

## CHAPTER VII.

## THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

OF all the ancient "clerks," whom the leaders of the reformation-movement had continued to regard with peculiar deference, none held so high and commanding a place as the illustrious bishop of Hippo. In the writings of the Swiss and Saxon theologians, in Luther and Zwingli, in Bucer and Calvin, as well as in Melancthon and the rest of his coadjutors, the honoured name of St. Augustine continually recurs: while the frequent citations from his works by the chief of the English reformers<sup>1</sup> demonstrate the confidence which they felt in his authority, and their delight in his sacred learning.

But notwithstanding the veneration in which he was held by men of conflicting views, it cannot be denied that the system of St. Augustine, at least on some speculative points, diverged from the corresponding statements of the rest of the Early Fathers.<sup>2</sup> The controversies which had been kindled in all quarters by the zeal of the Pelagian party drove him to reflect more deeply on the nature and necessity of Grace; and the course of these mighty investigations, combining with his natural temperament, conducted him to the ulterior problem, of reconciling the truth of the Divine fore-knowledge with the parallel fact of individual freedom, and the consciousness of moral responsibility. The treasures of thought

<sup>1</sup> This deference has been made the ground of animadversion by Bp. Horsley, Sermon on 1 St. Peter iii. 18—20, who thinks that the change in the Article on our Lord's descent into Hades was owing to doubts which had been entertained by St. Augustine as to the import of this passage.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Faber's Primitive Doctrine of Election, i. viii. 96—111. Lond. 1836: Prof. Blunt's Sketch of the Church, Sermon. iv. 167—177, Camb. 1836. This divergence did not escape the notice of Gardiner, Declaration (against Joye) fol. lxxix.

he had accumulated during this long and original process were made to supply a multitude of topics for the later disputations of the schools:<sup>3</sup> and it was out of the same source that the Genevan reformer, in the middle of the sixteenth century, professed<sup>4</sup> to have drawn the materials of the system, which he then reared with consummate skill, and bequeathed to a race of admiring disciples, impressed with his own name.

How far the contemporary school of Calvin affected the English reformation, has been a frequent subject of debate. It is true that his earliest assertion of the doctrines appertaining to our present inquiry was the close of the year 1551,<sup>5</sup> and therefore some time after the compilation of the Articles and the offices of worship: but if it be conceded that his teaching on Predestination and the other kindred questions is identical with that of St. Augustine, the Formularies of the Church may still have been to some extent tinctured with "Calvinism," although not immediately derived from the writings of Calvin.<sup>6</sup> This identity, however, cannot be maintained by any one who is intimately versed in the systems of

<sup>1</sup> "Of Predestination and reprobation, it is our part to speak advisedly. But that the only will of God is the cause of reprobation, being taken as it is contrary to predestination, not only St. Paul and St. Augustine, but the best and learnedest schoolmen have largely and invincibly proved." Dr. Whitaker to the Archbishop, in Strype's Whitgift, App. No. xxv. p. 200. For the interesting disputes on these questions at the Council of Trent, see Sarpi, i. 367, seqq.

<sup>2</sup> See Instit. Lib. III. c. 22, § 8, where he disingenuously affirms that St. Augustine claimed the support of the other Fathers, the fact being that he appeals only to three writers of the age anterior to his own. Mr. Faber's Doctrine of Election, ubi sup.

<sup>3</sup> Archbp. Laurence, Sermon. II. note (14). Yet the name of Calvin must have been well known in England before this period, for he was of the number invited to take part in the religious "Conference" which was projected as early as 1549: see above, pp. 83, 84. One of the first strictures upon him, by an English reformer, occurs in a letter of Hooper to Bucer (dated Zurich, June 19, 1548): "I do not rightly understand what you write respecting Calvin. I had never any intention of using my pen either against him or Favell, although his commentaries on the first Epistle to the Corinthians displeased me exceedingly." Original Letters, ed. P. S. 48.

<sup>4</sup> It is unquestionable that many of these points had been opened in the reign of Edw. VI., and even earlier: Heylin's Historia Quinqu-*Articularis*, Part III. c. 16: Gardiner against Joye, *passim*.

theology as they came from the schools of Geneva and Hippo: for much as the Calvinists were indebted to their venerable predecessor, they so far exaggerated some portions of his teaching, and so far curtailed or abandoned others, that in spite of similarity of language a deep and even a fundamental change is observable on passing from the ancient to the modern doctor. One striking example of this diversity relates to the question of "final perseverance," or the amissibility of regenerating grace. In both systems it was maintained that no more than a remnant of the human family were actual partakers of the gift entitled the "grace of perseverance:" yet Augustine held that others, not included in this remnant, were possessed of a true and justifying faith, which they might notwithstanding forfeit altogether; while Calvin absolutely restricted the communication of spiritual gifts to those whom a decree irreversibly exempted from the possibility of ultimate perdition.<sup>1</sup> In the one case there was a clear and positive check upon the desolating influence of presumption as well as of lawlessness and desperation; in the other, where grace was arbitrarily withheld except from the finally saved, we need not wonder

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Augustinian Treatise "de Correptione et Gratia," c. 6 and c. 13, or "de Prædestinatione Sanctorum," c. 14, with Calvin's "Institutiones," Lib. III. c. 24, § 6. It is very observable that the distinction was felt at the compiling of the Lambeth Articles, for in the emendations of Whitaker's theses by the archbishop and his colleagues, an important change was made in Art. v.: "In autographo Whitakeri verba erant 'in iis qui semel ojus participes fuerunt,' pro quibus à Lambethanis substituta sunt, 'in electis' sensu planè alio et ad mentem Augustini; cum in autographo sint ad mentem Calvini. Augustinus enim opinatus est, verum fidem quæ per dilectionem operatur, per quam contingit adoptio, justificatio et sanctificatio, posse et intercidi et amitti; fidem vero esse commune donum electis et reprobis, sed perseverantiam olectis propriam: Calvinus autem, veram et justificantem fidem solis salvandis et electis contingere." See Appen. No. v. Hutton, Archbishop of York, suggested an alteration in Art. vi., on the ground that as it stood it was opposed to St. Augustine, who taught, "Reprobi quidem vocati, justificati, per lavacrum regenerationis renovati sunt, et tamen exeunt," etc. Strype's Whitgift, 461, ed. 1718: cf. the Augsburg Confession, Part I. § 12; where notwithstanding the uniform reverence for St. Augustine, the notion that "persons once justified cannot lose the Holy Spirit," is denounced as an error of the Anabaptists. This charge seems to have been made against the Cambridge "Calvinists" in 1595: Strype's Whitgift, 434.

that the feeling of responsibility was endangered, if not altogether uprooted.

It is probable indeed that distinctions of this kind were unnoticed by many of the ardent refugees who sought shelter from the Marian persecutions under the roofs of "Calvinistic" reformers, and who were chiefly instrumental in opening the disputes which are still rending the Church of England. The number of such exiles was very considerable, embracing a majority of those who from the special emergency of the times were advanced, at the opening of the reign of Elizabeth, to the highest ecclesiastical honours. We may trace the effects of their long association with the leading Swiss reformers, by contrasting their future conduct with that of the smaller band of scholars, who lived in comparative retirement at home, during the triumphs of the Romanizing faction. These were in almost every case untainted, either by the disciplinary scruples of their brethren, or by the harsh and even blasphemous notions which many a predestinarian zealot brought back from his foreign masters.<sup>1</sup> They acted as the conservative elements of the Church in the midst of a troublous period, when there was "continual struggling to throw off its godly orders," or "to break in pieces those constitutions, on which it was established;" and had no such better elements survived, "it would in all probability have never been able to have subsisted afterwards." The admission of the doctrines of Geneva might have led the way to its "pretended holy discipline," and the forebodings of men like Richard Hooker have been fearfully accomplished.

It is not unlikely that the general respect for the authority of St. Augustine continued to aid the circulation of the strong "Calvinian" tenets, or at least, to disarm the hostility of some who could not fail to foresee the disastrous results in which they were sure to issue. Among this number we may class the venerable Parker, who had reluctantly obeyed the royal nomination to the helm of

<sup>1</sup> Some of them did not blush to say, that "all evil springeth of God's ordinance, and that God's predestination was the cause of Adam's fall, and of all wickedness." See other instances in Heylin, Hist. of the Presbyterians, 243, Oxf. 1670.

<sup>2</sup> See Strype's observations on Archbp. Parker; Life, 543.

the English Church.<sup>1</sup> The sobriety of himself and a few faithful coadjutors succeeded in thwarting the vigorous attempt to infuse a distinctively Genevan spirit into the public Formularies of Faith. As early as 1559, when the exiles were anxious to exhibit a declaration of their doctrine to the Queen, they laid peculiar stress on the tenet of Predestination<sup>2</sup> as "a thing fruitful and profitable to be known," appealing moreover to the example which had been set them by St. Augustine: yet we look in vain for any mention of that tenet in the test which was immediately put in circulation both in this and the sister island; and in the subsequent revision of the Edwardine Formulary, we have seen that the language of the Article on Predestination was somewhat softened or restrained, instead of contracting the more rigorous tone which was gradually pervading the great body of the Church.

The controversy, however, of which that doctrine was a prominent member, continued rather to increase with the lapse of the Elizabethan period; and it may be confidently affirmed that for an interval of nearly thirty years the *extreme* opinions of the school of Calvin, embracing the dogma of irrespective reprobation, were almost every where triumphant. He became, if we may employ the parallel of Hooker,<sup>3</sup> what the master of the sentence was in the

<sup>1</sup> See a curious account of one Richard Kechyn, whom the archbishop preferred, "charging him not to preach controversial sermons on the Divine Counsels," in Mr. Haweis' Sketches of the Reformation, 95. The obedient clerk was afterwards rebuked for his silence by one of the itinerant preachers, who declared that "Predestination should and ought to be preached in every sermon and in every place, before all congregations, as the only doctrine of salvation," &c.

<sup>2</sup> Strype's Annals, i. 116. They admit, however, that "in this our corrupt age," discreet ministers should speak "sparely and circumspectly" of such matters.

<sup>3</sup> Pref. to Eccl. Pol. chap. ii. § 8. In a MS. note of Hooker on "A Christian Letter," &c., he asks ironically, "What should the world doe with old musty doctors? Alleage scripture, and shew it alleage in the sense that Calvin alloweth, and it is of more force in any man's defense, and to the prooffe of any assertion, than if ten thousand Augustines, Jeromes, Chrysostomes, Cyprians, or whosoever els were brought forth. Doe we not daily see that men are accused of heresie for holding that which the fathers held, and that they never are cleere, if they find not somewhat in Calvin to justify themselves?" Works, i. 139, note (33), ed. Keble.

Church of Rome, "so that the perfectest divines were judged they which were skillfulest in Calvin's writings." Even the "horrible" dictum<sup>1</sup> "which speaks little better of our gracious God than this, that God should design many thousand of souls to hell before they were, not in eye to their faults, but to His own absolute will and power,"—was, in the language of Harsnet, in 1584, "grown high and monstrous, and like a Goliath, and men do shake and tremble at it; yet never a man reacheth to David's sling to cast it down. In the name of the Lord of Hosts," he adds, "we will encounter it, for it hath reviled not the host of the living God, but the Lord of Hosts."<sup>2</sup>

Such, then, was the general condition of the Church, in respect of the predestinarian controversy, when the predominant party attempted to fix and perpetuate their system, by compiling the memorable document which is known by the name of the "Lambeth Articles."

The main-spring of all the movement is found in the rigorously Calvinistic tenets of Dr. Whitaker, a distinguished polemical writer, and the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Assisted by Chadderton and Perkins,<sup>3</sup> the latter of whom was peculiarly violent, he resolved on immediate measures for checking the growth of "Pelagianism and Popery," as it was the fashion to characterize the teaching which demurred to the dicta of Calvin. The leader of the opposite party was the Margaret Professor of Divinity, Baro, or Baron, by name, who had sought an asylum in this country at an early period of his life, and by the favour of Burleigh had occupied his present post since 1574 or 1575. Though naturally of a mild and retiring spirit, he was uniform in opposing the principles avowed by his brother professor, and advocated more or less by a majority of the senior members of the Senate. His learned lectures, however, had the effect of diminishing the ex-

<sup>1</sup> Calvin himself says, "*horribile quidem decretum fateor*," in contemplating his own theory of reprobation. Instit. Lib. iii. c. 23, § 7.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Heylin, Histor. Quinqu-Articul. Part iii. ch. xvii. § 4.

<sup>3</sup> His "*Armilla Aurea*, containing the order of the causes of salvation and damnation," was published in 1592, for the use of students, and tended, perhaps, more than the writings of the other party, to damage the character of "Calvinism" by pursuing it into its logical results.

tre value which had been set upon the works of the Swiss reformers: and as the new generation, which had been trained by his teaching, replaced the more sturdy admirers of Calvin, the "Institutions" and other similar text-books were exchanged for the primitive Fathers and sometimes for the Schoolmen.<sup>1</sup>

Very soon after the date of his arrival at Cambridge, Baro had ventured to urge from the history of Nineveh, that "it is the will of God we should have eternal life, if we believe and persevere in the faith of Christ; but if we do not believe, or believing only for a time, do not persevere, then it is not the will of God we should be saved."<sup>2</sup> And a further exposition of his doctrine survives in the sermon "ad clerum" which he preached in 1595, when the Lambeth Articles were compiled. He there asserted three things, (1) "That God created all men according to His own likeness in Adam, and so consequently, to eternal life; from which he chased no man, unless because of sin. (2) That Christ died sufficiently for all, showing that the denial of this doctrine is contrary to the Confession of the Church of England, and the Articles approved by the parliament of this kingdom, and confirmed by the Queen's authority. (3) That the promises of God made to us, as they are generally propounded to us, were to be generally understood, as it is set down in the seventeenth Article."<sup>3</sup>

Notwithstanding the apparent moderation of these statements and the "modest" way in which they are said to have been delivered, the unfortunate professor was cited before Dr. Goade, the Vice-Chancellor of the University; and although the proceedings against him were eventually stopped by the interposition of his patron

<sup>1</sup> In a report of the Vice-Chancellor and others to Whitgift, who had sanctioned their search into private studies (Strype's Whitgift, 438), it is stated that things had already grown to such a pass, that "instead of godly and sound writers, among their stationers, the new writers were very rarely bought; and that there were no books more ordinarily bought and sold than popish writers," &c.

<sup>2</sup> Prælect. in Jonam, Prophetam, xxx. 217: Lond. 1579.

<sup>3</sup> Strype's Whitgift, 466. See also his "Orthodox Explanation of the nine propositions concluded upon at Lambeth." Ibid. App. No. xxvi. and the "Assertiones" of his accusers, *ibid.* 470. Their great objection was to his doctrine of "universal redemption."

Burleigh, he did not offer himself for re-election, retiring from the field of contest in 1596.<sup>4</sup>

But while the friend of Andrewes and Overall, and the champion of the English Church, was thus driven from his post by the innovating zeal of the "Calvinian" party another victim inferior both in age and reputation excited their indignant activity to a still more feverish pitch. William Barrett was a fellow of Caius College, and one of the warmest spirits in the number who "liked not Calvin's scheme." A sermon, "ad clerum," which he preached at St. Mary's church on the 29th of April,<sup>5</sup> 1595, contained a strong and even virulent attack on the popular system of theology; where, besides a denial of the indefectibility of grace and the received doctrine of assurance, he indulged in a number of bitter reflections upon Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, and others, who had taught the doctrine of irrespective reprobation.<sup>6</sup> Very soon after the delivery of this sermon the offender was cited before the Vice-Chancellor and heads of houses, and urged at several successive meetings to retract the obnoxious language. He finally consented to this course, and on the 10th of May read out in St. Mary's church, a form of recantation<sup>7</sup> which had been provided by some of the University authorities, if not by Dr. Whitaker himself. The insincerity of this act, like many similar ones in all ages, was instantly made apparent; and on the 26th of the same month several members of the senate reopened the dispute by presenting a memorial to the Vice-Chancellor and his colleagues, denouncing the sermon upon the score of its "savouring of popish doctrine in the whole course and tenour thereof," and reflecting on the "unreverend manner" in which it had been withdrawn.

The cause was now carried by both parties to Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury. On one side the letter of the heads of

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 473.

<sup>5</sup> Heylin, *Hist. Quinqu-Artic.* Part III. c. 20, § 6, 7.

<sup>6</sup> Strype, Whitgift, 436: and cf. Bk. iv. App. No. xxiii.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* App. No. xxii. It is observable that he was taught to discern the doctrine of reprobation in the 17th Article, although Whitaker in writing to the archbishop is more cautious. His words are, "For the points of doctrine, we are fully persuaded, that Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, if not against the Articles, yet against the religion of our Church, publicly received," &c. *Ibid.* Bk. iv. No. xxv.

houses (bearing date June 12,) complained of Barrett's behaviour, and stigmatized his teaching as "injurious to the worthy learned men of our times," as "strongly savouring of the leaven of popery," and as "contrary to the doctrine of the nature of faith set forth in the Articles of Religion and Homilies appointed to be read in Churches."<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Barrett appealed from the Vice-chancellor to the Primate, alleging that his opponents were no more than a puritanical faction in the University, for that many who studied truth and peace had refused to join the present persecution; and while admitting that he had dealt roughly with Calvin, directed his chief indignation against Perkins, whose book "On the Apostles' Creed," though denying an article of the faith,<sup>2</sup> had not been hitherto discountenanced by any of the University authorities. On these grounds he prayed the Archbishop to interpose, and save him from the malice of his enemies who had already punished him enough by stopping his degree.<sup>3</sup>

The first impressions of Whitgift seem to have been somewhat in favour of the appellant, for in a message to the Vice-Chancellor and heads of houses, he condemned the warmth of their recent proceedings and asserted his own prerogative in the adjudication of doctrinal questions. In particular he objected that some points of the retraction, which they had forced upon Barrett, were "contrary to the doctrine holden and expressed by many sound and learned divines<sup>4</sup> in the Church of

<sup>1</sup> Strype, Whitgift, 437, 438.

<sup>2</sup> Alluding to the "descent into hell," which the Calvinists expounded of our Lord's extreme mental sufferings.

<sup>3</sup> Strype, *ibid.* 438, 439.

<sup>4</sup> One of these was Hooker's bosom-friend Saravia, and a favourite of Whitgift. He was frequently at Lambeth and wrote (apparently for the Archbishop) a "Censure of Barrett's Retraction." *Ibid.* Bk. iv. App. xxiv. It is a sober and elaborate production, breathing far more the spirit of Augustine than of Calvin, and quoting the former authority throughout. He concludes by censuring the acrimonious language of Barrett, and by declaring "Fuerunt et sunt adhuc hodie in diversis ecclesiis quamplures fideles Christi servi bene de Ecclesia meriti, qui non idem de prædestinatione sentiunt, qui tamen se mutua charitate fuerunt amplexi nec ullius sese mutuo hæreseos insimulant," 193.—There is also a "Censura Censuræ D. Barreti," among the

England," and which he "for his own part thought to be false and contrary to the Scripture." Of the contumelious language in which Barrett had animadverted upon the Calvinistic writers, he expressed his entire disapprobation, adding that he "did not allow the same towards Augustine, Jerome, and other learned fathers, which nevertheless had often been abused in the University without control." And yet, he proceeded, "if a man would have occasion to control Calvin for his bad and unchristian censure of King Henry VIII., or him and others in that peremptory and false reproof of the Church of England in divers points, and likewise in some other singularities, he knew no article of religion against it, much less did he know any cause why men should be violently dealt withal for it, or termed ungodly, popish, impudent. For the doctrine of the Church of England did in no respect depend upon them."<sup>1</sup>

Emboldened by the result of his former application, and apprehensive lest his enemies should have strength enough to deprive him of his fellowship, Barrett now ventured to desire from the Primate a formal statement of the truth in the controversy which continued to distract the University of Cambridge. The heads of houses in the meanwhile started the question as to the right of the Archbishop to interfere in matters like the present, and from the warmth which this point excited on both sides, it is probable that the case of Barrett would have been thrown altogether into the background, had not Whitaker undertaken to mediate between the contending parties. His former service to the Church in answering Bellarmine had placed him very high in the opinion of Whitgift, and the conciliatory tone which he adopted at this stage of the dispute, was still more in favour of his faction. He did not venture to assert that the teaching of Barrett had contradicted the language of the Articles, nay, he was now not unwilling to concede that the topics chiefly controverted "were not concluded and defined by public autho-

Minor Works of Bp. Andrews, Oxf. 1846, 304, seqq. It is confined, however, to one point, viz.: the certainty of salvation, which Whitaker and his school maintained. In the same place will be found the "judgment" of that prelate touching the Lambeth Articles.

<sup>1</sup> Strype's Whitgift, 441.

riety;"<sup>1</sup> yet, inasmuch, as the Church had been violently disturbed, and as the opinions of his adversary were novel and offensive, he requested the Archbishop to use his influence in exacting from Barrett a further recantation.

After a comparative lull of some weeks, the contest was renewed in the following September, by the "Calvinian" heads of houses, who forwarded a more dutiful communication to the Primate, imploring him to allow a rigorous inquiry into the real opinions of the offender, in order that the grievous scandal which had been given "not only to malicious enemies but also to weak professors," might be at length entirely removed.<sup>2</sup> In compliance with their wish a string of questions "nicely propounded and suited critically to the principles of Whitaker," was now forced upon the notice of Barrett, who appears to have answered them at Lambeth. His replies were immediately sent to his implacable accusers, and submitted to the strictures of Whitaker, who began by denouncing them "as not only indirect and insufficient, but for the most part popish also." He urged in particular, that the views of Barrett respecting the nature of faith, were opposed to the statement of the Articles,<sup>3</sup>—but in what way he neglected to specify; and on the 17th of September, the heads of houses, with undiminished vigour, sent up a new list<sup>4</sup> of animadversions in addition to those which the Regius Professor had already transmitted to Lambeth.

Whitgift, in his turn, was now changed into a mediator, and

<sup>1</sup> Strype's Whitgift, App. No. xxv. 199: cf. the remarks of Dr. Waterland on this letter; Works, II. 343, 344, Oxf. 1843.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 451, 452. In this document they characterize the positions of Barrett as "contrary to the doctrine of our Church set down in the Book of Articles, in the Apology of the Church of England, and in the Defence of the same, in Catechisms commanded by authority to be used, and in the Book of Common Prayer;" but as Waterland remarks, "they neither specify those positions, nor at that time point to any Article, or particular passage of the Catechisms or Common Prayer, so that this general charge is of little or no moment." Ibid. 344.

<sup>3</sup> They were eight in number, and relate to the indefectibility of "justifying faith" and the other topics which had been handled by the anti-Calvinistic preacher. Strype, *ibid.* 452, 453.

<sup>4</sup> Strype, Whitgift, 453.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 454.

while censuring some of the answers which Barrett had recently given, declared with regard to another (and that even a principal point of the dispute) that he could not see how it varied from the Articles of Religion.<sup>1</sup> He declared, however, that he had been greatly annoyed by the want of respect to academical authority, which the defendant appears to have betrayed in the whole of the present disputation,<sup>2</sup> and as the contest between the heads of houses and himself was now amicably adjusted, he was not unwilling to aid them in correcting the unruly spirit, whom they were anxious to curb or banish. He therefore appointed a second meeting at Lambeth where Barrett was finally examined in the presence of a deputation from Cambridge, of which Whitaker was one; and after modifying some of his doctrinal statements, and recalling his acrimonious observations upon Calvin, he consented to make a public retraction in terms of his own devising; which seems, however, to have been delayed till the commencement of the following year, and then altogether abandoned.<sup>3</sup>

But while this controversy was still pending, another plan had been suggested to Whitaker and his party for obtaining a more authoritative sanction of their ultra-Calvinistic tenets, and for ejecting not only Barrett but Baro from the University of Cambridge, or it might be altogether from the Church.

Having paved the way in a vehement sermon<sup>4</sup> from the pulpit of St. Mary's, Dr. Whitaker proceeded to London early in November, 1595, at the desire, it would seem, of the heads of houses, in order that he might be present at a conference for allaying the animosity which had been every where excited by the proceedings above recounted. Another member of the deputation was Tyndal,

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 455, 456.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 457.

<sup>3</sup> A letter of his to Dr. Goade (in Heylin's Hist. Quinqu-Artic. Part III. ch. xx. § 10) appears to establish this point in opposition to Strype. He there says: "But if you and the rest of your assistants (whom I reverence) do purpose to proceed in disquieting and traducing me as you have done by the space of three quarters of this year, and so in the end mean to drive me out of the University, I must take it patiently, because I know not how to redress it: but let God be judge between you and me." According to Fuller, he afterwards went abroad and conformed to the Church of Rome. Hist. of Univ. of Cambridge, 286; new ed.

<sup>4</sup> Strype, Whitgift, 460.

Dean of Ely, who had before taken the most active part in prosecuting Barrett, and had been present also at his final examination. How long this conference continued it is difficult to ascertain. Whitaker was in London on the 19th of November, as we know from a letter which he then wrote to Burleigh,<sup>1</sup> the Chancellor of Cambridge, and as there is some reason for believing, that the disputes among the Calvinists were animated and protracted,<sup>2</sup> it is probable that they had assembled very early in the month. Heylin and others<sup>3</sup> inform us that the "propositions," which form the result of their labours, were submitted to the notice of the Primate on the 10th of November, while Strype<sup>4</sup> mentions that the work was actually completed on the 20th of the same month. The truth seems to be that Whitaker and the friends, who aided him in making the original draught of the Lambeth Articles, held a number of preliminary meetings in private;<sup>5</sup> and that after they had determined the precise shape of their production it was immediately presented to the Archbishop for his approbation or correction.

The conduct of Whitgift in this matter has occasioned very different conjectures as to the motives by which he was actuated, in lending even a partial assent to the theses of the Cambridge doctors. In addition to the inference which might be drawn from the favour he showed to men like Harsnet,<sup>6</sup> Saravia<sup>7</sup> and Hooker,<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> *Articuli Lambethani*, 4, Lond. 1651.

<sup>3</sup> Heylin, *Hist. Quinqu.* Part III. ch. xxi. § 2; Collier, II. 644.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 461.

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps at the house of Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, from whence the above letter to Burleigh is dated.

<sup>6</sup> After the publication of the Sermon (see above, p. 157) in which he had so strongly objected to the dogma of reprobation, he was made the archbishop's chaplain, and treated with peculiar kindness.

<sup>7</sup> See the paper above referred to, p. 160, note (4); from which it is clear that the tenets of Saravia were strictly *Augustinian*, and opposed to the system of Whitaker and Calvin.

<sup>8</sup> Hooker, in like manner, modified the Calvinistic theory, denying the doctrine of reprobation altogether, and following the language of St. Augustine on the efficacy of the sacraments. See *his* version of the Lambeth Articles; Works, ed. Keble, I. c. 2, *Eccle. Pol.* v. lx. 3, and App. to Bk. v. pp. 596, 597.

his own language in the case of Barrett would lead to the supposition that he shrank from the full development of the views propounded at Geneva. Yet, on the other hand, it is certain that he sympathized at least to a considerable extent with Whitaker and the Calvinistic party: and if the desire of peace<sup>1</sup> and the dread of innovation may be thought to have operated in his recognition of the Lambeth Articles, he had, notwithstanding, come to the deliberate conclusion, that after the modifications to which they were eventually submitted, he "agreed fully with them and they with him."<sup>2</sup>

During the conference which preceded their publication, he was mainly if not altogether assisted by Richard Fletcher, recently translated to the bishopric of London, by Richard Vaughan, bishop-elect of Bangor, and the above-mentioned deputation of divines from Cambridge.<sup>3</sup> So far as we are able to determine, they were all more or less of the school which Barrett and the Margaret Professor had ventured to assail, and it was consequently to be expected that the new test of doctrine would savour considerably of the channel from which it had been drawn. Yet on comparing the rough draught of the Articles as they came from the pen of Whitaker with the form which they ultimately assumed, we shall perceive that they underwent a number of corrections, all of which tended to make them less offensive to the anti-Calvinistic party. For example, there was a phrase in the original copy declaring that "all who had ever been partakers of true faith and

<sup>1</sup> In the short history of this compilation prefixed to the "*Articuli Lambethiana*," Lond. 1651, we have the following statement, which must be taken, however, *cum grano salis*: "Whitgiftus, princeps ejus conventus, etsi Whitakeri dogmata *minime* probabat, *facilitat tamen et metu discordiæ, cum suam probare aliis non posset, factus, est ipse alienæ sententiæ accessio, 4.*"

<sup>2</sup> See his own memoranda in Strype, 459. He adds, "I know them to be sound doctrines and uniformly professed in this Church of England, and agreeable to the Articles of Religion established by authority. And therefore I thought it meet that Barrett should in more humble sort confess his ignorance and error: and that none should be suffered to teach any contrary doctrine to the aforesaid propositions agreed upon."

<sup>3</sup> The corrected copy of the Articles in Strype is headed, "*Articuli approbati a reverendissimis dominis D. D. Joanne archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, et Richardo episcopo, Londinensi et aliis Theologis, Lambethæ, Novembris 20, anno, 1595.*"

of the sanctifying Spirit" must eventually be accepted: while in the Article, as amended and imposed upon the Church, the indefectibility of grace was affirmed not of all who had been regenerate and justified, but of "the elect," in accordance with the language of Augustine. A similar deference was shown in modifying the statement of another Article on the nature of assurance or the certainty of faith, and of a third touching the manner and degree in which grace is communicated or withheld with respect to the world at large.<sup>1</sup>

Yet in spite of these mitigating clauses, attributable to the influence of Whitgift, the "orthodoxal propositions," as they were frequently entitled, aroused in the doctors of the subsequent period the most unmeasured condemnation.<sup>2</sup> Nor can it be denied that the harshness of their tone and their unshrinking assertion of the "horrible decree" were calculated to inflame the disputations which they vainly struggled to suppress. Their aim was to fasten upon the Church a number of arbitrary definitions, ill according with the spirit of the men by whom the Reformation had been carried, and altogether out of harmony<sup>3</sup> with the Prayer-Book and the elder Formularies of Faith. Some indeed have represented them as no more than interpretative statements,<sup>4</sup> deducible from the authorized Articles of Religion; but we must despair of connecting them with that work by any of the ordinary processes of thought. On the other hand it is natural to infer from this attempt to introduce a more stringent measure and to speak a less faltering language, that in respect of the points which were then so violently urged by the ruling school at Cam-

<sup>1</sup> For these and other variations see Append. No. v., where the Articles are printed in the original Latin, with notes and emendations by the bishops and divines.

<sup>2</sup> See an extreme specimen in Warburton's Remarks on Neal's Hist. of the Puritans: Works, vii. 899; Lon. 1788.

<sup>3</sup> Collier, ii. 645, seqq., Heylin, Histor. Quinqu-Art. Part II. ch. viii. seqq., and Laurence, Bampton Lectures, *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> See Fuller, Bk. ix. p. 232. Hutton, archbishop of York, who yielded a general assent to them, employs a somewhat different language: "Hæ theses ex sacris litoris vel aperte colligi vel necessaria consecutione deduci possunt, et ex scriptis Augustini." Strype, 461.

bridge, the Church had before been either silent and undecided, or absolutely antagonistic.

Be this, however, as it may, the Articles of Dr. Whitaker, as accepted by the Primate and a few more of his episcopal brethren, have no claim whatever to be viewed as synodical determinations either now or then binding on the Church. We may quote them as melancholy illustrations of the age in which they were compiled, or may welcome them as proofs that certain tenets which we cherish were strenuously pressed to their logical results by the men of a former generation: but as Whitgift was careful to instruct the University of Cambridge (Nov. 24,) the document "must be so taken and used as *their private judgments*," who thought "them to be true and correspondent to the doctrine professed in the Church of England, and established by the laws of the land, and *not as laws and decrees*."<sup>1</sup>

The displeasure of Lord Burleigh and still more of his royal mistress,<sup>2</sup> combined with the death of Dr. Whitaker, who survived the triumph he had won over the antagonists of Calvin no more than a few days, suspended the further circulation of the Articles even among the authorities of the University which had called them into being. They were offered, indeed, to Professor Baro by some of the heads of houses, and were the means of involving him still further in the controversy to which we have before adverted:<sup>3</sup> but after the month of January 1596<sup>4</sup> no more is heard of imposing the "Lambeth propositions" as a test of doctrine or as an authorized interpretation of the Formularies of Faith, until the party, who had now extorted them from Whitgift, attempted at his death to incorporate them into the "Articles of Religion" in 1604.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strype, 462. Cf. Heylin, *ubi sup.* Part III. ch. xx. § 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Strype, 463, 464. The letter of Whitgift to the Vice-Chancellor (Dec. 8) advises him to comply with the royal wishes, and forbear urging them on the University. Fuller has a curious story of the Queen reminding the Primate, half in jest, that his recent conduct in "calling a council" had exposed him to a *præmunire*.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 162.

<sup>4</sup> They continued to excite "much talk and resentment" for some months later, as we gather from a communication of Hutton to Whitgift, "March 14, 1595" (*i. e.* 1596:) Strype, 478.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 480.



The Church, however, had in the mean time strengthened her hold upon the truths of the earlier Reformation, and in Cambridge even, the new race of theologians, with Overall at their head, were supplanting the ardent auxiliaries of Calvin as well as the platform he had reared upon the ruins of the ancient faith. The time of reaction was commencing, and the spells by which he had bound and bewildered the finest intellects of Europe were soon to be utterly broken; or if some continued to accept the general features of his system, they owed it to the proximity of a wider and purer creed that so many of his harsher tenets had been virtually withdrawn.

Unhappily this amelioration was confined to our own country: for in the sister-island, as we shall see in the following chapter, the Genevan spirit was destined to prevail during a much longer period, and to succeed in impressing the Lambeth Articles with a kind of ecclesiastical sanction.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE IRISH ARTICLES OF 1615.

THE Church of Ireland, after existing from the earliest ages of the Gospel, had gradually contracted the errors and diseases, which in the time preceding the Reformation were corrupting the Church of England. She threw them off, however, at the same period, by her own intrinsic vigour, and restoring the verities of the faith which had been partially perverted or forgotten, took her place at the side of her English sister, in the struggle with the Roman pontiffs.

During the reigns of Henry and Edward, the Irish prelates had been accustomed to lean almost exclusively upon the acts of our own Convocation, having adopted the formularies of worship which emanated from this country under the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown.<sup>1</sup> But, in 1560, the Elizabethan Prayer Book was regularly accepted by the clergy,<sup>2</sup> and the character of the Irish reformation became henceforward far more national. In 1566, as we have before noticed,<sup>3</sup> the "Brief Declaration" of doctrine coinciding with our "Eleven Articles," was appointed to be read by the incumbents "at their possession-taking, and twice every year afterwards;" but whether the English Articles of 1562

<sup>1</sup> The English Prayer Book was first used on Easter Sunday, 1551, at the commandment of Sir Anthony St. Ledger, the Lord Deputy. *Mant. Hist. of the Church*, i. 204, 295; 2nd ed.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Elrington's *Life of Archbp. Ussher*, 42.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 121. It is worthy of remark, that during the reign of Elizabeth and long after the Union of Scotland with England, the Scottish Church, as well as the Presbyterians, made use of the "Confession of Faith" drawn up in 1560. *Stephen's Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, i. 95. Lond. 1843. The Presbyterians subsequently adopted the "Westminster Confession," and the Church our authorized "Articles," in the Convocation at Laurencekirk, 1804.

were circulated simultaneously, as a co-ordinate authority, does not seem to have been fully settled. Archbishop Ussher stated, in the sermon which he preached in 1629, before the English House of Commons, "We all agree that the Scriptures of God are the perfect rule of our faith; we all consent in the main grounds of religion drawn from thence; we *all subscribe to the Articles of doctrine* agreed upon in the synod of the year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions," &c.; yet his learned biographer contends, that this language cannot be considered as absolutely decisive when weighed against the evidence which may be urged on the other side of the question. He argues that the archbishop "might have used the words in a general sense, as merely expressive of assent, and, indeed, *must* have done so, for many of the persons he addressed had never subscribed the Articles."<sup>1</sup>

It is not unlikely that the want of some minuter test than the "Eleven Articles" of Archbishop Parker was one of the reasons which operated in the mind of the Irish prelates when they consented, in 1615, to the compilation of the longer series, which is the subject of the present chapter. Still, it may not be concealed, that more questionable agency was at work among some of the bishops and divines, who took part in the framing of such a Formulary. The rigorous Calvinistic spirit, which had before invaded the Church of England, and had struggled to fetter the working of her system by means of the Lambeth Articles, is said to have been even stronger at this period in the whole of the neighbouring kingdom; and, though baffled on our own side of the Channel, to have been there for a while triumphant. The propagation of the Genevan tenets, if due, in some measure, to political causes,<sup>2</sup> was now more peculiarly aided by the influence of the learned Ussher, who had passed with unsullied reputation from his course of laborious study to occupy the chair of divinity in the University of Dublin.<sup>3</sup> His opinions were afterwards softened,<sup>4</sup> like those of many other theologians who were the glory of the Caroline period of the Church, but it is unquestionable that

<sup>1</sup> Ubi sup. 43, and note.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 43.

<sup>3</sup> Ubi sup. 44. He was also Vice-chancellor in the previous year, 1614. Ibid. 49.

<sup>4</sup> Waterland, Works, II. 346, and Dr. Elrington's Life, 290, seqq.

in the years of which we are now treating he was the unflinching advocate of Geneva, ranking with Whitaker and the rest, who endeavoured to purge the colleges at Cambridge from "Popish and Pelagian" errors. Ussher is even said to have drawn up the Irish Articles himself, at the nomination of a Synod, which assembled at Dublin in 1615, and which sat concurrently with the civil legislature,<sup>1</sup> according to the English usage. The president was Jones, the Archbishop of Dublin, but very few particulars have, unhappily, survived of the nature of its proceedings, or the degree of cordiality with which it had accepted the Articles bearing its name.<sup>2</sup>

They are a long and discursive compilation, extending to one hundred and four paragraphs, arranged under nineteen general heads, and comprehend a variety of statements, or rather disquisitions, upon the following theological topics: The Holy Scripture and the three Creeds; faith in the Holy Trinity; God's eternal decree and predestination; the creation and government of all things; the fall of man, original sin, and the state of man before justification; Christ, the Mediator of the second Covenant; the communicating of the grace of Christ; justification and faith; sanctification and good works; the service of God; the civil magistrate; our duty towards our neighbours; the Church, and outward ministry of the Gospel; the authority of the Church, General Councils, and bishop of Rome; the state of the Old and New Testament; The Sacraments of the New Testament; Baptism; the Lord's Supper; the state of souls of men after they be departed out of this life, together with the general resurrection and the last judgment.

Many of the Articles, contained in one or other of these divisions, are borrowed from the authorized English series, on corres-

<sup>1</sup> Parr, an older biographer of Ussher, implies that the two legislative bodies were convened at the same time, but the Parliament met May 18, 1613, and the Convocation did not assemble till the end of 1614, or the beginning of 1615. Elrington, 39.

<sup>2</sup> "Articles of Religion, agreed vpon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the clearge of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin in the yeare of our Lord God, 1615," &c. They will be found at length in Append. No. vi., printed from a copy of the original edition in Dr. Elrington's Life of Ussher, App. iv.

ponding points; some, again, are of a homiletic nature, relating wholly to Christian *duties*; others enter upon speculative questions, such as the fall of angels, and the primeval state of Adam; one absolutely pronounces that the pope is "the man of sin" and antichrist;<sup>1</sup> but the paragraphs which excited the strongest objection<sup>2</sup> at the time of their first appearance, as well as in the later ages, are those which include the Lambeth Articles, or bear upon the controversy out of which those Articles had issued. It is true that they are not incorporated altogether, being dispersed in various portions of the work, and that in the original copy<sup>3</sup> there was not the slightest reference to the compilation of 1595; yet the resemblance, with one or two verbal<sup>4</sup> exceptions, is so manifest and complete, that we cannot possibly mistake the connexion between them.<sup>5</sup>

Referring the reader to an Appendix for the Articles themselves, it is desirable to ascertain the amount of their authority, even with respect to the Irish clergy; and the rather because this question has been lately reopened, and made the ground of a resolute attack upon the two sister Churches. The document (as we have seen) professed to have been sanctioned by the Convocation of Dublin, and a paragraph appended to the original edition, authoritatively decreed as follows: "If any minister of what degree or qualitie soeuer he be, shall publikely teach any doctrine contrary to these Articles agreed upon,—if, after due admonition, he doe not conforme himselfe and cease to disturbe the peace of

<sup>1</sup> A similar decree had been made just before in a Calvinistic synod at Gappe, Collier. ii. 708.

<sup>2</sup> Mant, i. 385. seqq.

<sup>3</sup> Bp. Mant's copy had such a reference to each of the nine Articles of the Lambeth series; but it must have been either the London edition of 1629, or that which is appended to Neal's Hist. of the Puritans. See Elrington's Ussher, 44, note (f.)

<sup>4</sup> One of these is important, for while the Irish Articles (§ 37) affirms that true faith is not extinguished in "the regenerate," the fifth of the Lambeth Articles had deliberately avoided this phrase and spoken of "the elect." see above, p. 165.

<sup>5</sup> Some persons, like Heylin, asserted that the whole proceeding was "a plot of the Calvinians and Sabbatarians of England to make themselves a strong party in Ireland." See Mant, i. 387.

the Church, let him bee silenced and deprived of all spirituall promotions he doth enjoy."

The novelty, however, of the Synod, at least in its present constitution, and the informalities which may be traced in some of its proceedings,<sup>1</sup> appear to have excited considerable doubts at the time of their publication, as to the ecclesiastical authority of the Dublin Articles; for we find Dr. Bernard, one of the biographers of Ussher, himself strongly tinged with Calvinian notions, and a uniform admirer of the Articles, under the necessity of meeting this prevalent objection, and of asserting, on the verbal testimony of his patron, that the Formulary was actually signed "by Archbishop Jones, the president of Convocation, by the prolocutor of the lower House, in the name of the whole clergy, and also by the Lord Deputy, by order of James I."<sup>2</sup> Although part of this evidence has been discredited, perhaps with sufficient justice, it cannot be altogether set aside; and, accordingly, while we may assume that the Articles were destitute of preliminary sanction, and could not therefore be *legally* enforced, we are bound to admit, that there is not *enough* ground<sup>3</sup> for disputing

<sup>1</sup> Elrington's Ussher, 39, 40.

<sup>2</sup> Bernard's Life of Ussher, 50. Collier endeavours to explain the motives of the English monarch in confirming so many Articles at variance with his own opinions, ii. 708. Compare Heylin, Hist. Quinqu-Artic. Part iii. ch. xxii. § 5: but the solution of Wood, (in Dr. Elrington's Ussher, 47, 48,) is far more probable. Archdeacon Stopford discredits the testimony of Bernard, suspecting that the deputy never signed the Articles at all, and contending, that if he did, such an indirect exercise of the supremacy was invalid. Introduction to Vol. iii. of the MS. Irish Prayer Book, LXIII. ed. E. H. S. But the following extract from an anti-Armenian pamphlet of 1633, entitled "The Truth of three Things," &c. indicates that the royal sanction of them was generally believed: "I may adde hereunto the doctrine of the Articles of the Church of Ireland, which fitly may here be inserted, as both looking to King James, *under whose authority and protection it came forth*, and was maintained, and looking to the doctrine of the Church of England, since it were an intollerable and impudent iniury to the wisdome and religious knowledge of these time, to say that betweene them there was not a harmonie," 29, 30. The pamphlet, however, is full of special-pleadings.

<sup>3</sup> All the evidence against the *legitimate* adoption of the Articles has been ably stated in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Journal," No. 118, pp. 66, 67.

their formal acceptance by the Church, in some kind of synodical meeting.

Whether or no they were originally offered for *subscription*, like our own Articles, after the Convocation of 1571, and whether the Church ever authorized any of the prelates to exact this subscription from the clergy,—are altogether different questions, and such as it is not easy to determine either in one way or the other. The view which is most satisfactorily established<sup>1</sup> supposes that where individual bishops made use of the Articles as a positive test of doctrine, they were exceeding the power which had been determined by the language of the Synod; for the decree appended to the document itself betrays no wish to impose the Articles *absolutely* on the Church, either by the agency of subscription or any other apparatus. It declares, indeed, that whoever shall teach what is *contrary to them* shall be silenced and deposed, in imitation, it would seem, of the order which had accompanied the Lambeth propositions; yet unlike the authorized determinations of the Church in 1562, they had no more than a *negative* force, and must have acted rather as Articles of discipline and peace than as a public Formulary of Faith.

But whatever be the amount of authority which they exercised from 1615 to 1635, they were virtually, if not formally, abolished by the Convocation of this latter date. The leanings of the Irish Church in the direction of Geneva were now considerably adjusted, and with men like Strafford and Bramhall presiding in her counsels, it was natural to expect that a fresh effort would be made to remove every obstacle in the way of her cordial agreement with the English. Strafford, in his character of Deputy, had submitted a plan for this entire assimilation as early as 1634; and Laud,<sup>2</sup> with the consent of his royal master, at

<sup>1</sup> In this way only can we give a satisfactory explanation of the language employed in 1634 by Strafford, Laud, and Bramhall. They all speak as if the Irish Articles needed confirmation, and imply that the Puritan party were fully aware of the defect. See Archdeacon Stopford, *ubi sup.* LXIII., LXIV.

<sup>2</sup> In writing to Strafford, Oct. 20, 1634, he says, "I knew how you would find my Lord Primate [*i. e.* Ussher] affected to the Articles of Ireland; but I am glad the trouble that hath been in it will end there, without advertising of it over to us. And whereas you propose to have the *Articles of England*

once adopted the proposal, and urged its immediate execution. It was accordingly submitted to the Irish Convocation of 1635, and by the powerful advocacy of Bramhall, the following Canon was accepted, with a single dissentient voice: "For the manifestation of our agreement with the Church of England in the confession of the same Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments, we do receive and approve the Book of Articles of Religion, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord, 1562, &c. And, therefore, if any hereafter shall affirm that any of these Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved before he make a public recantation of his error."

No doubt can, therefore, exist as to the formal adoption of the English Articles, by the whole of the sister Church; but it has always been warmly disputed whether the fact of such an approbation has absolutely repealed the Dublin Articles. It is probable that the original promoters regarded the Canon of 1635 from very different points of view. Ussher, who was still unweaned from his Calvinistic tenets, though at this time the intimate friend of Laud, has left his own opinion of the case in the following extract from a letter addressed to Dr. Ward: "The Articles of Religion agreed upon in our former synod, anno 1615, *we let stand* as we did before. But for the manifesting of our agreement with the Church of England, we have received and approved your Articles, also concluded in the year 1562, as you may see in the first of our Canons."<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, it is clear that both Strafford and Bramhall anticipated the abrogation of the Irish Articles as the result of the present measure: the former

received in *ipsisimis verbis*, and leave the other as no way concerned, *neither affirmed nor denied*, you are certainly in the right, and so says the King, to whom I imparted it, as well as I. "Go, hold close, and you will do a great service in it." Strafford, Letters, i. 329: cf. Bramhall's Works, v. 80, and notes; Oxf. 1845.

<sup>3</sup> Mant, i. 491.

<sup>2</sup> Elrington's Life, 176.

actually expressing his intention "to silence them without noise,"<sup>1</sup> and the latter hoping to "take away that Shibboleth which made the Irish Church lisp too undecently, or rather, in some little degree, to speak the speech of Ashdod, and not the language of Canaan."<sup>2</sup> Heylin has, indeed, asserted that the Dublin Articles were actually "called in;"<sup>3</sup> but there is no sufficient proof that any order was given prohibiting the use of them by individual bishops, and the practice of Ussher himself<sup>4</sup> in requiring subscription to *both* the series would lead to the conclusion that they were still in some degree permitted. The attempt, however, rising out of the predilection of the Primate, to retain them by the vote of the Synod, as a co-ordinate authority<sup>5</sup> in the Irish Church, was strongly discountenanced by the Deputy, and ultimately abandoned; so that, however much of forbearance may have been exercised in abstaining from a direct repudiation of those Articles, they were in truth tacitly withdrawn, together with a Canon of the same period, which deliberately strove to set them on a level with the authorized English Articles. Whatever may have been the precise nature of their claims during the in-

<sup>1</sup> Strafford, Letters, Dec. 16, 1634. i. 342: cf. Neal, Puritans, ii. 107, ed. 1733.

<sup>2</sup> Mant, i. 493, and Bp. Taylor's Sermon upon the Lord Primate [Bramhall:] Works, viii. 411, 412, ed. Eden.

<sup>3</sup> Life of Laud, Part ii. 271—274: Hist. of the Sabbath, Part ii. c. viii. § 9.

<sup>4</sup> Elrington's Life, 176: cf. a letter of Laud to Ussher, May 10, 1635; Ussher's Works, xvi. 7, 8.

<sup>5</sup> This appears from the draft of the following canon proposed in the Convocation, but withdrawn through the influence of Strafford: "Those which shall affirm any of the Articles agreed on by the clergy of Ireland at Dublin, 1615, or any of the 39 concluded of in the Convocation at London, 1562, and received by the Convocation at Dublin, 1634, to be in any part superstitious, or such as may not with a good conscience be received and allowed, shall be excommunicated and not restored but only by the Archbishop." Pref. to Vol. III. of "MS. Book of Common Prayer for Ireland," E. H. S. cxvi. The note of Strafford is remarkable as indicating some defect in the authority of the Articles of 1615: "It would be considered here whether these Articles of Dublin, 1615, agree substantially with those of London, or *confirmed, equally by the King's authority*: else I see no reason of establishing them under one penalty."

terval which elapsed between the two Convocations of 1615 and 1635, they were henceforth in the condition of a will, in which the latest declaration has the force of overruling the earlier provisions, so far at least as they may seem to have worn a somewhat different aspect, or to have been capable of a contrary meaning.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, after the Rebellion, in which most of the remaining Puritanism of Ireland had been tempered or exploded,<sup>2</sup> no further instance occurs of a desire to enforce subscription to the Dublin Articles on the part of a single prelate. The English have alone been regarded as the preliminary test of doctrine on admission into holy orders,<sup>3</sup> and long before the civil enactment at the opening of the present century the two sister Churches, upon opposite sides of the Channel, were constituted by ecclesiastical usage the *united* Church of England and Ireland.

<sup>1</sup> See Collier's observation to this effect, ii. 763.

<sup>2</sup> It is well observed by a writer in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Journal" for June, 1850, that notwithstanding the strength of feeling at this period, in Ireland as elsewhere, against every thing "Genevan," the Dublin Articles of 1615 were unnoticed by the Convocation (from 1661 to 1665;) which is a strong proof that they were considered as no longer possessed of the slightest authority or obligation.

<sup>3</sup> Elrington's Ussher, 177.

## CHAPTER IX.

## THE SYNOD OF DORT AND THE ROYAL DECLARATION.

**A**FTER the failure of the vehement effort to fasten the Lambeth Articles on the Church of England, the zeal which had prompted their compilation appears to have gradually subsided. The Calvinistic party now found themselves every where confronted by a host of formidable opponents,<sup>1</sup> while many of their own champions had fallen back into silence and neutrality, or had altogether left their ranks.<sup>2</sup> Some, it is true, including men the most highly gifted of their times, continued to combine their acquiescence in the more rigorous of the Genevan doctrines with a pure and unflinching attachment to the Formularies of the Church; but, generally speaking, the extreme or supra-lapsarian Calvinist took the side of the disciplinary "Precisians," whose horror of "the cap, the tippet, and the surplice" had driven them, under the guidance of Cartwright, to a more congenial platform.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Bp. Young's remark at the time of Laud's ordination, in *Le Bas, Life of Laud*, 6. The following order of the King to the Universities in 1616, conduced to the same result: "That young students in divinity be directed to study such books as be most agreeable in doctrine and discipline to the Church of England, and incited to bestow their time on the Fathers and Councils, schoolmen, histories, and controversies, and *not to insist so long upon compendiums and abbreviatures*, making them the grounds of their divinity." *Wilkins*, iv. 459.

<sup>2</sup> *e. g.* Dr. Thomas Jackson, of whom Prynne says that he "disgraced his mother the university of Oxford, who grieved for his defection." *Works*, i. xi. *Oxf.* 1844. Hales of Eton abandoned his former opinions with the observation that he "bade John Calvin good night." *Faringdon's Letter*, prefixed to "Golden Remains." *Lond.* 1659. See also Bp. Sanderson's remarkable statement of the change of his own mind on this subject. *Hammond's Works*, i. 669, fol. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The first "conventicle" was organized in 1568. *Mr. Haweis' Sketches*, 189.

Yet the most cursory perusal of the Jacobean literature will convince us how large and acrimonious was the party, both within and without the Church, who persisted in preaching the "Divine decrees" as the sum and substance of the Gospel. Shrinking (as many of them did) from the logical consequences of their system, or, in other words, taking shelter in the *sub-lapsarian* hypothesis, by which the hardness of the older teaching was considerably softened, they still deemed it a part of their sacred duty to denounce the slightest divergence from their ground as Pelagian and even Popish.<sup>1</sup> To question the inamissibility of grace, to assert the universality of redemption, to claim any freedom of choice for man as the surviving element of his moral constitution,—suspending his final acceptance on the fruitfulness of his faith, or his use of the talents with which he was entrusted, would infallibly tend to implicate the preacher in long and angry disputations: it was treason against the majesty of Calvin, and a virtual renunciation of the Gospel.

But warm as might be the agitation rising out of domestic causes, it was still further exasperated and inflamed by the growth of a controversy upon the same questions in the republic of the Low Countries. Our own Church, as Bp. Hall expressed it, began to sicken of the "Belgic disease," or the "five busy Articles,"<sup>2</sup> and the preachers to indulge in pathetic warnings against the "poison" of Arminius. The leader of this formidable

<sup>1</sup> The Vice-chancellor of Oxford (Dr. Robert Abbott) in a Sermon before the University, 1614, made the following onslaught upon Laud, who was then rising into eminence: "Might not Christ say, what art thou? Romish or English, Papist or Protestant? Or what art thou? A mongrel, or compound of both? A protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of Free-will, inherent righteousness and the like?" *Le Bas, Life of Laud*, 25. Carleton, in like manner, denounces Montague as "running with the Arminians into the depths of Pelagius his poisoned doctrine," and when the "Appellant" declares that he has read nothing of the Arminians and utterly repudiates Pelagius, the only answer he obtains from his stern "Examiner," is this: "It seemeth that you are an excellent scholler, that can learne your lesson so perfectly without instructors." Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeale holdeth the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians, to be the doctrines of the Church of England, 19, 20: 2nd ed.

<sup>2</sup> "Men, brethren, fathers, help. Who sees not a dangerous fire kindling

attack upon the popular theology was a professor in the university of Leyden, who is said to have abandoned his Calvinistic tenets after reading a production of Perkins, one of the English supra-lapsarians.<sup>1</sup> Appalled, it would seem, by the principles enunciated in that work without the slightest mitigation or reserve, he resorted to the theory of the Divine decrees which had been first adopted by St. Ambrose,<sup>2</sup> regarding it as the best clue for escaping from the subject in which he was entangled, and urging it as the one intelligible way of vindicating the grace of the Almighty, and the freedom of His fallen creatures.

The date of this change in the teaching of Arminius was 1604, and as we might have expected from the age, to which his conclusions were addressed, he was immediately the object of unsparing castigation. Nor did his death in October of 1609, put an end to the animated strife which he had thus been the instrument of raising. On the contrary, it spread rapidly on all sides, and threatened to absorb into the Arminian party the learning and intelligence of Holland. Among the rest who contributed to extend it more especially were Episcopius and Uytendogaert,<sup>3</sup> the one by the agency of the press, the other of the pulpit. They were aided also by the countenance of Grotius and of Olden-Barneveld (the land-syndicus of Holland:) but the co-operation of these eminent statesmen had eventually the effect of associating the principles of Arminius with a large political combination who were bent on resisting the authority, which the revolution had conferred on the leading House of Orange. On this account, while some of the provincial states were the ardent patrons of the sect, it had to encounter the hostility of Prince Maurice, and the rest of the Dutch republic.<sup>4</sup>

in our Church, by these five fatal brands? which, if they be not speedily quenched, threatens a furious eruption, and shall too late die in our ashes." Bp. Hall, *Via Media*, Works, x. 479. Oxf. 1837.

<sup>1</sup> William Perkins, *Armilla Aurea* (see above, p. 157.) The animadversions of Arminius are entitled "Examen Prædestinationis Perkinsianæ."

<sup>2</sup> See Mosheim, II. 93, and the "Confessio sententiæ Pastorum, qui in federato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur," 31. Herdewic. 1622.

<sup>3</sup> Guerike, *Kircheng.* II. 519.

<sup>4</sup> Miller, *Philosophy of Hist.* III. 192, 193, 3rd ed.

In order to avert the indignation of the party who were thus wielding the civil sword, and threatening to use it in behalf of the Calvinistic dogmas, the school which had accepted the teaching of Arminius resolved to present a declaration of their tenets, at a general assembly of States, in 1610. This document was due to Episcopius and his colleague, and the title which it bore (the *Remonstrance*,) has suggested the future appellation of the sect. It consisted of five Articles,<sup>1</sup> touching predestination, the extent of Christ's death, man's free-will and corruption, the manner of our conversion to God, and the perseverance of the saints; but so far from conciliating its opponents, either political or religious, it led, after a stormy interval of eight years,<sup>2</sup> to the calling of the Synod of Dort.

The grand object of this meeting was the condemnation<sup>3</sup> of the tenets embraced in the "Remonstrance," so that the cause of the Arminians was in fact decided before it was at all examined. Towards the end of November, 1618, sixty-one<sup>4</sup> of the Dutch divines, comprising thirty-six ministers, five professors, and twenty elders, had assembled at the town of Dort to welcome the arrival of twenty-eight foreign coadjutors, who had been invited to the synod from various European States, for the purpose of lending additional weight to its conclusions, but without the power of exercising any vote in the determination of the schism.

Among the rest who contributed to the respectability of the

<sup>1</sup> See *Acta Synod. Dordrecht.* Part III. ed. 1620, for the Articles and also for the Judgments of the Divines upon each thesis in succession.

<sup>2</sup> During this interval (1611) a public disputation had taken place at the Hague between the Remonstrants and the Contra-Remonstrants, but no concession having been made by either party and the toleration of the Prince of Orange being exhausted, he imprisoned Grotius and Olden-Barneveld. Collier, II. 716. The latter was afterward beheaded, in 1619. Guerike, II. 521.

<sup>3</sup> It has even been alleged that an oath was taken by the delegates, to proceed in this arbitrary manner, but Fuller has shown satisfactorily with regard to the English divines at least, that no such obligation was imposed. *Church Hist.* Book XI. Sect. II. §§ 14, 15. In fact, the foreign deputies had no votes, and therefore might not be called upon to take the oath administered to the others.

<sup>4</sup> Kerroux, *Abrégé de l'Hist. de la Hollande*, II. 500, 501, (quoted by Miller), makes the number sixty-four.

proceedings was James I. of England; whose motives in thus furthering the triumphs of Geneva have given rise to a number of conjectures. The bitterness which he had shown in opposing the doctrine<sup>1</sup> as well as the discipline of the Non-Conformists at the Hampton-Court Conference of 1604, and the patronage which he afterwards lavished upon Montague<sup>2</sup> and the sturdiest adversaries of Calvin, would imply that his own leanings were not in the direction of the principles so fearlessly asserted at this synod: and yet his denunciation of Vorstius<sup>3</sup> who had succeeded to the theological chair of Leyden, include the very strongest censure of Arminius and some of the principles of his school. It is probable that the reasons by which James had been swayed in acceding to the wishes of the Belgic states, were partly theological and partly political. The reprehensible speculation of Vorstius<sup>4</sup> had led him to infer that Arminius, the favourite of the same body, was similarly tainted by heretical notions; or at least that his teaching had some kind of tendency to unworthy ideas of the Divine Being: while on the other hand, the intimate friendship subsisting between James and the Prince of Orange impelled him to assist in the depression of a party, who, by the admixture of the political elements to which we have before adverted, had become in a great degree identified with the opposition to that house.

But in what way soever the English monarch was incited, whether by the strength of these causes, or of others which have been suggested by different writers,<sup>5</sup> he answered the earnest solicitations of the States by sending a private deputation<sup>6</sup> of divines to the

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Cardwell's Hist. of Conf. 180, seqq.

<sup>2</sup> The famous "Appello Cæsarem," (1624) was approved by James, and immediately licensed with the declaration "that there was nothing contained in it but what was agreeable to the public faith, doctrine and discipline established in the Church of England."

<sup>3</sup> Heylin, Hist. Quinqu-Artic. Part III. ch. XXII. § 8.

<sup>4</sup> He had seemed to call in question the absolute perfections of the Divine attributes. Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Collier, II. 716.

<sup>6</sup> Whatever this synod may signify in some place we have nothing to do with it. The English that appeared there were no other than four court-divines: their commission and instruction were only from the King... they

national synod of Dort. These were George Carleton, bishop of Llandaff, afterwards of Chichester; Joseph Hall, at that time dean of Worcester, and afterwards the distinguished bishop of Exeter and Norwich; John Davenant, Margaret Professor at Cambridge, and afterwards bishop of Salisbury; and Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and arch-deacon of Taunton.<sup>1</sup> With the exception of Carleton, who was always reputed a most rigid Calvinist, these divines may be classed with the more moderate of the party who opposed the system of Arminius, and with respect to the benefits of infant baptism, or the actual reception of grace by many, who did not afterwards persevere,<sup>2</sup> the opinions of Ward and Davenant had been drawn exclusively from Hippo, in contradistinction to Geneva. They were on this account well fitted to carry out the intention of the King by advocating those principles in the synod, which might "tend to the mitigation of the heat on both sides," and dissuade the Contra-remonstrants in particular from "delivering in the pulpit to the people those things for ordinary doctrines which are the highest points of schools."<sup>3</sup> It is moreover asserted that the King instructed them to lay special emphasis upon the doctrine of universal redemption,—a tenet which "pursued in its just consequences is suf-

had no delegation from the bishops and by consequences were no representatives of the British Church." Ibid. 718.

<sup>1</sup> They were joined in the following month by Walter Balcanqual, a Scotchman, who was also the bearer of credentials from King James. Collier, II. 717. Hales's Letters from the Synod of Dort, 44, ed. 1659.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Ward in writing to Archbp. Ussher, (May 25, 1630), asserts that the efficacy of baptism in infants had been discussed by Davenant and himself at Dort, when they signified their judgment that the case of infants was not *appertaining to the question of Perseverance*. Ussher's Works, xv. 504. ed. Elrington. See also Ward's "Determinaciones Theologicae," 44 seqq. Lond. 1658, and Bedford's "Vindiciae Gratiae Sacramentalis," to which a Letter of Davenant is prefixed relating to the same question. These works together with Ward's "Vindication," which Ussher, his bosom-friend, published after his death, demonstrate that a belief in the regeneration of all infants (as distinguished from their final perseverance) was deemed in no way incompatible with the strongest denial of the Arminian theory of decrees. See below, note (2), and compare Ussher's Works, xv. 505—520.

<sup>3</sup> See the Royal Instruction, in Collier, II. 716.



ficient to overthrow the whole Calvinian system of the five points."<sup>1</sup>

On the arrival of the deputies at Dort the business of the meeting was begun, though the representatives of Arminianism did not arrive till the fourth of the following month.<sup>2</sup> The president, elected at the outset, was Bogermann, one of the sternest of the Contra-remonstrant party, who had openly stated his opinion that all who refused the Calvinistic dogmas should be punished by the civil sword.<sup>3</sup> The assessors and secretaries who were appointed at his wish, had been trained in the same rigid school, so that when Episcopius and his party saluted the synod at the meeting of December the 7th, it was not difficult to foresee that the cause which they expressed themselves willing to defend, had been virtually predetermined. If any doubts existed on this point, they were dispelled by a circumstance which happened on the morrow; for two of the Arminian deputies from Utrecht, who had taken their places with the other members of the synod, were now ordered to renounce that character, and to associate in future with

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Waterland, Works, II. 348. Oxf. 1843. This question was first handled by Balcanqual, the Scotch deputy of King James, (Hales, Letters, 74), and from his own correspondence (Ibid. 2) we learn that Davenant and Ward agreed in maintaining that "Christ died for all particular men," while Carleton and Goade persisted in the belief that He died "only for the elect, who consists of all sorts of men." The Calvinistic limitation prevailed for a while (Ibid. 4); but the following extract from a subsequent letter of the same divine, April 1<sup>st</sup>, implies that the English theologians had afterwards returned to the question; "The deputies appointed by the synod have taken pains, I must needs confess, to give our Colledge all satisfaction; besides the second Article [on the extent of Christ's death], some of our Colledge have been earnest to have this proposition out: 'Infideles damnabunter non solum ob infidelitatem, sed etiam ob omnia alia peccata sua tam originale quam actualia;' because they say that from thence may be inferred *that original sin is not remitted to all who are baptized*, which opinion hath been by more than one council condemned as heretical: *They have, therefore, at their request put it out*," 34: cf. Sententia Theologorum Magnæ Britanniæ de Articulo secundo, Acta Synod. Dordrecht. Part II. 100—106.

<sup>2</sup> John Hales, who was an eye-witness of the proceedings for three months, writes (Dec. 6, 1618, *stylo novo*.) "The armies have been in sight one of another and have had some parley." Letters, 23.

<sup>3</sup> He had before this time translated into Dutch the notorious Treatise of Beza, "De Hæreticis a civili magistratu puniendis."

the thirteen others who had been formally *cited*<sup>1</sup> as delinquents. In vain did Episcopius urge them to discuss the controverted questions publicly and *seriatim*: his appeal to "the Scriptures and to solid reason,"<sup>2</sup> was met by a demand of the president for unquestioning submission to the terms imposed by himself and the synod, and when the Remonstrants with an air of defiance protested against an authority which they deemed imperious and unjust, they were eventually dismissed the assembly, deprived of their ecclesiastical appointments, and banished out of the territory of the Dutch republic. How sad must have been the feelings which this spectacle excited in the breast of the future Bp. Hall! He did not however stay to see the end of the proceedings,<sup>3</sup> for the failure of his health induced him to solicit a recall from his royal master, and his place was very speedily supplied by Dr. Thomas Goade, who had distinguished himself as one of the prosecutors of Barrett more than twenty years before. Time had in some measure softened the acerbity of his spirit, and it is satisfactory to observe that throughout the whole course of the discussions, from the opening of the synod to its close, the conduct of the English theologians, more especially of Davenant and Ward, was always on the side of Christian moderation, as well as of Christian truth. When they finally returned to their own country<sup>4</sup> in

<sup>1</sup> Hales, *ubi sup.* 26. seqq. A third deputy from Utrecht, "professed to submit himself to the judgment of the synod, if they shall decide according to his conscience," 33.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 39. It was conceded by the synod that the Remonstrants might propose their doubts both in the question of election and of reprobation, but must not venture to make any suggestion as to the best mode of proceeding, 47. "An absolute liberty of going as far as they list in oppugning before the synod what opinions they pleased of learned men, this was thought unfit," 48, 52.

<sup>3</sup> He had preached in the 16th Session of the Synod (Nov. 29) what Hales described (p. 10) as "a polite and patheticall Latine sermon," urging among other means of reconciliation a full discussion of Rom. ix. by the two contending parties: "Agite ergo, viri iudices, si me auditis, jubete, ut pars utraque litigantium, breven, claram, apertamque sine fuco sine ambagibus, illius loci paraphrasin, sancta Synodo, fraterna manu, exhibeat." Acta Synodi Dordrecht. 46.

<sup>4</sup> Balcanqual's last letter is dated "25 of April *stylo loci*." The Synod itself closed May 9, 1619, with the 15th Session. Guerike, II. 522.

April 1619, they left a salutary admonition in the ears of their over-zealous colleagues: "If questions happen to arise which the reformed Churches have not hitherto decided, and if they are discussed by learned and holy men, without any detriment to the faith, it is not seemly in grave and moderate divines to obtrude upon all others their own way of thinking. In such a case all is well, provided only the diversity of opinions break not the bond of peace among the clergy, nor be the means of disseminating faction. We suggest, moreover, that of those things which are established on the sure foundation of the Word of God, there are some, which ought not to be promiscuously inculcated upon all, but touched in the proper time and place with tenderness and judgment. One of them is the sublime mystery of predestination, sweet indeed and most full of comfort, but to them who are rooted in the faith, and exercised in holy living; for to such only will it prove an unfailling bulwark in the midst of the grievous struggles of the conscience. But truly when the imprudence of certain preachers exposes this profound inquiry to men who have not learned as they ought the first principles of religion, and whose mind is still rioting in carnal affections, it follows as the necessary consequence that while they dispute on the mysteries of predestination, they are abandoning the salutary Gospel, and while they dream of nothing else but predestination unto life, they enter not on the way everlasting as it is marked out for the predestined. Still greater need of caution is there in approaching the mystery of reprobation, not only that it may be handled sparingly and prudently, but also that in the expounding of it the horrible and unscriptural opinions be avoided which lead rather to desperation than to the edification of the people, and which are now one of the most grievous scandals in some of the reformed Churches. Finally, let us so think of the most precious merit of Christ's death that we spurn not the opinions of the Early Church, nor the Confessions of the Reformed Communion, and what is of the highest moment, that we never weaken the promises of the Gospel universally propounded in the Church."<sup>1</sup>

It would have been well for our own country, as for others,

<sup>1</sup> *Suffragium Collegiale Synodo Dordrecht*, 103, 104, Lond. 1626.

if the controversialists had hearkened to this sober counsel, and instead of pursuing their speculations on the nature of the Divine decrees, had turned to that aspect of religion immediately bearing upon man. But in spite of the earnest efforts of a small conciliatory band, the return of the deputies from Dort was the signal for a still deeper agitation of the topics there disputed. "Already do we see the sky blacken," was the language of Bishop Hall,<sup>1</sup> (himself one of the few mediators;) "we hear the winds whistle hollow afar off, and feel all the presages of a tempest, which the late example of our neighbours bid us fear." A growing school of the English theologians had warmly espoused the tenets of Arminius, and gave vent to their unmeasured condemnation of the synod in which his system was proscribed; the rest were even louder in their praises of the Calvinistic party, and though happily restrained from the deeds of bloodshed which had accompanied the suppression of the Dutch Remonstrants, it is impossible to exaggerate the ferocity of the zeal which they now breathed in every quarter.

The pulpits of the rural district, as well as of the town, were propagating the perturbation of which the Universities were the centre. Every where, some or other of the "Five Points" was the text of the fiery preacher, and if he chanced to hold the Calvinistic theory, which was very frequently the case, he stirred up the strongest passions of his audience by associating the system of Arminius with the hated Babylonish harlot;<sup>2</sup> while the press, vying with the pulpit, was inundating the country with a host of publications, which for the coarseness of their tone and the ran-

<sup>1</sup> Dedication of the "Via Media."

<sup>2</sup> The House of Commons, who made their religious discontent a plea for political agitations, were manifesting the same spirit. The following specimen occurs in their remonstrance against the Duke of Buckingham: "And as our fear concerning change of subversion of religion is grounded upon the daily increase of papists. . . . so are the hearts of your good subjects no less perplexed, when with sorrow they behold a daily growth and spreading of the faction of the Arminians, that being, as your majesty well knows, but a cunning way to bring in popery, and the professors of those opinions, the common disturbers of the protestant churches, and incendiaries in those states wherein they have gotten any head, being protestants in show, but Jesuites in opinion," &c. Rushworth, *Hist. Collect.* i. 621, Lond. 1682.

cour of their spirit are unrivalled even among the sickening annuals of the Quinquarticular disputations.

The zeal and vehemence, or, we might almost add, the frenzy, with which these questions were now handled, appear to have at length satisfied the King that his sanction of the recent synod had been the means of calling up a power which, if not speedily allayed, might embody itself in some political agitation, and shake him from his throne. His next step, therefore, was an effort to restrain the contending parties, and with the versatility which may be traced in all his public conduct, he wrote a letter to archbishop Abbot (August 4, 1622), deploring the abuses and extravagances of the pulpit, and charging him to circulate a number of "Directions concerning Preachers" among all the clergy of his province. One of these, which was obviously intended as a curb on the rampant disputations, was couched in the following terms: "That no preacher of what title soever, under the degree of a bishop, or dean at least, do from henceforth presume to preach in any popular auditory the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or the universality, efficacy, resistibility or irresistibility of God's grace; but leave those themes to be handled by learned men, and that moderately and modestly, by way of use and application, rather than by way of positive doctrine, as being fitter for the schools and universities than for simple auditories."<sup>1</sup>

But notwithstanding the vigilance of the ecclesiastical authorities, who were now as weary as King James of the fruitless<sup>2</sup> agitation, and grieved at the spread of "indecent railing," the royal order, in many districts of the island, was continually forgotten, or ignored. When Charles I. succeeded to the throne in 1625, he found the Church of England labouring under the evils which had grown up in the previous reign, spent by unedifying contests, and torn by the factions which were fostered every day by the viru-

<sup>1</sup> Wilkins, iv. 465. In the January following, Gabriel Bridges of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was prosecuted under this order for preaching against the theory of irrelative predestination. Heylin, *Histor. Quinqu-Art.* Part III. ch. xxii. § 10.

<sup>2</sup> Almost the only fruit of it was a daily defection from the Church to popery, anabaptism, or other points of separation in some parts of this kingdom. Abbot's Letter explaining the above doctrines, Wilkins, 466.

lence of party-spirit. He therefore betook himself in earnest to the remedies which had been suggested by his father, and with the help of Laud and some other bishops,<sup>1</sup> drew up the memorable Proclamation of 1626. He began by deploring the prevalence of dissensions, and "the sharp and indiscreet handling of some of either party," on the ground that they had "given much offence to the sober and well-grounded readers, and raised some hopes in the Roman Catholics that by degrees the professors of our religion may be drawn, first to schism, and afterwards to plain popery." He then signified his disapprobation of all those who, from motives of a different kind, adventured to innovate on the existing usage of the realm, avowing his determination to visit the clergy, whoever they might be, with a severe penalty, if they should raise, publish, or maintain opinions not clearly warranted by the doctrine and discipline of the Church.<sup>2</sup>

In the Universities and market-towns where this edict was immediately put in circulation, it seems to have had the desired effect of silencing the more boisterous polemics, but a number of the unquiet spirits in remoter parts of England, identifying the "Institutions" of Calvin with the revelations of the holy Bible, were not slow in perceiving that by such a measure their craft was seriously endangered, and their agitations at an end. The mutters of discontent were not long in reaching the ears of Laud, and it was to check the further outbreaks of their zeal, and if possible to guard against the civil commotions which they were soon to be the means of precipitating into the depths of the Great Rebellion,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Their object might be in some measure to deliver Montague from his numberless assailants, among the rest from the House of Commons, who had established a Committee of Religion, and undertaken the censorship of the theological press. See *Le Bas, Life of Laud*, 87, 88.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, i. 412.

<sup>3</sup> Many of the divines at that period foresaw the inevitable tendency of the Genevan teaching. In a letter to the Duke of Buckingham in 1625 from three of the Bishops, it is affirmed "that they cannot conceive what use there can be of civil government in the commonwealth, or of preaching and external ministry in the Church, if such fatal opinions, as some which are opposite and contrary to those delivered by Mr. Mountague shall be publicly taught and maintained." And a yet stronger affirmation of this truth may be seen in a letter of Dr. Brooks, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, Dec. 15, 1630. Heylin's *Histor. Quinqu-Art.* Part II. ch. vi. § 10.

that the King was now advised to order a reprint of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to insist with still greater force on the execution of his recent edict. The document, which rose out of this conference with the bishops,<sup>1</sup> and which has since kept its place in front of our Articles, under the title of "His Majesty's Declaration," made its appearance in 1628.

After reminding the people that he was the supreme Governor of the Church, and as such desirous of repressing unnecessary disputations, he proceeds, with the advice of his bishops, to declare that the Articles of Religion contain true doctrine, and to confirm them by his royal approbation. He then states, in the two following clauses, that differences on the external polity of the Church should be settled by the clergy assembled in Convocation,<sup>2</sup> and that from the decisions of this body he will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree. On approaching the dissensions which had "been ill raised" among the clergy, he expressed his satisfaction that all of them had cordially subscribed the Articles established, and that even in "those curious points in which the present differences lie," the disputants were on both sides not unwilling to carry their appeals to that common standard. In respect, therefore, of the questions rising out of the Quinquarticular controversy, he ended by the following order: "We will that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning

<sup>1</sup> Prynne, in his *Canterburie's Doome*, has the following observation, after charging archbishop Laud with the intention of establishing Arminianism in England: "To which end he procured his Majesty by a printed declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, compiled by himself and other bishops, of which the most part were Arminians," 160: cf. Rushworth, i. 653. That Laud was in reality actuated by "moderate counsels" and an earnest desire for peace is proved by his private correspondence. Le Bas, *Life*, 128, 129.

<sup>2</sup> This clause aroused the special indignation of the puritan, Sir John Elliott: "And now to the particular in the declaration, we see what is said

of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."<sup>1</sup>

It was not easy to conceive a more sober document than the one above recited, for the clergy were simply required to perform a most obvious duty in abstaining from all attempts to torture the Articles of Religion into non-natural acceptations; yet so crooked was the age to whom this order was addressed, that it served only to embitter and inflame the passions it was anxiously striving to appease.<sup>2</sup> A large body of the Calvinistic clergy, in and about London, lost no time in preparing a petition to the King, in which they deprecated the restraints he had imposed upon "the saving doctrines of God's free grace in election and perseverance." They

of popery and Arminianism; our faith and religion is in danger by it, for like an inundation it doth break in at once upon us. It is said, If there be any difference of opinion concerning the reasonable interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, the bishops and clergy in the convocation have power to dispute it, and to order which way they please, and for aught I know, popery and Arminianism may be introduced by them, and then it must be received by all." Rushworth, i. 649.

<sup>1</sup> Wilkins, iv. 475. On Dec. 30, 1639, the king published instructions for causing the contents of the Declaration to be put in execution and punctually observed for the time to come. Heylin, *ubi sup.* Part III. ch. xxii. § 12.

<sup>2</sup> The following passage from a "Declaration" of the king on the dissolution of parliament (March 10, 1628,) is a strong proof of his personal earnestness in this matter: "Having taken a strict and exact survey of our government, both in the Church and commonwealth, and what things were most fit and necessary to be reformed, We found, in the first place, that much exception had been taken at a book, entitled, *Appello Cæsarem*, or *An Appeal to Cæsar*, and published in the year 1625, by Richard Montague, then bachelor of Divinity, and now Bishop of Chichester; and because it did open the way to those schisms and divisions, which have since ensued in the Church, We did, for remedy and redress thereof, and for the satisfaction of the consciences of our good people, not only by our publick proclamation, call in that book, *which ministered matter of offence*; but to prevent the like danger for hereafter, reprinted the Articles of Religion, established in the time of Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory; and by a Declaration before those Articles, *We did tie and restrain all opinions to the sense of those Articles*, that nothing might be left to fancies and invocations (? innovations.) For we call God to record, before whom we stand, that it is, and always hath been our heart's desire, to be found worthy, of that title, which we account the most glorious in all our crown, *Defender of the Faith*." Rushworth, i. App. p. 4.

alleged that the Declaration had placed them in a most painful dilemma, for that they must henceforward incur the displeasure of the King if they attacked "the Pelagian and Arminian heresies," or, on the other hand, must provoke a still heavier indignation by neglecting to make known the whole counsel of God.<sup>1</sup> In the House of Commons also, where the puritanical party was now predominant, and where it was solemnly averred that the suppression of "Popery and Arminianism" was the very foremost duty,<sup>2</sup> a debate<sup>3</sup> on the royal Declaration had resulted in the following vow: "We the Commons in parliament assembled do claim, protest and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion which were established by parliament in the thirteenth year of our late Queen Elizabeth, which by the publick act of the Church of England, and by the general and currant expositions of the writers of our Church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others, wherein they differ from us."

How fatal these protestations are to the plea that the Articles were manifestly framed on the Calvinistic hypothesis, it is almost needless to remark; for as the royal Declaration did no more than restrict the teaching of the clergy to a plain and literal interpretation of that Formulary, the outcry which was now raised against a principle so clear was the fullest admission of the ground which Montague and the rest had taken, when they urged that the "Calvinism" of the Articles can be proved by none of the laws which have ordinarily obtained in the construction of legal or of other documents.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Collier, II. 746, 747.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, I. 652.

<sup>3</sup> The speeches of Rous and Prynne are full of the most vehement denunciations of Arminianism. Ibid. 645, 647. The latter asserts it to be the duty of a parliament to establish true religion and to punish false, declaring its superiority above the Convocation of Canterbury, which is but provincial, and cannot bind the whole kingdom, and adding, with respect to York, that "it is distant and cannot do any thing to bind us or the laws." Ibid. 649, 650.

<sup>4</sup> See the remarks of Dr. Waterland on this subject, Works, II. 350.

## CHAPTER X.

### OBJECTIONS TO THE ARTICLES AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.

THE earliest example of antipathy to the Articles of 1562 was the result of the numerous scruples which began to be urged in the reign of Elizabeth, touching the rites and ceremonies of the Church. Though some of the Puritans were able to reconcile their rejection of "the defiled robes of Antichrist" with the acceptance of the thirty-fourth article on ecclesiastical "Traditions,"<sup>1</sup> it was felt by the majority as a harsh and unwarranted restriction, which they might piously struggle to remove. Accordingly the bill "for ministers of the Church to be of sound religion," which passed in 1571, was so ambiguously worded by its promoters in the House of Commons as to relieve some of the puritanical clergy (at least in their own opinion) from the necessity of subscribing to any other Articles, except those "which *only* concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments."<sup>2</sup>

Yet even this apparent relaxation did not conciliate the licentiousness of party-spirit, which was now diffusing itself on all sides, among the mass of the English people. The "Admonitions to the Parliament" in 1572 were bold and acrimonious manifestations of the same growing discontent. Stimulated by an epistle from Beza, which is appended to the first "Admonition,"

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 113, 114. Some, however, more consistently objected to the Article in question, and as early as the Convocation of 1562, proposed that the censure of those who disconform may be softened, and let down to a gentler dislike. Collier, II. 486.

<sup>2</sup> Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, I. 267, 268, Lond. 1732; Blackburne, Works, v. 23, Camb. 1804, and below, pp. 217—220. The Parliament of 1610 urged this distinction on behalf of the Puritans. Neal, II. 83.

the Non-conformists began to insist more impatiently than ever upon "purity of discipline," understanding, in the first instance, the subversion of the hierarchy, which was regarded as the "cheefe cause of backwardnesse, and of all breache and dissention."<sup>1</sup> But their zeal was not suffered to expire in its denunciation of the bishops, and of "antichristian rites." "Remoue Homylies, *Articles*, Inunciations," was the indiscriminating clamour of the self-same faction, "and that prescripte Order of seru<sup>ce</sup> made out of the masse-booke."<sup>2</sup>

Some writers, indeed, have contended that the Puritans while agitating for "their conceived discipline, never moved any quarrel against the *doctrine* of our Church;"<sup>3</sup> but nothing can be more certain than that the authors of the two Admonitions to Parliament took a very different ground, affirming, with as much of sagacity as of malice, that "the righte government of the Church cannot be separated from the doctrine."<sup>4</sup> They positively argued that in addition to its ritual deformities, the Prayer Book was "full of corruptions,"<sup>5</sup> that in the Ordinal there was at least one paragraph which they never hesitated to condemn as "manifest blasphemy;" and for this very reason some of them had refused to subscribe in the course of the previous year, when summoned before the high Commissioners. It is true that the Articles of Religion, excepting so far as they involved an approval of the other Formularies of the Church, appear to have been in a less degree obnoxious to the Nonconformists in the reign of Elizabeth. They were sometimes not unwilling to avow, "For the Articles concerning the substance of doctrine, *using a godly interpretation in a poynte or two*, which are eyther *too sparsely* or *else too darkely set downe*, we were and are ready, according to duetie, to subscribe vnto them." But the reverse accompanying this statement may not unreasonably excite our suspicion, that even with respect to the particular document thus arbitrarily chosen for

<sup>1</sup> "To the godly readers," A.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. A. iij.

<sup>3</sup> Bp. Carleton, Examination (of Montague's Appeal,) 8, 121. Lond. 1626.

<sup>4</sup> First Admonition, C.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. B. vii.

<sup>6</sup> See the passage at length and remarks upon it in Whitgift's "Answers to a certain Libell instituted, 'An Admonition to the Parliament,'" Lond. 1573, 298, 299.

approval, the Puritans had secret misgivings, lest here also they should "be stoong with the tayle of Antichristian infection." And on turning to other portions of the same manifestos, there is satisfactory proof that such scruples existed in the authors of the second Admonition. After a severe invective on episcopacy, for its persecuting and intolerant spirit, they proceed to enumerate additional grievances, equally needing reformation: "I praye you are they not starke naught, yea, and so are diuers of them, not onely for their bribing and corruption, and their arrogancie, their tyrannie, but for flat heresie in the sacrament, and some bee suspected of the heresy of Pelagius. For the first, that is, concerning the sacrament, the bishops are notoriously knowne which erre in it, and for free-will not onely they are suspected, but others also. And indeede *the booke of the Articles of Christian religion* speaketh *very daungerously of falling from grace*, which is to be *reformed*, because it too much enclineth to their erreure."<sup>1</sup>

The disaffection implied in language of this kind went on gradually deepening its hold upon the people in proportion as the principles imported from Geneva were more and more consciously developed. In 1587, appeared "A defence of the Government established in the Church of England by John Bridges, deane of Sarum," who is occupied in vindicating the Articles no less than the other Formularies of Faith from the same unquiet spirits. They had ventured to "speake against diuers grosse and palpable errors that had escaped the bishops," in the compilation of the Book of Articles;<sup>2</sup> alleging, it would seem, by way of example<sup>3</sup> a few of the more obnoxious. The first related to the distinction which is drawn in the sixth Article between the Canonical and Apocryphal books, but the cause of their vehement dislike is only matter for conjecture.<sup>4</sup> The second ground of animadversion is the same as we have before noted in the "Admonitions to the Parliament." The Puritans argued that the clause of the sixteenth Article which assumed the defectibility of grace was susceptible

<sup>1</sup> Second Admonition to the Parliament, A. D. 1572, 43.

<sup>2</sup> 1301, 1302, Lond. 1587.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 1302.

<sup>4</sup> Bridges says, after guessing for some time, 1304—1308, that he can neither see nor feel "the gross and palpable errors."

of an heretical interpretation, if not positively false.<sup>1</sup> They looked upon the terms "justified" and "elect," as altogether interchangeable, while Bridges who answered their cavils took up a very different position, maintaining that "diuers graces of the Holy Ghost may bee geuen to those that are not elected,"<sup>2</sup> and consequently that the statement of the Article is in no way at variance with the view of predestination, as held by himself and others of the Augustinian school. A third and more sweeping objection assailed the whole body of the Articles, as the fruit of prelatial or popish domination. According to the Puritanical scheme, they ought to have been severally proved by a number of scriptural texts, whereas now "they must be accepted of all men, without either reason or testimonie of the Scripture, and no man permitted to shew anye reason or scripture, that inforceth his conscience to the contrary, but onely to hang vpon the authority of bishops."<sup>3</sup>

It may seem unfair to associate the growth of this ecclesiastical democracy with the more purely theological movement which agitated the University of Cambridge in 1595: for the Nonconformists who had enlisted under the banner of Cartwright, were loud in denouncing the ritual and hierarchy, which Whitaker and others, who took part in the compilation of the Lambeth Articles, had most cordially accepted. And the same is unquestionably true of Ussher and of the members of the Dublin Convocation, who afterwards embodied those articles into their own national creed, and bound them, in some sort at least, upon the conscience of the Irish clergy. Yet, on the other hand, it cannot be concealed that in these and all similar attempts to impart a distinctly Genevan tone to some of our speculative theology, there is betrayed a certain amount of misgiving on the part of their promoters as to the insufficiency of the present Articles of faith for establishing their cherished notions. Whitaker, as we have seen,<sup>4</sup> admitted that the points which he condemned in the teaching of Barrett "were not concluded and defined by public authority," and a like feeling must have actuated the Irish prelates in departing so far from the English standard, where it seems to fall short

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 1308.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 1310<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 1314.<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 159, note (4), 162.

of the system of Calvin. Nor is this mode of explaining their conduct to be viewed as a mere conjecture. The wavering voice of the Articles was deliberately confessed at the Hampton-Court Conference in 1604, when the Puritans prayed by their representative Reynolds, himself the unhesitating champion of Geneva, that "the nine assertions orthodoxal, concluded upon at Lambeth, might be inserted into the Book of Articles,"—a motion which was however strenuously refused on the ground that when such questions might chance to be disputed in the schools, it was desirable to determine them in those seats of learning, and "not to stuff the Book with all conclusions theological."<sup>1</sup>

It is indeed very observable that the Non-conformists were still complaining with the greatest warmth "of the errors and imperfections of the Church, as well *in matter of doctrine* as of discipline,"<sup>2</sup> and at the Conference which had been summoned with a view to moderate their scruples, it was specified among the list of grievances submitted by Dr. Reynolds, that "the Book of Articles of Religion, concluded in 1562, might be explained in places obscure, and enlarged where some things were defective. For example, whereas in Article XVI. the words are these; *After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace*; notwithstanding the meaning be sound, yet he desired, that, because they may seem to be contrary to the doctrine of God's predestination and election in the seventeenth Article, both these words might be explained with this or the like addition; *yet neither totally nor finally.*"<sup>3</sup> In the answer of Bp. Bancroft, which is of some historical importance, it was stated that "very many in these daies, neglecting holinesse of life, presumed too much of persisting of grace, laying all their religion upon predestination. *If I shall be saved, I shall be saved*; which he termed a desperate doctrine, showing it to be contrary to good divinity, and the true doctrine of predestination, wherein we should reason rather *ascen-*

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Cardwell, Hist. of Conferences, 178, Oxf. 1841.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 185.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 225.<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 178. The same deepening objection to the Articles is seen in an "Apology of the Lincolnshire Ministers" in 1604, (Neal ii. 55), who affirmed that the Book of Articles as well as of Common-Prayer, "contained sundry things which are not agreeable, but contrary to the Word of God."

*endo* than *descendendo*." He then pointed to the teaching of the Church of England in the final clause of Art. XVII., admonishing us to receive God's promises in such wise as they be *generally* set forth to us in holy Scripture.<sup>1</sup>

A second objection<sup>2</sup> of the puritan representatives, was based upon the wording of Art. XXIII., "in the congregation," as if it implied that all men might preach and administer the sacraments *out* of the congregation, without any lawful mission. This, however, was one of the merest cavils, for the term congregation is clearly equivalent to the *Church* in its widest acceptation, and "by the doctrine and practice of the Church of England, none but a licenced minister might preach, nor either publicly or privately administer the Eucharist."<sup>3</sup>

A third objection related to the language of Art. XXV., in which confirmation seems to be characterized as a rite that had "grown partly of the corrupt following the Apostles;" whereas in the proper Service it is said to be administered "after the example of the Apostles."<sup>4</sup> According to Bancroft, the discrepancy should be solved by supposing that while the Article has respect to the undue elevation of the ordinance in ranking it with the two "sacraments of the Gospel," the Prayer Book "aims at the right use and proper course thereof."

A further emendation was proposed in Article XXXVII., by adding to the clause "The Bishop of Rome hath no authority in this land," the words "nor ought to have;" but such an addition was declared to be redundant, and when Dr. Reynolds proceeded

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 180, 181. Overall (dean of St. Paul's) entered into the same question (186), reaffirming a statement he had made during the discussion of the Lambeth Articles, to the effect that "whosoever (although before justified) did commit any grievous sin did become, ipso facto, subject to God's wrath, and guilty of damnation until they repented." His opponents, who adopted the rigorously-Calvinistic tenet, had maintained the absolute indefectibility of grace, believing that all persons who were once truly justified, though afterwards guilty of the most grievous sins, "remained still just, or in a state of justification, before they actually repented of those sins." See Overall's *Sententia Eccl. Anglican. de Prædestinatione, etc. "Articuli Lambethani,"* 41, seqq. Lond. 1651.

<sup>2</sup> His. of Conferences, 179.

<sup>3</sup> See Bancroft's Answer, Ib. 181.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 179.

to suggest that a phrase, denying the intention of the minister to be of the essence of the sacrament, should be annexed to the book of Articles as a remedy against some prevalent error, it was in like manner summarily dismissed, and the Formulary left in the shape it had presented from the time of the Convocation of 1571.<sup>1</sup>

But an attempt, which threatened to be far more successful, was made in 1643, by the party who had uniformly expressed their antipathy to some of the authorized Articles, and who were now, for the first time, invested with the power to carry out their wishes. At an early session of the "Assembly of Divines," they received an order from both Houses of Parliament (July 5, 1643,) requiring them to take into their consideration the first *ten* of the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England, "to free and vindicate the doctrine of them from all aspersions and false interpretations."<sup>2</sup> A second list of instructions from the same quarter extended the authority of the Assembly to the *nine* Articles following, and these also were afterwards submitted to a close and elaborate censure. The orders, however, had been limited in both cases to "the clearing and vindicating" of the Articles, and accordingly the Divines, in their report to the House of Commons, felt it their duty to acknowledge that, notwithstanding the additions and alterations they had thought proper to insert, very many things continued to be "defective," and "other expressions also fit to be changed." At the time when their work was interrupted by a fresh order, bearing date Oct. 12, 1643, *fifteen* of the Articles had been thus "sparingly" revised; but no further pro-

<sup>1</sup> In "A Note of such things as shal be reformed in the Church" (Strype's *Whitgift*; 575) drawn up, it would seem, at the close of the Conference, we find the following minute: "The Articles of Religion *to be explained and inlarged*. And no man to teach or read against anie of them." The handwriting is thought to be Bancroft's, but it is not probable, after reading his speeches at the Conference, that he was willing to make any change whatever.

<sup>2</sup> From one of "six hundred copies of the proceedings of the Assembly of Divines upon the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England," printed "for the services of both houses and the Assembly of Divines" (Camb. University Lib. ff. 14, 25.) The Articles are signed by "Charles Herle, prolocutor, Henry Borrough, Scriba, Adoniram Byfield, Scriba."



gress appears to have been made either at this or any subsequent period.<sup>1</sup> Their services were bestowed, in the first instance, on "the work of Church-Government," and afterwards in framing the memorable "Confession for the three kingdoms, according to the solemn League and Covenant." It seems indeed to have been their own wish to throw the Articles entirely aside, "as a piece several ways imperfect, and the whole as relating only to the Church of England," but an order from the House of Commons, Dec. 7, 1646, commanded them to present the result of their criticism to their parliamentary employers; and to this circumstance we are probably indebted for its preservation to our own times.<sup>2</sup>

The design of this revision, in the language of Neal,<sup>3</sup> "was to render the sense of the Articles *more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism.*" And a cursory examination of the phraseology adopted in the new series of definitions, will leave no doubt as to the kind of influence which presided over that second reformation of the Church. The first, second,<sup>4</sup> fourth,<sup>5</sup> fifth,

<sup>1</sup> We learn from a pamphlet (Lond. 1654) that the revised Articles, which are called "Fourteen Pillars of the Church of England," were presented to Charles I. at the Isle of Wight.

<sup>2</sup> Above, 199, note (2.) A few hints on this subject will be found in Lightfoot's "Journal of the Assembly of Divines," Works, XIII. 5. seqq. ed. Pitman. On July 12, there was a great debate as to the propriety of adducing Scriptural proofs for each Article according to a wish expressed by the Elizabethan Non-conformists. See above, p. 194. This was carried in the affirmative, 5. On July 15, Selden and others who had been appointed to search for authentic copies of the Articles, made their report to the Assembly, 6. On July 28, the third Article excited much discussion, some proposing that it should be altogether withdrawn, 7. The three Creeds were considered, Aug. 18, and after a long agitation about translating them anew, and about "setting some gloss upon the preface and conclusion of Athanasius' Creed, which seems to be something harsh," the question was deferred till some future time, 10. It appears that the Divines were "very busy upon the sixteenth Article and upon that clause of it which mentioneth departing from grace," 17, when the work was finally suspended by the parliamentary order.

<sup>3</sup> III. 68.

<sup>4</sup> In the new Article, "for our sakes truly suffered most grievous torments in his soul from God"—"truly suffered" in the authorized Article.

<sup>5</sup> "At the general resurrection of the body at the last day"—"at the last day."

twelfth, fourteenth, and fifteenth, as we might expect from their character and purport, were left as they stood before, or altered only in such a manner as to indicate but little of the ruling spirit. Of the rest, the *third* of the new series interprets the "descent into Hell" as equivalent to "continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power and dominion of death." The *sixth* omits all mention of the testimony of the Church in determining the canon of Scripture; it eliminates the Apocrypha altogether; it adds a list of the New Testament canon: and also substitutes for the canonicity of the sacred books the fact of their *inspiration*, as the ground of our deference to their teaching. The *seventh* adds one clause, implying that even the civil precepts of Moses should be urged upon Christians, provided they be not such as were peculiarly meant for the commonwealth of the Jews; and a second, affirming that by the "moral law" we understand all the Ten Commandments taken in their full extent.<sup>2</sup> The *eighth*, on the Creeds, was finally accepted, with the proviso that they should be retranslated, and explained in an Appendix to the contemplated edition of the Articles.<sup>3</sup> The *ninth*, on Original Sin, bears the special impress of Geneva: (1) the divines insert that original sin consists of the "first sin imputed," as well as of inherent corruption; (2) that man is not only "very far gone from original righteousness," but "wholly deprived" of it; (3) that he is of his own nature inclined *only* to evil; (4) they substitute "regenerate" for "baptized;" and (5) affirm that concupiscence "is truly and properly sin." The *tenth*, "Of Free-will," interpolates a clause, which describes "the preventing grace" of God as "working so effectually in us, as that it *determineth* our will to that which is good." The *eleventh*, "Of the justification of man (before God,)" in explaining the mode of our acquittal declares

<sup>1</sup> This clause is somewhat illustrated by the fact that during the Protectorate of Cromwell, there was a party who laboured to bring about the abolition of the whole law of England, and to substitute the Mosaic in its place. Lord Campbell, Lives of the Chancellors, III. 88.

<sup>2</sup> The force of this language is felt by comparing the scruples of Chillingworth, who maintained that the fourth commandment was no part of the moral law, and did not appertain to Christians. See the Life prefixed to his Works, ed. 1820, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 201, note (1.)

that the "whole obedience and satisfaction" of our Saviour "is by God imputed unto us, and Christ with His righteousness apprehended and rested on by faith only:" while the *thirteenth* changes the expression "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit" into "works done before justification by Christ and regeneration by His Spirit."

One member of the self-constituted synod which undertook this revision of the Articles, and one of the clerical assessors in compiling the Westminster Confession, was a Dr. Cornelius Burges. On the restoration of the monarchy, and with it of the Church of England, he published a number of "Reasons shewing the necessity of reformation of the public doctrine,"<sup>1</sup> as well as of worship and government. He also indulged in very frequent attacks upon the Articles of Religion, impugning them as either *doubtful* or *defective*. Under the first head, he included a severe censure of the Royal Declaration,<sup>2</sup> on account of the shelter it was thought capable of yielding to the "Arminian" tendencies of the clergy. He argued that its retention as a preface to the Articles was a check upon the spread of salutary doctrine leading the way to a number of "sad consequences," among which is the sanction which was there given to a belief in the defectibility of grace, in the judicial authority of the Church, and in a variety of questionable statements which are interspersed in the Book of Homilies, more particularly in that relating to Almsdeeds.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, it was attempted to prove that the Articles were *defective*, (1) in failing to enumerate the books of the New Testament canon; (2) in shrinking from an assault upon sundry points of Popery, or rather of "Arminianism," which were loudly calling for the animadversion of the Church;<sup>4</sup> (3) in passing over many topics of general divinity, such as the creation, the doctrine of providence, the fall of man, sin, effectual calling, sabbath or Lord's day, mar-

<sup>1</sup> The work professes to have been written "by divers ministers of sundry counties in England," but Burges was the real author. See Bp. Pearson's *Minor Works*, II. 165, and the Editor's note.

<sup>2</sup> Bp. Pearson is not quite correct in speaking of the date of the Declaration, as 10 Caroli. The mistake is explained by Bennett, 366.

<sup>3</sup> See Pearson's replies to the objections *seriatim*, *ibid.* II. 174, seqq.

<sup>4</sup> The work of Burgess specifies universal redemption, universal grace, falling from grace, &c. See Pearson's remark, 189.

riage, communion of saints, &c. In all cases, however, it has been satisfactorily shown by Bp. Pearson, that the objections were either false in themselves, or rested upon a false hypothesis as to the nature and object of the work against which they were directed.<sup>1</sup>

Many of the same cavils have continually recurred in the writings of the later Puritans,<sup>2</sup> and are no where, perhaps, stated so plausibly and fully as in Richard Baxter's "English Non-conformity," which appeared in 1689. Like most of his predecessors in this field of criticism, he was not unwilling to acquiesce in the definitions of doctrine as they stand in the present series, but with the authors of the Admonitions to Parliament, he was constrained to add, that "the words of the Articles *in the obvious sense* are many times liable to exception, and there are many things in them that good men may scruple."<sup>3</sup> He then proceeds to specify the instances where exception had been taken to some one or other of them, by the writers of his own age; but his remarks are frequently unworthy of serious refutation,<sup>4</sup> and are interesting only as evidence that in spite of the general offers of the Nonconformists to accept the doctrinal Articles, provided the remnants of popery might be weeded out of the Ordinal and the Prayer-Book, there was always a lurking disaffection in the members of his school to the teaching of the English Church. She clung to the inheritance she had received, not from the Reformation merely, but through it from the earliest ages of the faith; while he felt a positive horror both of primitive and mediæval Christianity, acting and even arguing as if Christ never "had a true Church on the earth before these times."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See as above, and Answer to Dr. Burges, II. 205, seqq.

<sup>2</sup> They had publicly urged at the Savoy Conference, 1661, as one of their many grievances, that their preachers were obliged to accept the Articles as not contrary to the Word of God. Cardwell, *Hist. of Conf.* 266 (note).

<sup>3</sup> Chap. xxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Bingham, in his "French Churches' Apology for the Church of England," 36—98, Lond. 1706, has examined most of the objections, made by Baxter and others to the Articles of Religion. One of the latest assailants was John Wesley, who reduced the number of the Articles to twenty-five, and inserted a number of characteristic changes.

<sup>5</sup> Bp. Pearson, "On the Creed, To the Reader."

His hostility was, however, disarmed or abated at the period of the Revolution of 1688, for he was then left to the unfettered use of his own modes of worship, while the hope of his cordial conformity was less and less strongly cherished; and although the "Act of Toleration"<sup>1</sup> enjoined the formality of subscribing the Articles of Religion, excepting the thirty-fourth, the thirty-fifth, the thirty-sixth, the affirmative clauses of the twentieth, and a portion of the twenty-seventh,<sup>2</sup> even this point of contact or collision was gradually weakened<sup>3</sup> and is now altogether removed.

The subsequent efforts of the Arian party in the Church to escape from a number of unpalatable truths which are propounded in the Articles of Religion will be noticed in the course of the following chapter, on the history of Subscription.

<sup>1</sup> Stat. 1 Gul. et Mar. c. 18, § 8.

<sup>2</sup> For the relief of the dissenters "who scruple the baptizing of infants," § 10.

<sup>3</sup> It appears that in 1772, the subscription of the dissenting ministers was very seldom made. Letters to a Bishop, 56: and in 1779, the Act of 19 George III. c. 44, absolved him altogether.