the Gnostic and other heretics held, to a great extent, the doctrines of material fatalism. We have already seen that some of the Gnostics considered actions as influenced by the stars. We have seen also, that Florinus taught that God was the Author of evil, and that Irenæus, who had formerly been his friend, wrote against him.<sup>5</sup> Against such statements Irenæus constantly maintained human freedom, and denied that the will was a mere machine acted on by good or evil principles, and itself passive under them. But the necessity of the grace of God's Holy Spirit he as strongly expressed, when occasion required.<sup>6</sup>

The Marcionites maintained that the universe was governed by two independent principles, one of good, and the other of evil. This naturally led to the belief in a physical restraint on the will of the creature. Accordingly, Tertullian, in disputing against

<sup>1</sup> *Dial. cum Tryphone, Opera*, p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol. i. Opera*, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> *Apol. ii. Opera*, p. 45.

<sup>4</sup> *E. g.* 'Ἐπὶ Θεῶν τὸν πάντα ποιήσαντα ἐπίκειναι δεῖ πάντας, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου μόνου σωτηρίαν καὶ βοηθείαν ζητεῖν· ἄλλὰ μὴ, ὡς λοιποῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, διὰ γένος ἢ πλοῦτον ἢ ἰσχυρὴν ἢ σοφίαν νομίζεν δύνασθαι σώζεσθαι. — *Dial. c. Tryph. Opp.* p. 329.

Concerning Justin Martyr's opinions on free will, consult Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 75, ch. 111.; Faber's *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, Bk. i. ch. xi

<sup>5</sup> See History of the Ninth Article.

<sup>6</sup> *E. g.* Sicut arida terra, si non percipiat humorem, non fructificat: sic et nos, aridum lignum existentes primum, nunquam fructificaremus vitam, sine suprema voluntaria pluvia. — *Adv. Hær.* 111. 19.

Concerning the opinions of Irenæus on free will, see Faber as above, and Beaven's *Account of Irenæus*, ch. xi. p. 112.



them, strenuously contends that freedom of the will was given to Adam.<sup>1</sup> From the same father we learn that Valentinus taught that man was created of three different kinds, — spiritual, animal, and terrestrial; the first sort as Seth, the second as Abel, the third as Cain; and that, as the distinction was from birth, it was consequently immutable. The first kind were destined to certain salvation, the last to certain perdition, the lot of the second was uncertain, depending on their greater inclination on the one hand to the spiritual, on the other to the carnal.<sup>2</sup>

The fathers, who were contemporary with these heretics, were naturally led, in disputing against them, to use strong language on the freedom of the will; so that it is no wonder if, after the rise of Pelagius, his followers were ready to quote some of the ancients in defence of their errors.

Origen was one of those who opposed the Marcionite and Valentinian heresies; and his peculiar system of theology specially led him to more than ordinarily strong assertions of the freedom of the will. He took up the Platonic notion of the preëxistence of souls. The state of all created beings he believed to be regulated by their former actions. All souls were created free. Every rational creature was made capable of good or of evil. Angels and devils were alike created capable of holiness or of wickedness. The devil and his ministers fell by abuse of freedom; the holy angels stood by a right use of it.<sup>3</sup> Every reasoning being is capable of degenerating or of improvement, according as he follows or resists reason. Men have been placed in different positions in this world; but it is because of their conduct in a former existence. Jacob was beloved of God more than Esau, because in the former life he had lived more holily.<sup>4</sup> And, as good or evil are *substantially* in none but the Holy Trinity, but all holiness is in creatures only as an *accident*, it follows that it is in us and in our own wills to be holy, or through sloth and negligence to decline from holiness to wickedness and perdition.<sup>5</sup> Holiness is attained or lost, much as music or mathematics. No man becomes a mathematician or a musician but by labour and study, and if he becomes idle and negligent, he will forget what he has learnt, and cease to be skilful in his science

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. *Adv. Marcion*, Lib. II. 8, 9, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian, *De Anima*, c. 21–30. See Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, pp. 330, 522.

<sup>3</sup> *De Princip.* Lib. I. cap. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. II. cap. 9, num. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Et per hoc consequens est in nobis esse, atque in nostris motibus, ut vel

beati vel sancti simus, vel per desidiam et negligentiam a beatitudine in malitiam et perditionem vergamus, in tantum ut nimius profectus (ut ita dixerim) malitiæ, si quis in tantum sui neglexerit, usque ad eum statum deveniat, ut ea quæ dicitur contraria virtus efficiatur. — Lib. I. cap. 5, num. 5.

or his art; and so no man will be good who does not practise goodness, and, if he neglects self-discipline and is idle, he will soon lapse into sin and corruption.<sup>1</sup> Such language assigns so much strength to man, and keeps out of sight so much the necessity of Divine grace, that it has been truly said not to have been “without reason that St. Hierome accuses him of having furnished the Pelagians with principles;” though yet in some places he speaks very favourably of grace and of the assistance of God.<sup>2</sup>

In later times, as we have seen already, Manes and his followers held that good or evil actions were produced by the good or the evil principle. They appear to have believed that men are acted on by these powers as an inanimate stock, which must passively submit to the impulses which move it.<sup>3</sup>

St. Augustine was himself originally a Manichee. In his earlier treatises he constantly directs his arguments against the Manichean doctrines, as being those errors with which he was best acquainted, and which he dreaded most.<sup>4</sup>

After the rise of Pelagianism, and when his efforts were chiefly directed to the overthrow of that heresy, he speaks less frequently and clearly in favour of the original freedom of the will, and brings more prominently out those predestinarian opinions which are so well known in connection with his name. It would not, however, be true to say that he materially changed his opinions on that subject; for in some of his most decidedly Anti-Pelagian writings, and whilst most strongly maintaining the sovereignty of Divine grace, he unequivocally asserts the freedom of the human will, as a gift of God to be used and accounted for.<sup>5</sup>

The tenets of the Pelagians on this subject are expressed in one of the charges urged against Cœlestius in the Council of Carthage, “That a man may be without sin, and keep the commandments of

<sup>1</sup> Lib. i. cap. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Hist.* Cent. III. Origen.

It seems as if Clement of Alexandria pressed the doctrine of free will to a very undue extent, though not so far nor so systematically as his great pupil Origen. See Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, ch. x. p. 429.

<sup>3</sup> Beausobre, and apparently Lardner who quotes him, doubt whether the Manichees did believe the will to be so thoroughly enslaved. See Lardner, *Hist. of Manichees*, Sec. IV. 13. Vol. III. p. 474.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, see the treatise *De Libero Arbitrio*, *Opp.* Tom. I.

<sup>5</sup> For example, *De Spiritu et Litera*, § 52, Tom. x. p. 114.

Liberum ergo arbitrium evacuamus per gratiam? Absit, sed magis liberum arbitrium statuimus. Sicut enim lex per fidem, sic liberum arbitrium per gratiam non evacuatur sed statuitur. Neque enim lex impletur nisi libero arbitrio: sed per legem cognitio peccati, per fidem impetratio gratiæ contra peccatum, per gratiam sanatio animæ a vitio peccati, per animæ sanitatem libertas arbitrii, per liberum arbitrium justitiæ dilectio, per justitiæ dilectionem legis operatio. Ac per hoc, sicut lex non evacuatur, sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam, qua lex impletur: ita liberum arbitrium non evacuatur per gratiam, sed statuitur, quia gratia sanat voluntatem, qua justitia libere diligitur.

God if he will;”<sup>1</sup> or in the passage which Augustine cites from his work, “Our victory proceeds not from the help of God, but from the freedom of will.”<sup>2</sup> The Semi-Pelagians, though they did not deny the necessity of grace, yet taught that preventing grace was not necessary to produce the beginnings of true repentance, that every one could by natural strength turn towards God, but that no one could advance and persevere without the assistance of the Spirit of God.<sup>3</sup>

In the ninth century, Goteschal, a Saxon divine, broached strong predestinarian doctrines, which, of course, more or less embraced the subject of the present Article; for, as he is said to have held that God eternally decreed some men to salvation and others to perdition, he must have held that the will was in a great degree subject to an inevitable necessity.<sup>4</sup> The history of this controversy, however, more properly belongs to the seventeenth Article. The disputes on the doctrines of Goteschal divided the writers of his day. He was defended by Ratramn, monk of Corby, famous on more accounts than one, and condemned by Rabanus Maurus and Johannes Scotus Erigena.

In the twelfth century flourished Peter, surnamed Lombardus or Lombard, Archbishop of Paris, who wrote a book called *Libri Sententiarum*, in which he compiled extracts from the fathers on different points of faith and doctrine, from which he was afterwards known as the *Magister Sententiarum*, or *Master of the Sentences*. His work became the text-book for future disputants, the storehouse for scholastic polemics, esteemed wellnigh upon a par with Scripture itself.

The schoolmen, who followed him, and flourished chiefly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, discussed to a great extent the questions concerning predestination and the freedom of the will. The most famous of these, as being heads of powerful and opposing parties, were Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus. Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican Friar, of a philosophical spirit and great learning, and was known by the name of *Doctor Universalis*, or *Angelicus*. He was born in Italy, A. D. 1224, and died in 1274.

<sup>1</sup> Wall, *Infant Baptism*, i. p. 357; Collier, *Ecc. Hist.* Book i., and the account of Pelagianism given under Article IX.

<sup>2</sup> *Victoriam nostram non ex Dei esse adjutorio, sed ex libero arbitrio.* — August. *De Gestis Pelagii*, Tom. x. p. 215.

<sup>3</sup> Mosheim, *Ecc. Hist.* Cent. v. pt. ii. ch. v. § 26.

Vitalis held that “God did work in us to will, by the Scriptures either read or heard by us; but that to consent to them or not consent is so in our own power that if we will it may be done.” — August. *Epist. cvii. ad Vitalem*.

<sup>4</sup> See Mosheim, Cent. ix. pt. ii. ch. iii.

His most famous work is his *Summa Theologicæ*. In philosophy he was a Realist; in Theology, a disciple of St. Augustine; and therefore opposed to that belief too prevalent among the schoolmen, that the gift of grace was dependent on the manner in which men exercised their merely natural endowments (*pura naturalia*). Duns Scotus, born at Dunston in Northumberland, about the period of the death of Aquinas, was a Franciscan. He attacked the system of Thomas Aquinas, and acquired the name of *Doctor Subtilis*. He so strongly maintained the doctrine of the freedom of the will as to approximate suspiciously to the error of Pelagius. Duns Scotus was the founder of the School called the *Scotists*, to which the Franciscan friars belonged. The followers of Thomas Aquinas were called *Thomists*, and to these belonged the Dominicans, who with the Franciscans divided between them the learning of the Christian world in the ages preceding the Reformation.

In reasoning on the subject of the human will, and the need of grace to produce holiness, the school-authors invented a mode of speaking, alluded to in our thirteenth article, by which they endeavoured to reconcile some of the apparent difficulties of the question. They observed that Cornelius, before his baptism and a knowledge of the Gospel, had put up prayers and given alms, which are spoken of in Scripture as acceptable to God.<sup>1</sup> They thought, therefore, that some degree of goodness was attributable to unassisted efforts on the part of man towards the attainment of holiness; and, though they did not hold that such efforts did, of their own merit, deserve grace, yet they taught that in some degree they were such as to call down the grace of God upon them, it being not indeed obligatory on the justice of God to reward such efforts by giving His grace, but it being agreeable to His nature and goodness to bestow grace on those who make such efforts. Endeavors, then, on the part of man to attain to godliness were by the schoolmen said to deserve grace *de congruo*, of congruity. But, when once grace was given, then it enabled the recipient to deserve at the hands of God, not only farther grace, but even in the end everlasting life. All this of course was to be considered as depending on the Atonement of Christ; but whatever was presupposed, it remarkably tended to the exalting the power of the will, and the strength of unassisted man.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Acts x. 4: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God."

<sup>2</sup> Laurence, B. L. Serm. iv. and the notes to that Sermon *passim*. Neander, vol. VIII. pp. 230, 231. Neander points

out the marked distinction between the doctrine of grace *de congruo*, as held by Aquinas, and the same doctrine, as held by Alexander of Hales and the Franciscans.

We now come to the period of the Reformation. The doctrine of grace *de congruo* gave the greatest possible offence to Luther, and called forth much of his strongest language. For example, in his treatise on the *Bondage of the Will* he asserted, that "in his actings towards God, in things pertaining to salvation or damnation, man has no free will, but is the captive, the subject, and the servant, either of the will of God, or of the will of Satan."<sup>1</sup> Again, "If we believe that God foreknows and predestinates everything . . . it follows that there can be no such thing as free will in man or angel, or any creature."<sup>2</sup> These expressions are characteristic of the vehemence of Luther's temper, when opposing what he considered a dangerous error, and are much stronger than the opinions subsequently expressed by him, and very different from the language of Melancthon and the confessions of the Lutheran Churches.

In the Council of Trent the Lutheran opinions on this doctrine were set forth to be discussed. Much was said on both sides of the question. The Franciscans, as being followers of Scotus, spoke much for the absolute freedom of the will, and in favour of the doctrine of grace *de congruo*. The Dominicans, after St. Thomas Aquinas, repudiated the idea of congruous merit, and maintained the inability of man to turn to good of his own will, since the fall of Adam. The decrees were drawn up, so as to displease either party as little as possible, but with a leaning to the Franciscan doctrines. Those were condemned who said "that since the sin of Adam free will is lost," and that "bad as well as good works are done by the working of God." Yet, at the same time, those were anathematized who said that "a man could be justified without grace," "that grace is given to live well with greater facility, and to merit eternal life, as if free will could do it though with more difficulty;" and who said that "a man may believe, love, hope, or repent, without the prevention or assistance of the Holy Spirit."<sup>3</sup>

In the earlier days of the Reformation, the Lutherans generally held extreme language on the slavery of the will, and Melancthon himself used expressions which he afterwards withdrew. The more

<sup>1</sup> Cæterum erga Deum, vel in rebus quæ pertinent ad salutem vel damnationem, non habet liberum arbitrium, sed captivus, subjectus et servus est vel voluntatis Dei, vel voluntatis Satanæ. — *De Servo Arbitrio*, *Opp.* Tom. i. p. 432.

<sup>2</sup> Si enim credimus verum esse, quod Deus præscit et præordinat omnia, tum neque falli neque impediri potest sua

præscientia et prædestinatione, deinde nihil fieri nisi ipso volente, id quod ipsa ratio cogitur concedere, simul ipsa ratione teste, nullum potest esse liberum arbitrium in homine vel angelo, aut ulla creatura. — *Id.* p. 481.

<sup>3</sup> Sarpi, pp. 134, 210; Heylyn, *Historia Quinquarticularis*, pt. i. ch. iv.

matured convictions of this great writer were sober and wise ; and the confession of Augsburg, whilst affirming that the will of man “ hath not the power to effect the righteousness of God without the Spirit of God,”<sup>1</sup> yet declares that “ the cause of sin is the will of wicked beings, namely, the devil and ungodly men, which, when not aided by God, turns itself from God, as it is written, When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of himself.”<sup>2</sup>

The Calvinistic reformers do not hesitate to use the most extreme expressions on the inability of man to do anything but evil. “ The mind of man,” says Calvin, “ is so wholly alienated from God, that it can conceive, desire, and effect nothing but what is impious, perverted, foul, impure, and flagitious ; the heart of sin is so steeped in venom, that it can breathe forth nothing but fetid corruption.”<sup>3</sup>

The followers of Calvin have, for the most part, used language similar to their leader. Whether Calvin allowed to Adam free will in Paradise, or believed that even his fall was predestinated, has been matter of dispute. Of the Calvinistic divines, those called Supralapsarians held, as has been mentioned before, that God fore-ordained that Adam should sin, and therefore denied to him free will even in a state of innocence. The Sublapsarians held that he fell of his own will, and not by constraint or through the ordination of God.

Among the bodies of Christians who embraced the Calvinistic doctrines and discipline, some of the most considerable were the Churches of Holland and Belgium. The Belgic Confession, put forth in the year 1567, contains explicit declarations that all things in the world must happen according to the absolute decree and ordination of God, though God was not to be called the author of sin, nor to be blamed for its existence.<sup>4</sup> Several divines of the Belgic Church had demurred at these doctrines ; and at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, Jacob Van Harmin, or Arminius, a pastor of Amsterdam, broached the

<sup>1</sup> Non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ justitiæ Dei, seu justitiæ spiritualis, quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus Dei. — Art. XVII. ; *Sylloge*, p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> Art. XIX. De causa peccati docent, quod tametsi Deus creat et conservat naturam, tamen causa peccati est voluntas malorum, videlicet diaboli et impiorum, quæ non adjuvante Deo avertit se a Deo, sicut Christus ait Joh. viii., Cum loquitur mendacium, ex seipso loquitur. — *Syll.* p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Stet ergo nobis indubia ista veritas, quæ nullis machinamentis quateferi potest, mentem hominis sic alienatam prorsus a Dei justitiæ, ut nihil non impium, contortum, fædum, impurum, flagitiosum concipiat, concupiscat, molitur : cor peccati veneno ita penitus delibutum, ut nihil quam corruptum fetorem efflare queat. — Calv. *Institut.* Lib. II. cap. v. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Confess. Belgica, *Sylloge*, p. 234

sentiments generally known by the name of Arminianism. He dying in 1609, and his followers being persecuted by the dominant party, they addressed, in 1610, a *Remonstrance* to the states of Holland, whence they were called *Remonstrants*. Their sentiments on the subject of free will may be gathered from the third and fourth of the five articles, to which, the Arminian doctrines were reduced.

The third article says that "man cannot attain to saving faith of his own free will, in regard that, living in an estate of sin and defection from God, he is not able of himself to think, will, or do anything which is really good." The fourth article runs thus, "The grace of God is the beginning, promotion, and accomplishment of everything that is good in us; insomuch that the regenerate man can neither think, will, nor do anything that is good, nor resist any sinful temptations without this grace preventing, coöperating, and assisting; and consequently, all good works which any man can attain to, are to be attributed to the grace of God in Christ. But, as for the manner of the coöperation of this grace, it is not irresistible; for it is said of many in Scripture, that they did resist the Holy Ghost, as in Acts vii. and many other places."<sup>1</sup>

The disputes between the Remonstrants and their opponents led to the calling of a Synod at Dort, or Dordrecht, at which deputies were present from most of the Protestant Churches of Europe. At this the Arminians were excommunicated, and the doctrines of the Swiss and Belgic reformed Churches declared to be decidedly Calvinistic, and intolerant of the opposite opinions.<sup>2</sup> Both *election* and *reprobation* are declared to be of God alone;<sup>3</sup> but at the same time, it is affirmed that God is not to be considered as the author of sin;<sup>4</sup> nor is it to be said that He works on men as logs or stocks, but rather by giving life and energy to their wills.<sup>5</sup> The decrees of the Synod are indeed generally esteemed decidedly supralapsarian, and were unsatisfactory to the English divines who were present during some of their discussions;<sup>6</sup> but their language seems less exaggerated than some who were opposed to them have been inclined to represent it.<sup>7</sup>

The Church of Rome, after the Council of Trent, was not

<sup>1</sup> Heylyn's *Hist. Quing.* pt. I. ch. v.; Mosheim, *Ecl. Hist. Cent. xvii.* Sect. II. pt. II.

<sup>2</sup> Heylyn and Mosheim as above.

<sup>3</sup> *Sylloge*, p. 406, Art. vi.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 409, Art. xv.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 431, Art. xvi.

<sup>6</sup> See Bp. Hall's *Observations on some Specialities in his Life.*

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Heylyn, *H. Q.* pt. I. ch. vi.

exempt from the same controversies which divided the Protestants on grace and free will. Molina, a Jesuit, professor at Eboræ, in Portugal, in 1588, published a book entitled *Liberi arbitrii concordia cum Gratiæ donis, Divina Præscientia, Prædestinatione, et Reprobatione*. His theory was somewhat similar to that of the Arminians, who taught that grace was given, according as God foresees that man would embrace and make good use of it. The Dominicans were much offended at this work, and accused the Jesuits of reviving Pelagianism. This led to a long and violent contention between the two orders, which caused Clement VIII. to appoint a sort of Council called the Congregation de Auxiliis.<sup>1</sup> The death of Clement VIII., before a settlement of these disputes, did not prevent their continuance under his successor, Paul V. And though Paul did not publicly declare for either side of the question, it is probable that he urged both parties to moderation, being deterred from pronouncing against the Jesuits by the patronage extended to them by the court of France, and from deciding against the Dominicans by the protection of the court of Spain.<sup>2</sup> The controversy, hushed for a time, broke out again in the year 1640, in consequence of the writings of Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, who revived the doctrines of Augustine, in his book entitled *Augustinus*. His followers were called Jansenists, and were strongly opposed by the Jesuits; the former maintaining the sentiments held by Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and the Dominicans, the latter holding those of Duns Scotus and the Franciscans. The book of Jansenius was first condemned as a breach of the concord which had been enjoined in the Church, but was afterwards more distinctly prohibited by a solemn bull of Pope Urban VIII., A. D. 1642. The Jansenists however continued to prosper, numbering many able and pious men in their ranks, and appealing to miracles in support of their opinions. But ultimately they were condemned and persecuted by the Bishops of Rome, and the dominant faction of the Church.<sup>3</sup>

Before concluding this sketch of the different controversies in other countries, we must mention the Socinian opinions on free will; which, of course, correspond with their views of original sin: as they appear to consider that man's will is so far free and strong as to need only external, and not internal help towards his sanctification.<sup>4</sup>

After the Retormation, or during the establishment of it *in*

<sup>1</sup> Mosheim, Cent. xvi. Sect. III. pt. I.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Cent. xvii. Sect. II. pt. I. § 40

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. Cent. xvii. Sect. II. pt. I. § 35.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Cent. xvi. Sect. III. pt. II. 17.



*England*, the first thing which particularly claims our attention is the Article of Free Will in the *Necessary Doctrine*, set forth by King Henry VIII. and signed by Convocation, A. D. 1543. In this it is said that "man has free will now after the fall of Adam;" and free will is defined, as "a power of reason and will by which good is chosen by the assistance of grace, or evil is chosen without the assistance of the same."<sup>1</sup>

The reformers in the reign of Edward VI. appear to have followed closely upon the steps of the Lutherans (Melancthon and the Confession of Augsburg), in the Articles which concern grace and free will.<sup>2</sup> The Article on free will, in the forty-two Articles of 1552, was immediately succeeded by an Article on grace, which was worded as follows:—

" OF GRACE.

"The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by Him given, doth take away the stony heart and giveth an heart of flesh. And although those who have no will to good things, He maketh them will, and those that would evil things, He maketh them not to will; yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will. And therefore no man, when he sinneth, can excuse himself as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillingly or by compulsion."

During the Marian persecution, the English Divines who fled to Frankfort and other places on the Continent, by being thrown into contact with foreign reformers, were drawn into the controversies which agitated them. Many came back with strong prejudices in favour of the Calvinists, while others were strongly disposed to maintain Lutheran views. There were therefore three distinct parties in the Church in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth. Some were for the restoration of popery; others inclined to Lutheran views of grace and of the Sacraments; and a third party had imbibed Calvinistic sentiments of predestination and church discipline, and Zuinglian sentiments on sacramental grace. The last were the forerunners of the Puritans, who soon became non-conformists, and finally dissenters. They acquired the name of Gospellers, and called their opponents Freewillers. Archbishop Parker and the leading men of the day wisely strove to heal the divisions, and softened down the language of our formularies so as to include as many as possible within the pale of the

<sup>1</sup> *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.* p. 359, where see the Article of Free Will at length.

<sup>2</sup> See Laurence, *B. L. passim*, especially Sermon v.

National Church; and among other measures of conciliation the *Article on Grace* was omitted, to satisfy the Calvinistic section of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

The controversies, however, between the high Church and the Puritan divines, both on points of doctrine and of discipline, continued to divide the Church. Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, in doctrine agreed with Calvin, but in discipline was a high Episcopalian. During his primacy were drawn up the famous Lambeth Articles, which he would gladly have imposed on the Church, but which never received the authority of the queen, the parliament, or the convocation. The first of these Articles says, that "God hath from eternity predestinated some men to life, others He has reprobated to death;" and the ninth asserts, that "it is not in the will or power of every one to be saved."<sup>2</sup>

In the conference held at Hampton Court in the reign of King James I. A. D. 1603, an effort was made on the part of the Puritan divines to obtain an alteration in some of the XXXIX Articles, and to have them made more conformable to Calvinistic language; but no alteration was effected, owing to the opposition of the King and of the Bishops to the arguments of the Puritans.<sup>3</sup>

The Articles remain therefore as they were put forth in 1562, and afterwards in 1571. And those on the subject of grace, free will, and other similar subjects, are the same as those drawn up in 1552, by Cranmer and his fellows, with the exception of the omission of the Article on Grace which was then the tenth Article, and the prefixing of the first part of the present tenth (originally the ninth Article) down to the word "wherefore."

There have been, ever since the reign of Elizabeth, two parties in the English Church, one holding the doctrines of Calvin, and the other opposing those doctrines, and each party has considered the Articles to speak their own language. It is however an undoubted truth that the Articles were drawn up before Calvin's works had become extensively known, or had become in any degree popular in this country. It is probable that they speak the language neither of Calvin, nor of Arminius; and between the extreme opinions, which had prevailed among the Schoolmen and others, they held a middle course, carefully avoiding the dogma of congruous merit, maintaining jealously the absolute necessity of preventing grace to enable us to will or to do according to the

<sup>1</sup> Heylyn's *H. Q.* pt. III. ch. xvii. On the state of parties, &c. in Elizabeth's reign, see Soames's *Elizabethan Religious History*.

<sup>2</sup> Heylyn's *H. Q.* pt. III. ch. xx.

<sup>3</sup> Heylyn, pt. III. ch. xxii., Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 178, &c.

commandments of God, but not minutely entering into the questions concerning the freedom of man before the fall, or the degree of free agency left to him since the fall.

---

## SECTION II. — SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE ninth Article having asserted that man by the fall is “very far gone from original righteousness,” there arises at once a probability that he is weak and helpless towards good. In reasoning therefore on that Article, it was natural in some degree to anticipate some of the conclusions of this.

Yet still, unless it be clearly conceded that by the fall man became *totally* corrupt, with no shadow of the image of God in which he was created, and with a mind nearly approaching, if not actually similar, to the mind of devils; it would be possible that such a degree of strength might remain to him that he might make some independent efforts towards holiness, and in some degree prepare himself for the reception of grace. As therefore the ninth Article does not define the exact amount of man’s defection from original righteousness, it was quite necessary to state the doctrine of his utter helplessness in this.

The subject, as it is stated in the Article, seems to divide itself into the two following heads.

I. Since the fall, man has no power by his own natural strength to turn himself to faith and godliness, or to do good works acceptable to God. But the grace of God is absolutely necessary to enable him to do this.

II. The grace of God acts in two ways.

1. First, it is preventing grace, giving a good will.
2. Afterwards, it is coöperating grace, working in and with us, when we have that good will.

I. First, then, since the fall, man has no power by his own natural strength to turn himself to faith and holiness, or to do good works acceptable to God. But the grace of God is absolutely necessary to enable him to do this.

Here the point to be proved is simply this. Whatever degree

of defection is implied in the fall, whatever natural amiability any individuals of the human race may possess, no one, by mere natural strength, and without internal help from God, can believe or do what is, in a religious point of view, pleasing or acceptable to God.

1. In the sixth chapter of St. John our Lord says, "No man can come unto Me, except the Father which hath sent Me draw him" (ver. 44); and again, "Therefore said I unto you, no man can come unto Me, except it were given him of My Father" (ver. 65).

Now here the proposition is quite general. All mankind are included in the sentence, "No man can come" to Christ, except it be given him of God, except God the Father draw him. This is a plain statement of natural weakness, and of the need of preventing grace. It shows that by nature man is apart from Christ, and that only the gift of God and the drawing of God can bring him to Christ.

To this argument the Pelagians answer, that no doubt it is necessary that God should draw us, if we are to come to Him; but the way in which He draws us is not by internal assistance and the motions of His Spirit in our hearts, but externally, by the calls of His word, the warnings of His Providence, the ordinances of His Church. Thus, therefore, say they, He may be said to draw us, and thus it is given us of Him to come to Christ. But we may reply to this objection, that such an interpretation is inconsistent with the whole drift of our Lord's discourse: The Capharnaite Jews, who heard Him, were staggered at His sayings, and disbelieved them. Externally the word of God was drawing them then, but they murmured against it, and refused to listen to it. Accordingly our Lord tells them that it was from an absence of *inward* sanctification that they rejected the *outward* calls of His word. If they came to Him, it must be by the drawing of the Father, through the grace of His Spirit; for, says He, "No man can come unto Me, except the Father, which hath sent Me, draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. As it is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and that hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (vv. 44, 45). If by these words is meant only the outward drawing by external means, it is plain that all who heard Him had such drawing in its most efficient form; yet most of them rejected Him. It is evident that they lacked something more than this. That being taught of God, that learning of the Father,

which would bring them to Christ, must therefore have been something within them, not the calls of His word without; and hence we may conclude that our Lord's words show it to be an invariable rule, a truth coextensive with the nature of fallen man, that no one can come to Christ, or, what is the same thing, turn and prepare himself to faith and calling upon God, without the internal operations of the Spirit of God.

2. To confirm this view of the subject, let us recur to what we saw, in considering the ninth Article, was the doctrine of Scripture concerning our original corruption.

Our Lord states (John viii. 34) that "whosoever committeth sin is the servant (*δοῦλος the slave*) of sin." Now all men by nature commit sin, and therefore are slaves of sin. This is what St. Paul calls "the bondage of corruption" (Rom. viii. 21). This natural state of man is, both by our Lord and by the Apostle, contrasted with the liberty of the soul under a state of grace. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John viii. 36), says Christ; and St. Paul calls it "the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21). In like manner our Lord distinguishes between the state of a servant and the state of a son (John viii. 35). Nay, so complete is this servitude of sin by nature, that St. Paul, more than once, calls it *death*. He speaks of people as by nature "*dead* in trespasses and sins" (Ephes. ii. 1; Col. ii. 13). He says of those who had been delivered from this state by grace, that "God had *quickened* them together with Christ" (Ephes. ii. 5); that those who were baptized into the death of Christ, having been *dead* in trespasses and sins, God had "*quickened* together with Him" (Col. ii. 12, 13). Now slavery and death are the strongest terms to express utter helplessness that language admits of. So, freeing from slavery and quickening or raising to life, as plainly as possible, indicate a free gift, independent of the will or power of the recipient, and show that the recipient must previously have been in a condition, as unable to free himself as the bondsman, as unable to quicken himself as a dead man.

In accordance with all this, St. Paul (in Rom. vii. viii., a passage considered in the last Article) argues at length, that man, being by nature "carnal, sold under sin," even if able to admire what is good, was utterly unable to perform it (Rom. vii. 14-21), there being a law, ruling in his members, which makes him captive to the law of sin (v. 23). And then he tells us, that the way in which this bondage must be broken is by the Spirit of God taking possession of and ruling in that heart, in which before sin had

ruled, and so delivering it from the law of sin. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (viii. 2).

Not only is such helplessness of the unregenerate man plainly taught by our Lord and His Apostles, but we farther find, that the very mind and understanding are represented as darkened by the natural state of corruption, and so incapable of comprehending and appreciating spiritual truth, until enlightened by the Spirit of God. Thus "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; . . . neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. ii. 14, comp. Rom. viii. 5, 6, 7; Jude 19). Man by nature has no discernment of those things which belong to the Spirit of God; and if so, it is quite clear, that, if he ever attains to spiritual discernment, it must be given him preternaturally.

To this belong all the passages concerning the new birth; for if a new birth be necessary, there must, before it, be an absence of that life which is the product of such a birth. Accordingly, God is represented as begetting us of His own will (James i. 18). To enter into the kingdom, a man must be born again, of water, and of the *Spirit* (John iii. 3, 5). In Christ Jesus a new creation availeth (Gal. vi. 15). It is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His own mercy that God saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Tit. iii. 5).

In like manner, the Scriptures, when speaking of the good works of Christians, represent them as due, not to any independent effort of the human will, but altogether to the grace of God working in them. Thus our Lord, in a parable, fully declares the whole source and spring of Christian holiness to be the life and virtue derived from Him. He likens Himself to a Vine, and all His disciples to branches. We know, that branches of a tree derive life and strength from the sap, which is sent into them from the root and stem. In like manner our Lord tells us, that, by being branches of Him, we may bring forth good fruit, but that, apart from Him, we can do nothing. "Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the Vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me (*χωρὶς ἐμοῦ*, apart from Me) ye can do nothing (John xv. 4, 5).

So constantly is this dependence of the Christian upon Divine

grace urged by the sacred writers, that they frequently call to our remembrance, not only that we owe our first turning from evil to the quickening of God's Spirit, but that even the regenerate and the faithful believer is at every step dependent upon the illumination, guidance, strength, and support of the same Divine Comforter and Guide. So St. Paul, writing of himself and other regenerate Christians, says, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves : but our sufficiency is of God" (2 Cor. iii. 5). When urging his faithful converts to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling," he adds as an encouragement to them, "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. ii. 13). And when speaking with thankfulness of the labours which he himself had been enabled to undergo for the sake of the Gospel, he adds, "Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me" (1 Cor. xv. 10).

Now all this language of Scripture seems plainly to prove that by nature man has no free will to do good, no power to make independent efforts towards holiness. There is an iron tyranny, a law of sin and death, which keeps him in bondage and deprives him of the power to escape, and even of the discernment of spiritual things, which would make him desire deliverance. From this law of sin and death the Spirit of life can set him free ; from this bondage the Son can make him free indeed ; but none besides. Nay! he is sleeping the sleep of spiritual death, and therefore needs internal as well as external aid to rouse him ; aye! a new creation, a new birth, a new life. And even when set free, quickened, regenerate, he continues still able to act and think uprightly only so long as he derives strength from Christ ; just as the branch can bear no fruit, except it derive sap and strength from the stem on which it grows.

II. It being thus proved that by nature man, corrupted by the fall, is not in possession of free will, or more properly, that his will, though unrestrained by God, is yet warped and led captive by evil spirits and his own bad propensities, it remains that we consider the effects of God's grace upon the will, when setting it free from this captivity. The Article describes these effects, as follows : —

1. God's grace prevents us, that we may have a good will.
2. It works in us, or with us, when we have that good will.

The passages of Scripture which have been already brought to bear in the former division of the subject, may appear to have sufficiently demonstrated these two propositions.

1. The necessity of preventing grace follows, of course, from the

doctrine that man, of himself, cannot turn to God. For, if he cannot turn of himself, he must either remain forever alienated, or must need some power to turn him. In the language of the prophet, "Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned" (Jer. xxxi. 18). Accordingly, we read continually of the first turning of the heart as coming from God. God is said to be "found of them that sought Him not, and made manifest to them that asked not after Him" (Isai. lxxv. 1; Rom. x. 20). We read of His opening people's "hearts so that they attend to the things spoken" (Acts xvi. 14); and we are taught that He "worketh in us both to *will* and to do" (Phil. ii. 13); so that the regenerate and sanctified Christian is declared to be God's "*workmanship* created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (Eph. ii. 10). God is said to have "wrought" believers for immortality and glory (2 Cor. v. 5). The "new man" is said to be "*created* in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. iv. 24).

Such passages, and all others which speak of new birth and new creation, show plainly that God's grace prevents us, waits not, that is, for us to make advances to Him, but graciously comes forward to help us, whilst yet we are without strength. They show too, that whereas by nature the will was corrupt and not tending to God, bound down and taken captive to the law of sin, so when the grace of God renews it, it is no longer in slavery, but free, choosing life and holiness, not by compulsion, but by free choice and love. "The Son makes us free indeed" (John viii. 36). "The law of the Spirit of life makes us free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). There is a "glorious liberty for the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21). It is, "to liberty" that we "have been called" (Gal. v. 13); for, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

We see then the contrast which exists between the will in its natural corrupt state, and the will in its regenerate and purified state. In the former it is enslaved; in the latter it is free. Satan keeps it a bond-slave in the first; God sets it free in the last. Then it could only choose evil; now it is free to choose good. Then under the law of sin and death; now under "the perfect law of liberty" (James i. 25).

2. But the will, thus set free, needs farther support, guidance, and strength. The new-born Christian has still a conflict to undergo, for which he requires the whole armour of God. This is expressed in the Article, by the words "working with us when we have that good will."



The Latin Article has the word *cooperante*, which in the first English translation was rendered “working *in* us;” but in 1572 it was expressed somewhat more closely after the Latin, “working *with* us.”

Such expressions of course imply that when the will is renewed there is need of farther grace to support it, but, at the same time, that the renewed man is to exert himself in the strength of that grace, and to work under its influence.

The doctrine of coöperation has been opposed by many as assigning too much strength to man. Man, say they, is altogether too weak either to begin the work of grace, or even, after that work is begun, to contribute anything towards its completion. It is patching the pure robe of Christ’s righteousness to add any of the filthy rags of man’s works to it. Accordingly, St. Paul attributes all his own labours, not to himself, but to “the grace of God which was with him” (1 Cor. xv. 10); and says, “I no longer live myself (ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ), but Christ liveth in me” (Gal. ii. 20). And it is written that God “worketh *in* us,” not *with* us, “both to will and to do” (Phil. ii. 13).

Whether coöperation be a good expression or not, and whether it be altogether reverent to speak as if the Holy Spirit of God and man’s renewed will act in concert together, is of course fairly open to question. In general, no doubt the Scriptures speak of God’s working *in* us, rather than *with* us. Yet the doctrine of our Article, rightly understood, rests on a sound foundation.

In the first instance indeed man’s will is represented as being under bondage. Spiritually we are described as slaves, blind, dead. But as we have seen, the Son is said to “make us free;” the “law of the Spirit of life frees us from the law of sin and death;” and so we are brought into “the glorious liberty of the children of God.” Thus it appears that Christ’s service is indeed perfect freedom. The will, no longer enslaved and bowed down, is set at liberty and enabled to act; and though, whenever and howsoever it acts in a good direction, it is always acting under the guidance and governance of the Spirit of God, yet it does not follow that that guidance is a yoke of bondage, or of irresistible necessity. Accordingly, when the Apostle has explained how the Spirit frees us from the law of sin, and brings us into the glorious liberty of God’s children (Rom. viii. 2–21), he tells us a little farther on, that whereas we still continue weak and ignorant, “the Spirit *helpeth* our infirmities” (ver. 26). In the very same breath in which he tells us that “it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do,” he bids us

“work out our own salvation with fear and trembling” (Phil. ii. 12, 13). And so he speaks of himself as using all kinds of self-discipline (1 Cor. ix. 27), and as “pressing forward to the mark for the prize of the high calling” (Phil. iii. 14).

To this purpose are all the exhortations of Scripture addressed to those who are under grace, not to miss the blessings which God has prepared for them. For example, we have warnings not to “defile the temple of God,” *i. e.* not to pollute with sin our bodies, in which God’s Spirit dwells (1 Cor. iii. 17); not to grieve, not to quench the Spirit (Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19); not to neglect the gift which is in us, but to stir it up (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); not to “receive the grace of God in vain” (2 Cor. vi. 1), “to stand fast,” and not “fall from grace” (Gal. v. 1–4); “to take heed lest there be an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God” (Heb. iii. 12); to “look diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God” (Heb. xii. 15); when we think we are standing, “to take heed lest we fall” (1 Cor. x. 12).

Now all such passages do indeed plainly presuppose that all the good we can do comes from the Spirit of God working in us. Yet they seem as plainly to prove that that blessed Spirit does not move the will as a mere machine, so that it is impossible for it to resist or neglect His blessed influences. It seems plain from them, that under those influences, and guided by them, the renewed heart moves willingly; and that, whenever those influences do not produce their full effect, it is because the remains of corruption in that heart resist and counteract them. And this is all that is meant in the Article by the term *cooperante*, “working with us.”

If, indeed, according to the sentiment of Luther, quoted in the former section, man’s will was first a mere bond-slave of sin, and after grace equally a slave, or machine, moved passively and irresistibly by the Spirit, we can hardly understand how it should be that men are not all equally abandoned before grace, and all equally moving onward to perfection under grace. Since by that theory the will is entirely passive under the motions of the Spirit, opposing no obstacle to them, and therefore, as we should suppose, likely in all persons to be fully and perfectly sanctified.

The doctrine of Scripture, however, is evidently expressed in the words of our Article. God must give the will, must set the will free from its natural slavery, before it can turn to good; but then it moves in the freedom which He has bestowed upon it, and never so truly uses that freedom, as when it follows the motions of the Spirit. Yet clearly there remains some power to resist and

to do evil. For, though "those that have no will to good things God maketh them to will; . . . Yet, nevertheless, He enforceth not the will."<sup>1</sup> And so, although He must work in us, yet we, under His influences, must strive and press forward, not resisting Him, not neglecting, but stirring up His gifts in our hearts.

<sup>1</sup> Art. of 1552.