

//  
KY  
P317<sub>n</sub>

# REMARKS

ON THE  
CONTROVERSY

SUBSISTING, OR SUPPOSED TO SUBSIST,

BETWEEN

THE ARMINIAN

AND

CALVINISTIC

Ministers of the Church of England:

IN A

SECOND LETTER

TO

THE REV. JOHN OVERTON, A. B.

AUTHOR OF

"THE TRUE CHURCHMEN ASCERTAINED."



By EDWARD PEARSON, B. D.,

Rector of

Rempstone, Nottinghamshire.

---

Paribus se legibus ambæ  
Invictæ gentes æterna in fœdera mittant. VIRG.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD,  
BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY, NO. 190, PICCADILLY.

1802.

SOUTHEASTERN BAPTIST  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY  
Wake Forest, North Carolina

THE NEW YORK

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Brettell and Bastie, Printers,  
No. 54, Great Windmill Street. Hay-market.

THE NEW YORK  
LIBRARY  
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Closed  
Shelves

BX

5131

P42

1802

REMARKS, &c.

IN A

SECOND LETTER

TO

THE REVEREND JOHN OVERTON, A. B.

REVEREND SIR,

SOME time since, I took the liberty of addressing to you, as the author of a work, entitled, "The true Churchmen ascertained, or, an Apology for those of the regular Clergy of the Establishment, who are sometimes called *Evangelical Ministers*," some "Remarks on the doctrine of Justification by Faith," being an examination of your Chapter on that subject. It appeared to me, that an answer, by way of *specimen*, to a part of your work, and more especially to *that* part, would be sufficient to put your readers on their proper guard, and supersede the necessity of a  
general

general reply. I do, indeed, flatter myself, that any unprejudiced person, who reads those Remarks with attention, will be convinced, that, however faithfully you may have represented the sentiments of your *friends* on the subject of Justification, you have not rightly stated the doctrine of the *Church of England*; particularly, that you have not rightly stated the sense of the eleventh Article, in which the doctrine of the Church of England on this subject is expressly delivered; and he will thence be naturally led to suspect, that you have not, in other instances, so fully proved your agreement with the doctrines of the Church, as the confidence of your assertions, or the plausibility of your arguments, may give occasion to suppose. It has, however, occurred to me, on a further consideration of your work, and of the effect, which it is adapted to produce, that a few Remarks on it of a more extended nature

nature may not be without their use. I beg leave to repeat my former declaration, that, in making them, my great design, next to that of promoting the cause of religious truth (the prevalence of which must, in the end, be productive of *general good*) is to bring all the members of the establishment, if not, according to the Apostolic exhortation, to be “perfectly joined together in the same mind and judgment,” yet to bear with each other’s difference of opinion in “humility and meekness,” and to “hold the faith in unity of spirit (or affection) and in the bond of peace.”

I. The first Remark I have to make, and which those, who consider the influence of names on the generality of people, will not think unimportant, respects the title of *Evangelical* ministers of the established Church, which you have recognised as belonging to you and your friends. Your apology for this recognition

tion is to me by no means satisfactory. If, as you assert, it is the title, under which you have been attacked, it is pretty evident, that it must have been first assumed; and the assumption of a title, which, by arrogating so much to yourselves, was directly calculated to derogate from the just claims of others, was sufficient to provoke an attack. Whether, however, this title was assumed by yourselves, or given you by others, I should be equally inclined to dispute its continuance. In the first case, it would be the mark of pretensions, which I should think it necessary to oppose; in the second, a term of reproach, in which I should disdain to join.

It is very well known, that, almost ever since the first establishment of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation, some persons have contended for an *Arminian*, and others for a *Calvinistic* interpretation

tation of the Articles of the Church. For, though the *name* of Arminianism did not exist at the time of the Reformation, the opinions were then held, which were afterwards distinguished by that name. Now, to this difference of interpretation of the Articles may be reduced all the difference of opinion, which is asserted to subsist between you and the generality of the ministers and members of the establishment. For, though you are not so adventurous as to undertake the defence of "Calvinism to its *full extent*," you defend the Calvinistic interpretation of certain Articles, which those, whom you consider as opponents, interpret in an Arminian sense; and this seems to be the only or chief difference between you and your opponents. It is evident, therefore, that the terms *Arminian* and *Calvinistic* are sufficient, as well as appropriate terms of distinction. This being the case, it cannot be pretended, that any new term  
was

was necessary ; and certain it is, that, for the introduction of a new term of distinction, nothing but necessity can be a sufficient apology. Besides, every term, by which a party is distinguished, supposes another, by which the party in opposition to it is to be known. Now, if one class of ministers of the establishment is to be distinguished by the term *Evangelical* or *Gospel*, by what name, which does not imply disgrace, shall the rest be called? It is most devoutly to be wished, that all difference of opinion among the ministers of the establishment, which renders terms of distinction necessary, may speedily be done away ; but if, unhappily, this should not be the case, it may yet very reasonably be insisted on, that the use of such terms of distinction on one side, as imply a dereliction of professed principles on the other, be carefully avoided. In conformity with this sentiment, I would have it understood,

that



that I am as averse from the practice of bestowing opprobrious appellations, as from that of assuming arrogant ones. According to my idea, no one, who professes to adhere to the doctrines of the Church, and who does not, by his conduct, evidently militate against its discipline, ought to be stigmatized with the name of *Methodist*; for a Methodist is one, who sets the discipline of the Church at defiance, and breaks out into open *schism*.

II. The question itself in debate, then, between you and your opponents, is nothing more nor less than the comparative merits of an Arminian and a Calvinistic interpretation of some of the Articles of the Church; a question, which is so far from being *new*, as you sometimes seem to intimate, that it has frequently wearied the patience of the disputants on both sides, as well as that of their readers. You have, indeed, avoided the defence of  
those

those tenets of Calvinism, which have, of late years, become peculiarly unpopular; and to you I am inclined to give credit for so much candour and sincerity, as to admit, that you have fairly and fully developed your creed; but, on the part of many of those, for whom you have undertaken to apologize, I should be glad to have it explicitly acknowledged, whether you have, in your book, entered into a defence of *all* the opinions, by which they wish to be distinguished? whether they are ready to give up those peculiar notions respecting *immediate conversion, perseverance of the saints, assurance of salvation, &c.* which the majority of Calvinistic ministers are understood to entertain? Be this as it may, it will contribute something to the elucidation of the general question, if our attention is carried back, for a moment, to the famous *Five Articles or Points*, as they are called, by which the Arminians

nians were originally distinguished. I will transcribe them, therefore, from *Mosheim*. "They held," says he,

"1. That God, from all eternity determined to bestow salvation on those, whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus; and to inflict everlasting punishment on those, who should continue in their unbelief, and resist unto the end his divine succours.

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

"3. That *true faith* cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free-will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and

and that, therefore, it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be *re-generated* and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ.

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

“ 5. That they, who are united to Christ by faith, are thereby furnished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seduction of Satan, and the allurements of  
sin

sin and temptation; but that the question, *Whether such may fall from their faith, and forfeit finally this state of grace?* has not been yet resolved with sufficient perspicuity, and must, therefore, be yet more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the Holy Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point."

The historian adds, that "this last Article was afterwards changed by the Arminians, who, in process of time, declared their sentiments with less caution, and positively affirmed, that *the saints might fall from a state of grace.*"

When I read these Articles, I can consider it as little less than a libel on the Gospel to distinguish those by the appellation of *Evangelical*, who, in opposition to such generous sentiments, represent the gift of eternal life as circumscribed by *absolute decrees* and the *withholding of necessary grace*, and who, by their mode of

defending

defending these and the like doctrines, seem to take delight "in shutting the gates of mercy on mankind." The substance of these *Five Articles* is by some, not perhaps with perfect propriety, comprehended under the respective terms of *predestination, redemption, grace, justification, and perseverance*; by others, it is reduced to *predestination and grace*. Other doctrines, beside what are here mentioned, came afterwards to be subjects of controversy between the Arminians and Calvinists; but the sentiments of the Arminians on these form the basis of their distinguishing tenets, and will give a sufficient insight into their opinions in general.

In the present state of Theological knowledge, or at least of the means, by which such knowledge may be obtained, it is not necessary to enter into the particular merits of these Articles. This could be done, indeed, only by a repetition of  
 what

what has often been said before. It will be sufficient, on this head, to refer to Heylin's history of them, entitled, "Historia Quinquarticularis," to Whitby's "Discourses on the Five Points," to Winchester's Tract on the 17th Article of the Church of England, printed at Oxford in 1772, to Dean Tucker's "Letter to Kippis," and to the first volume of Mr. Daubeny's "Appendix to his Guide to the Church." Dr. Jortin, who does not often speak at random, says of Whitby, that "in his treatises on election, reprobation, and original sin, he confuted Calvinism even to a demonstration."—Dissertation II.—With respect to the Articles themselves, he says, "In England, at the time of the Synod of Dort, we also were much divided in our opinions concerning the controverted *Articles*; but our divines having taken the liberty to think and judge for themselves,

and

and the civil government not interposing, it hath come to pass, that, from that time to this, almost all persons here of any note for learning and abilities have bid adieu to Calvinism, have sided with the Remonstrants, and have left the fatalists to follow their own opinions, and to rejoice (since they can rejoice) in a religious system, consisting of human creatures without liberty, doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy."

*Ibid.* So far as authority ought to have any weight in determining the merits of the case, this passage, in which the opinions of the divines of the Church of England are testified by so able a witness, ought to have a great deal. It is my wish, however, that the question, whether truth be on the side of the Arminians or on that of the Calvinists, should be determined, were it necessary to determine it at all, not by the weight of authority, but by  
the



the preponderance of the arguments, which have been or may be advanced in favour of each. I am persuaded, that the more the subject is investigated, the more will it be for the advantage of Arminianism; and that, if Calvinism should gain ground in the nation, it will be principally owing to that inattention to religious concerns, which so much prevails among the laity of the present day; especially among those of them, who, on account of their intelligence on other subjects, are looked up to and followed as exemplars.

Those, who argue in favour of Calvinism, have a great many objections to get over, which may be urged from reason and Scripture with respect to its *truth*, as well as from experience with respect to its *utility*. If, indeed, it be not true, it will hardly be expected to be useful in the end: but, whether true or not, its hostility, in many respects, to public peace and happiness, particularly in a form of govern-

ment like ours, is matter of sad experience. It is no just reason for blaming those, who hold any particular opinions, that others, who held the same opinions, acted wrong; but it is a very good reason for keeping a jealous eye upon the opinions themselves. It ought ever to be remembered, with respect to Calvinistic opinions, though without any uncharitable sentiments towards those, who may now hold them, that, so far as religious opinions were at all concerned, *they* were the opinions, which once involved our Church and State in ruin. The sagacious author of the "Pursuits of Literature" asserts, that "Calvin and his disciples were never friends to Monarchy and Episcopacy;" and few will be so hardy as to deny, that the history of our nation bears him out in his assertion.

Since, however, neither the truth nor the utility of Calvinism is the immediate subject of your work, it may not be  
 proper

proper to dwell much on either. Your object is to shew, that, whatever Calvinism may be in these respects, it is the system of religious opinions, which was embraced by our early reformers, and the system, which actually pervades the Articles, Homilies, and Offices of our Church. With respect to the first of these positions, I will venture to say, before I particularly remark on your mode of proof, that, if others have in vain attempted to shew, that our first reformers were *not* Calvinists, you have not been at all more successful in your endeavour to shew, that they *were*. The truth evidently is, that some of our reformers were inclined to Calvinism and others to Arminianism; and the consequence, as might be expected, was, that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was exclusively established. To the Church of England is "*sua opinio, suus honor.*" Properly speaking, she is not, in  
her

her doctrines, any more than in her discipline, Calvinistic, Arminian, Romish, or Lutheran; but, combining the perfections of all those persuasions, and avoiding their faults and defects, she stands as distinguished in a religious view, as the state, to which she is allied, does in a political one. Though, therefore, it is natural enough, from the private opinions of individuals, who were concerned in the Reformation, to form conjectures respecting the opinions, which were meant to be established as the doctrines of the Church, and though, to such conjectures, it may not be unreasonable to allow some degree of probability, yet in vain must ever be the attempt thence to *ascertain* those doctrines. This can no otherwise be done, than by a fair interpretation of the Articles, &c. themselves, in which the doctrines of the Church are professed to be delivered. I accepted the challenge to this mode of inquiry,

inquiry, which is contained in your chapter on Justification, by examining your interpretation of the eleventh Article; and I greatly deceive myself, if I have not incontrovertibly shewn, that the Calvinistic interpretation, which you have given of that Article, in endeavouring to establish on it the doctrine of justification and salvation by *faith only*, when faith is considered as the *condition* of either, is not the true sense of it; is not the sense, which the words will fairly bear, nor that, consequently, in which the Church of England does, or ever did, intend it to be understood.

But, were I even to admit, that the private opinions of some of the reformers, if known, are a criterion, by which the sense of the Articles is to be determined, I should still be disposed to contend, that, in your attempt to shew what those opinions were, you have adduced evidence of a questionable and incompetent nature.

I can-

I cannot think, that the testimony of those, who are professedly hostile to our religious establishment, ought to have much weight in the decision of a question, which, if decided according to their testimony, would, in their opinion, tend to disparage that establishment. When you review your quotations, you will, I doubt not, feel the force of this observation. Besides, in citing detached passages from those writers, who are undoubted *friends* to the establishment, it is very easy to give an idea of their sentiments very different from that, which would be excited by a perusal of the same passages in their proper context, when all the circumstances belonging to them are taken into the account. A writer, who is combating one extreme, often seems, by neglecting the limitations, which he would otherwise put to his expressions, to fall into the other. When, for instance, Hooker, in his "Discourse on Justification," is contending against  
the

the notion of the merit of good works, in opposition to the Papists, he *might*, in particular places, have made use of expressions, which, taken separately, would have tended to depreciate good works, and made him appear, what you seem desirous to represent him, a determined Calvinist. On examination, however, I do not find this to be the case. The quotations from Hooker, which occur in your chapter on Justification, may lead some of your readers to imagine, that Hooker entirely agrees with you on that subject; whereas the following passages, if I mistake not, will sufficiently evince the contrary; and will show, in particular, that you have not *his* authority for asserting, that "good works are not an appointed condition of *salvation*." That judicious author, in the Discourse just referred to, observes, "To say ye cannot be *saved* by Christ without works, is to add things not only not excluded, but commanded, as being  
in

in their place and in their kind necessary, and therefore subordinated unto Christ, by Christ himself, by whom the web of salvation is spun." "Again, We ourselves do not teach Christ alone, excluding our own faith unto justification; Christ alone, excluding our own works unto sanctification; Christ alone, excluding the one or the other as unnecessary unto *salvation*." It is to be observed, that Hooker makes a distinction between the righteousness of *justification*, and the righteousness of *sanctification*, by which last, he affirms, "we are brought to the actual possession of eternal bliss," and which, as he also affirms, "we have by *works*, and not by *faith only*." So also, speaking more particularly of the conditions of justification (i. e. of the *first* justification) the same judicious author says, "Although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man, which is impious in himself, full of iniquity, full of sin, him being found in Christ through  
*faith*



*faith*, and having his sin remitted through *repentance*; him God upholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it," &c. It is remarkable, that, in your quotation of this passage, page 185, you have omitted the words "and having his sins remitted through repentance;" which words, when restored to their proper place, and taken in combination with the passages above-cited, will make Hooker's opinion, concerning the conditions of justification, exactly to accord with that, which, in opposition to you, I have maintained in my *Remarks* on that subject; for it is evidently his opinion, that the conditions of the *first justification* are *repentance* and *faith*, and those of the *final justification* or *salvation*, *faith* and *good works*. In the same Discourse, there are so many passages, which confirm this statement, that I can hardly think you would have drawn the attention of your readers to it, if you had lately perused it with care, and still retained your opinions.

I will

I will be content with transcribing one passage more. Speaking of the possibility of those being saved, who had lived in Popish errors, he says, "Did they hold, that we cannot be saved by Christ, without good works? We ourselves do, I think, all say as much, with this construction, salvation being taken as in that sentence, *Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore fit confessio ad salutem*, except infants and men cut off upon the point of their conversion. Of the rest, none shall see God, but such as seek peace and holiness, though not as a cause of their salvation, yet as a way, which they must walk, who will be saved. Did they hold, that without works we are not justified? Take justification so as it may also imply sanctification, and St. James doth say as much. For, except there be an ambiguity in the same term (justification) St. Paul and St. James do contradict each the other, which cannot be. Now, there is no ambiguity in the name either of faith or of works, being meant by them both in one

one and the same sense. Finding, therefore, that justification is spoken of by St. Paul, without implying sanctification, when he proveth, that a man is justified by faith without works; finding likewise, that justification doth sometimes imply sanctification also with it, I suppose nothing to be more sound, than to interpret St. James speaking not in that sense, but in this." I wish this passage to be compared with what I have said, in my "Remarks on the doctrine of Justification," concerning the apparent discordancy between St. Paul and St. James. It will then be seen, that, though I do not agree with Hooker in supposing, that the word *faith* is used by St. Paul and St. James in the same sense, I am supported by his authority in saying, that "St. Paul is speaking of the *first justification*, or of *entering* into a state of salvation," and that "St. James is speaking of our *continuing* in a state of salvation, so as at  
last

last to be *saved*;" in which latter particular, You and I are at as great a distance of opinion, as we are in the former; otherwise, you will be compelled to allow, that good works are a condition of *justification*, as well as of *salvation*. According to my idea, Hooker has discovered and noticed a *part* of the difference of meaning, which was intended by St. Paul and St. James, but not the *whole*.

At page 181, in a Note, with a view, as it should seem, to bring a disparagement on the distinction sometimes made between a *first* and a *final* justification, you quote a passage from Hooker, which, when taken in its proper context, will by no means answer your purpose. After stating this distinction in Mr. Hooker's words, you observe, "These notions Mr. Hooker mentions amongst those, in which the Romanists *differ* from us;" and you then add, in Hooker's words, "This is

is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread, when they ask her the way of justification." One would naturally suppose, from this, that Hooker meant to apply the last passage to the distinction between a *first* and a *final* justification; whereas it will appear, by a reference to Hooker (see the beginning of his Discourse on Justification) that he applies it to the doctrine of justification by inherent grace, and to the practice of seeking to be justified by "Ave Marias, crossings, Papal salutations, penance, masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, fasts," &c.\* Mr. Hooker

\* The Editors of the *Christian Observer* (May, 1802, p. 318.) speaking of Mr. Overton's work, say, "We have compared his authorities with the originals, and examined them with a view to estimate the doctrines inculcated in the context." It is matter of surprize to me, that, having made this comparison and examination, they should say, respecting the subject of this *Note*, "Mr. Overton supports his sentiments by a decisive extract from Hooker." April, 1802, p. 243. With the licence

Hooker is so far from having the antipathy, which you suppose him to have, to the distinction between a *first* and a *final* justification, that he has himself virtually acknowledged it. In the passage already quoted, taking notice of the different senses, in which the word justification is used by St. Paul and St. James, he asserts, that the latter, under that term, comprehends *sanctification* also; which is, in fact, making it equivalent to what is meant by the *final* justification, and saying, that St. Paul speaks of the *first* justification, and St. James of the *second*. From what has been said, I leave it to be considered, without any apprehension about the consequence, how justly you can lay claim to the authority of *Hooker*.

III. But, though I do not think, that Calvinism, even in your moderated sense

licence, which Mr. O. has used on this occasion, I would undertake to make Hooker, or any other author, support any sentiment whatever.

of it, was intended to be established by the Articles, &c. of the Church of England, neither do I think, that it was intended to be altogether excluded. If, therefore, you had been content with affirming, that, in subscribing to the Articles in the Calvinistic sense, you had a right to be considered as a legitimate member and minister of the Church of England, you would not have had to number me among your opponents; and I am inclined to believe, that, if Calvinistic ministers of the establishment in general had been content with the quiet possession of their own opinions, without insinuating on all occasions, and sometimes openly declaring, that Arminian opinions are contrary to the truth of the Gospel, and to the doctrines of the Church, they never would have experienced any molestation, or have been drawn into the thorny paths of controversy. This, however, is by no means the case. The followers of Calvin, like

like their leader, have always had a strong disposition to intolerance, and they still retain it. In the true spirit of Procrustes, they would exclude every one from communion with them, whose opinions do not exactly coincide with their own. However desirous I may be, Sir, to except *you* from this accusation, I cannot help observing, that the general tenor of your work, as well as the leading title of it, evidently shows, that nothing less than an acknowledgement, that you and your friends, and you and your friends alone, are the true and genuine sons of the Church of England, will be sufficient to satisfy you. Your work, indeed, in its *second* title, professes to be an *apology* or *defence*. That it is so in *name*, however, rather than in *reality*, appears from the result of your reasoning; which is, “*We*, then, are the *true Churchmen*; and Mr. Daubeny and his associates are *dissenters* from the Church of England.” How this is to be reconciled with the idea  
of



of a mere *defence*, I do not perceive. If any of your opponents, in their attacks upon you, have made use of similar language, I do not undertake to justify them. I am for granting that liberty to others, which I claim for myself. I find, therefore, more cause of blame in your mode of maintaining your opinions, than in the opinions themselves. It will, I think, eventually be seen, that, even in a *prudential* view, this mode is ill-chosen, and that, if you had attempted less, you would have accomplished more. Where a latitude of interpretation is intended to be allowed, it does not follow, as in other cases, because one interpretation is right, that another, which is somewhat different, is wrong; and my opinion is, that if, so far as subscription to the Articles is concerned, either *Arminian* or *Calvinistic* ministers of the establishment are *wrong*, it is only in considering themselves *exclusively right*. You, for instance, think, that the

c

eleventh

eleventh Article refers to the *conditional*, as well as to the *meritorious* cause of our justification. I think, that it refers to the *meritorious* cause *only*. You think, or may think, that the third Article asserts our Saviour's descent into a place of *torment*. I think, that it refers merely to the separation of his soul from his body, and that no reference to a place of torment is intended. These, probably, are our different opinions as to the sense of two of the Articles, and we may differ as much with respect to the sense of some others; and yet, as I conceive, both you and I may very honestly subscribe to the Articles, and answer the purposes, for which our subscription to them is required. There is, indeed, a *limit* to this latitude, beyond which it would not be honest to go; nor can a rightly-disposed mind, I imagine, have any great difficulty in discovering where that limit is. To the concession here made it may, perhaps, be objected,

that

that it supposes the Church to connive at, if not to countenance, the profession of *error*; since truth, from its nature, does not admit of any variety. It is to be considered, however, that the object of subscription to Articles of religion is not so much to guard against *error*, considered abstractedly, as against *pernicious* error, and to secure such a consent and agreement in religious opinions, as the joining in the same public worship necessarily requires. Now, I do not conceive, that either Calvinism or Arminianism, so far as either can be held in consistency with any fair interpretation, which the Articles of the Church will bear, though one of them must undoubtedly be nearer than the other to truth, is *perniciously* erroneous in itself, or incompatible with the purposes, which the Articles were intended to answer. It has happened, indeed, that both Calvinists and Arminians have entertained opinions, which I should deem *perniciously*  
erroneous ;

erroneous; but then it cannot be pretended, that they held such opinions consistently with any fair interpretation of the Articles; consistently with any interpretation, which has either ever received the *declared* sanction of authority, or could reasonably be conceived to have its *implied* sanction. That the chief of those differences of opinion, which subsist between Arminians and Calvinists, who are members of the establishment, or at least of the differences noticed by you, are comprehended in an interpretation, which has the declared as well as the implied sanction of authority, may be demonstrably proved. For this purpose, I need only refer to the *Royal Declaration*, issued in 1628 by Charles I. which was ordered to be published with the Articles. About this Declaration you have, indeed, said a great deal; but, unfortunately, you have entirely overlooked the great object of it, which was, to make peace between the Arminians and Calvin-

ists of that period. Acknowledging its validity, as (p. 46.) you seem to do, it is surprising to me, that you did not draw from it a conclusion directly contrary to that which you really have drawn. If, as you say, and as is undoubtedly true, this Declaration was obtained by the influence of Bishop Laud and his associates, as "expressive of the doctrines *then* taught in the Church," nothing is more certain, than that it is expressive of Arminianism, and that Arminianism was then taught in the Church; for nothing is more certain, than that Bishop Laud and his associates were Arminians. Mosheim, speaking of Laud, says, "He rejected the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination publicly in the year 1625; and, notwithstanding, the opposition and remonstrances of Abbot, substituted the Arminian system in its place." The historian, it may be observed, here seems to speak of the prevalence of Arminianism

minianism as being a *new* thing. It is well known, however, that the great body of the English clergy were Arminians long before this period. "Scarcely," says the same Mosheim, "had the British divines returned from the synod of *Dort*, and given an account of the laws, that had been enacted, and the doctrines, that had been established, by that famous assembly, than the king, together with the greatest part of the episcopal clergy, discovered, in the strongest terms, their dislike of these proceedings, and judged the sentiments of Arminius, relating to the divine decrees, preferable to those of Gomarus and Calvin." Among the reasons, which Mosheim mentions for this preference, is this very substantial one, "Every one knows, that the peculiar doctrines, to which the victory was assigned by the synod of *Dort*, were absolutely unknown in the first ages of the Christian Church." This return of  
our

our divines from the synod of Dort happened about the year 1618, only 56 years after the Articles were finally settled. I might add, that the inclination of the leading part of the English clergy towards Arminianism was pretty clearly discovered at the Hampton-Court Conference, so early as 1603; and that, considering the tenacity of opinion, by which Calvinists are generally distinguished, it is against all probability, that “the greatest part of the episcopal clergy” should very *suddenly* pass over from Calvinism to Arminianism. How these facts are to be brought to an agreement with your assertion, page 83, that “there were but *four* or *five* maintainers of the Anti-Calvinistic doctrines, during *half a century* after the Articles were settled, in the two Universities and the aggregate of divines in the nation,” I do not clearly see. But, leaving this, is it at all credible, that Laud, an Arminian, and when the greatest part  
of

of the episcopal clergy were Arminians also, should be industrious to obtain a *Declaration*, by which a Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles was to be sanctioned by authority? Is it not evident, that, if it had been his intention to restrain the interpretation of them either to Arminianism or to Calvinism, he would have restrained it to Arminianism? In fact, he meant not to restrain it to either, but, in the words of the Declaration itself, "to shut up the prevailing disputes (i. e. the disputes between the Calvinists and Arminians) 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." Collier, in his "Ecclesiastical Hist. of Great Britain," speaking of Laud, says, "This prelate, for silencing the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, procured the reprinting of the thirty-nine Articles, with  
the



the king's Declaration prefixed at the head of them." Vol. 2. p. 746. The same historian afterwards adds, "The Calvinian party complained loudly of this *Declaration*. They gave out, that the design of it was chiefly for the suppressing orthodox books, for the discouraging godly ministers from preaching the comfortable doctrines of man's election to eternal happiness, and for promoting the growth of Arminianism." This evidently shows, that, if either Arminianism or Calvinism was at that time understood to be more countenanced than the other by the Declaration, it certainly was Arminianism. The Declaration states, that, "even in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them." Now, as this relates to the disputes, which then subsisted between the Arminians and Calvinists, it shows, beyond a doubt, that such a latitude of interpretation

terpretation was then contended for, and by this Declaration intended to be authorized, as might enable both Arminians and Calvinists to subscribe the Articles without the imputation of insincerity, and entitle both to be considered as legitimate parts of the established Church. In order, therefore, to make good the charge, which you have alleged against the great body of the clergy, of neglecting to preach the doctrines, which their subscription to the Articles implies a promise to preach, it was at least necessary, that you should have proved this negligence with respect to *every sense* of the Articles, which the Royal Declaration was intended to allow. Many would think, that, to make good such a charge, something more than this was necessary; but, that this was necessary, every one must think, who examines the subject with intelligence and candour. It is a circumstance worthy of remark, that the distinction,

inction, which you wish to establish, between the great body of the clergy of the present day and the early reformers, with respect to doctrines, is the very same, which Richard Baxter, in the time of the Protectorate, endeavoured to establish between what he called the *old* and *new* episcopal divines\*. Of the old episcopal divines he mentions many, particularly Jewel, Pilkinson, Hall, Carlton, Davenant, Morton, Abbot, Usher, Potter, Downham, Grindal, Parker, Hooper, Farrar, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, most of whom, I believe, are also mentioned by you. From the doctrines of these, as Mr. Baxter will have it, the episcopal divines of that day had departed. This accusation, however, the learned and venerable Bishop (afterwards Archbishop) Bramhall, in his "Vindication of himself and the episcopal clergy," repels, by say-

\* See his Treatise, entitled "The Grotian Religion."

ing, "His distinction of episcopal divines into *old* and *new*, is but chimera of his own brain, without any ground, neither doth he bring one grain of reason to make it good," p. 67. And afterwards, "All the world seeth evidently, that all the material differences, which we have with them (Mr. Baxter and his party) are about those Holy Orders, and that Liturgy, and those Articles, and those Rites, which we received from those *old* episcopal divines." p. 69. Whether the great body of the clergy of the present day, in vindicating their agreement with the same old episcopal divines, may not with propriety adopt the same language, I leave to the candid and judicious to determine.

If we revert to a period of our history somewhat earlier than this, that is, to the beginning of the reign of James I. we shall find, that the *Puritans*, who always agreed with the episcopal Calvinists in points of *doctrine*, however they might differ

differ from them in *discipline*, were not altogether satisfied with the Articles themselves. The Puritans, indeed, generally objected more to our doctrine, than they did to our discipline; and the time was, when they professed to agree with us in the latter. "It is certain," says swift, "that, before the rebellion in 1642, though the number of Puritans (as they were then called) was as great as it is with us, and though they affected to follow pastors of that denomination, yet those pastors had episcopal ordination, possessed preferments in the Church, and were sometimes promoted to bishopricks themselves." \* Now, one of the proposals made by the Puritans at the Hampton-Court Conference was, that, to the words in the sixteenth Article, "we may depart from grace given," should be added, "yet neither totally, nor finally," which, if admitted,

\* Sentiments of a Church of England man.

would

would have rendered the Article itself nugatory. The doctrine of the *perseverance of the Saints*, which was thus meant to be established, if not now actually held, is very nearly allied to doctrines, which are held, by many of those, who aim to be distinguished by the title of *Evangelical*, and who think themselves under the protection of your *Apology*. To what false grounds of confidence that doctrine leads, and what irregularities of conduct it may encourage, we may learn from an anecdote, which Dr. Hey has given us from Neal “When Oliver Cromwell was on his death-bed, he asked Dr. Goodwin, *Whether a man could fall from grace?* to which the Doctor answering in the negative, the Protector replied, “*Then I am safe, for I am sure I was once in a state of grace.*” Norris. Lect. vol. iii. page 447. Another proposal was, that the *Lambeth Articles*, as they are called, the Calvinistic complexion of which is well known

known, should be considered as part of the Articles of the Church. In the conference at the Savoy also, in 1660, as I will point out to you more particularly hereafter, when I come to remark on the subject of *discipline*, there appeared the same desire of obtaining a change, if not in the *Articles*, yet in the *Liturgy* and *Service* of the Church. Now, if Calvinists had always understood the Articles, &c. to be so completely Calvinistic, as they are sometimes pretended to be, is it conceivable, that they would have been desirous of such important alterations in them, as these additions would have made?

Whether Calvinists of the present day, who are professed members of the Church of England, would, if they had the power, effect an alteration in the Articles themselves, I will not venture positively to affirm; but this I may say, without fear of refutation, that, consistently with obedi-  
ence

ence to the Royal Declaration, which is prefixed to the Articles, and of which, I suppose, no one will deny the validity, the Articles cannot be asserted to be exclusively Calvinistic. The Arminians, who form the great body of the English clergy and of the English people, are, I believe, very well satisfied with the Articles in their present state. I profess at least for myself, who certainly am not a Calvinist, that, even with respect to the seventeenth Article, in which an Arminian might be supposed to find the most difficulty, I do not wish for any alteration. My opinion, indeed, respecting the sense of that Article, may not agree with that of many Calvinists; but then I think, that its sense is by Calvinists often perverted. The Article, it may be observed, is so cautiously drawn up, that it does not contain any positive assertion of the *truth* of predestination; but, after laying down a definition of the term, merely points out the circumstances,



circumstances, in which, whether true or false in itself, the application of the doctrine of predestination will be productive of good or harm. When the doctrine of predestination is applied to such "godly persons," as the Article had in view; to those, who have long lived in the profession and practice of true religion, and who, "having attained to the image of Jesus Christ, walk religiously in good works," the application of it cannot do any harm. On the contrary, if duly tempered by *humility*, as, in such persons, it will not fail to be, it is a ground of comfort, to which, by the promises of the Gospel, they seem to be entitled, as the foretaste of that heavenly bliss, to which the religion of Christ will eventually lead them. To such persons a participation in the holy assurance of St. Paul, that "there is laid up for them a crown of righteousness," is not to be denied. But when, as is frequently the case, this doctrine, from mis-

taken notions concerning the *new birth*, is applied to persons, who are lately turned from a careless or wicked life, and who have made some (let us say some *sincere*) resolutions of living better for the future, the application of it is in itself presumptuous and impious, and the probable effects of it extremely dangerous. "In the doctrine of predestination," as Bishop Bancroft, in the Conference at Hampton-Court, well observed, "we should infer rather *ascendendo*, than *descendendo*; that is, we should conclude our election from the regularity of our lives, rather than rest our happiness upon any absolute irrelative decree; as that, if God has ordained us to happiness, no habits or degrees of wickedness can make us miscarry." Collier, v. ii. p. 676. The truth is, that those, who are best entitled to the assurance, which is intended to be built on this doctrine, will generally be the most backward to claim it. Such persons, content to rest

in a *humble hope* of acceptance, will seldom be solicitous about more; much less will they be eager in applying to themselves a doctrine, which cannot justly be applied to any one, but on the supposition of the most excellent qualities; qualities, of which it must ever be their duty to assume the possession with the greatest diffidence. That the doctrine, as laid down in the Article, is to be considered as a subject of pious *speculation* or *contemplation*, rather than as a principle of *practice*, evidently appears, not only from the use of the term "godly consideration," but from the whole concluding clause of the Article, which is, "Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be *generally* set forth to us in holy Scripture; and, in our *doings*, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God."

Having mentioned the *Lambeth Articles*, I think it worth while to give a transcript  
of

of them. They may be found in Fuller's *Church Hist.* b. ix. and in Collier's *Eccles. Hist. of Great Britain*. I shall transcribe them from a translation, which seems an accurate one, in a "*Review of the doctrines of the Reformers*, by Thomas Bowman, M. A. Vicar of Martham, Norfolk," printed at Norwich in 1768, and sold by Dilly and Johnson.

- " 1. God from eternity hath predestinated certain men unto life, certain men he hath reprobated.
- " 2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the person predestinated, but only the good will and pleasure of God.
- " 3. There is predetermined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminished.
- " 4. Those, who are not predestinated to salvation,

salvation, shall be necessarily damned for their sins.

“ 5. A true, living, and justifying faith, and the spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the elect, either finally or totally.

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

“ 7. Saving grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved, if they will.

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

“ 9. It

“ 9. It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved.”

It appears to me, that this exposition of what Calvinism really is, must, in the mind of every one, who is able either to read the *Scriptures*, or to discover any thing of the character of the Supreme Being from the contemplation of his *works*, be a sufficient refutation of it, and that no arguments need be employed for that purpose. It is not, however, to be denied, that, from the force of early prejudice, or some other cause, many sensible and well-informed persons have been Calvinists to the full extent of these Articles. Mr. Bowman, who seems to have been a person of this description, has given a copy of the Five Arminian Articles, which I transcribed from Mosheim, as well as of these Calvinistic ones, and thus, whether prudently or not, has held out an invitation to a comparison of the two; nor has he, indeed,  
made

made any scruple of declaring to which of them he gave the preference. Were I, Sir, to represent you and your friends as desirous, if not of having the Lambeth Articles incorporated into the Articles of the Church of England, yet of having them considered as a fair comment on the present ones, I should not do so on a mere conjecture. It is well known, that, in the reign of James I. by the management of Archbishop Usher (then Provost of Dublin College) who was a Calvinist, the Lambeth Articles, which had been suppressed by the command of Queen Elizabeth, and rejected at the Hampton-Court Conference, were incorporated into the Articles of the Church of Ireland. Now, in Mr. Bowman's work, of which, with respect to its object, and the general tenor of the arguments employed to enforce it, *yours* may not improperly be considered as a re-publication, these Irish Articles are recognised as "speaking the sense of the Church

Church of England, and, in particular, as well illustrating and explaining our seventeenth Article on predestination." In the course of the same work, Mr. Bowman reminds us, that "an Archbishop (Laud) was brought to the bar, condemned, and executed, among other things, for introducing Arminianism." This observation proves, if it prove any thing, that Calvinism prevailed among those, who had the management of affairs at the period of that prelate's fall; of which, indeed, no one can entertain a doubt. This circumstance, however, will not be admitted as very favourable to the cause of Calvinism, when it is considered, that the same persons soon afterwards brought Charles I. to the block, among other things, for not agreeing to abolish *Episcopacy* and the use of a *Liturgy*. See Collier, vol. ii. page 858. It is but just to add, with respect to Archbishop Usher, that he afterwards renounced his Calvinistic opinions



nions. "Sometime before his death," says Collier, vol. ii. p. 868, "he changed his opinion touching the *Five Points*, came over to the other side, and was reconciled to Bishop Overal's sentiment. That this is a matter of fact, appears from the signed testimonies of Dr. Bryan Walton, Mr. Peter Gunning, and Mr. Herbert Thorndike." It is proper to add also, that, in 1634, by virtue of the *Union Cannon*, the Articles of the Church of England were received as those of the Church of Ireland. See Collier, vol. ii. p. 763. \*

In my "Remarks on the doctrine of Justification by Faith," I have said, that "a great cause of the disputes, which have arisen between Arminians and Calvinists, is the want of a due attention to the meaning of *words*, and that the parties are probably much nearer to an agreement in *opinion*, than is generally imagined." It

\* In the first edition of Collier, *two* pages are thus numbered.

is possible, that many persons will be more ready to admit the truth of this, when they know, that it was also said by *Baxter*. In the work, to which I have already referred, speaking of the Arminian opinions, he says, " I am grown to a very great confidence, that most of our contentions about those points are more about words than matter." What shall we say, then, of those, who, in these days, declare the differences of opinion between Arminians and Calvinists to be such, as to affect our everlasting salvation? That such there are, an anonymous Letter, which I received soon after the publication of the " Remarks " now mentioned, furnishes but too evident a proof. I am always sorry to find, that we are retrograde in liberality of thinking; and you, Sir, I am assured, will not be proud of an ally, who, in his attempt to shield you from my attack, has manifested sentiments, of which even *Baxter*, the believer in *witchcraft*,

*craft*, and the persecutor of those accused of it, would have been ashamed. \* The Letter, which had on it the *Leicester* post-mark, was this :

REV. SIR,

Practical infidels would thank you for your publication ; but the perusal of it  
produced

\* It may be said, that the error of Baxter, in believing the reality of witchcraft, was the error of the *age*, rather than of the *man*. When, however, the judgment of any one is referred to as *authority*, which seems often to be the case with respect to Baxter, it is right, that every circumstance, by which a true estimate of his judgement may be formed, should be taken into consideration. It is the part of superior judgement to perceive the errors of the age, and to contribute something towards their correction ; not to confirm and promote them ; much less, under their influence, to excite men to unjust and cruel actions. Besides, is it fair, that the error, which has brought a reproach on the memory of the venerable *Hale*, should be forgotten in the character of *Baxter*? of that Baxter, who was the *voluntary* instigator to the execution of a law, which *Hale*, in his capacity of a judge, thought himself *obliged* to execute? See a very sensible and candid work, entitled, " An Historical Essay concerning witchcraft, by Francis Hutchinson, D. D." So great was the senseless and savage rage of the *Puritans*, in the day of their power,  
against

produced no emotions in my mind but those of grief and pity: grief, that Rempstone has such a blind guide, and pity for you, reflecting on the consequence of such doctrines as yours.

May God in mercy show you the way of salvation, for as yet you are utterly a stranger to it; and may you, before death, become a *true Churchman*; for *now* I scruple not to say you are not.

I am, Sir,

Your well wisher, and a *friend*,

though not a *minister*,

of the Establishment." \*

against the supposed crime of witchcraft, that, from the beginning of the great rebellion to the *Restoration*, a space of not quite twenty-years, between three and four thousand innocent persons are said to have lost their lives on this account within the British dominions. See Notes on *Hudibras*, P. 2 Cant. 3.

\* Though the perusal of this Letter produced in my mind the same emotions of grief and pity; *grief*, that a difference of opinion on religious subjects should be the occasion of exciting, in any one, acrimonious sentiments; and *pity* for him, in whom they are excited; yet I was not insensible to the honour conferred on me by the  
writer

IV. Another remark, which I have to make, respects the subject of *discipline*. It is but too evident, that many persons, who profess themselves members of the established Church, are extremely deficient in a sense of the obligation, which lies on them, to observe the discipline of the Church; and to this deficiency, if I mistake not, Calvinistic preaching, in which, to speak generally, doctrine is every thing and discipline nothing, has very much contributed. I conceive, that even a lay-man, who professes himself a member of the Church, gives a tacit promise to observe its discipline; and I am sure, whether he does or not, that, from the positive injunctions of Scripture to "obey those, who have rule over us, and who watch for our souls," he is under an *obligation* to observe it. With respect to

writer of it, in affording me such an indubitable proof of his opinion, that my publication is formidably hostile to the cause of Calvinism.

ministers

ministers of the Church, the case is still more evident. They have made an express promise, that they will obey the *discipline* of the Church, as well as a declaration, that they believe its *doctrines*. Every minister, before his admission into holy Orders, is required to subscribe to the three Articles of the thirty-sixth Canon; one of which is, "That the book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used, and that he himself will use the form in the said book prescribed in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, and none other." Further, if he is an *incumbent*, or a *licensed curate*, he must have taken an oath to "yield true and canonical obedience to the bishop of his diocese in all things lawful and honest." Consistently with his oath, therefore, no such minister can make any deviations from  
the

the established discipline, which he either knows, or may reasonably suppose, would be disapproved of by the bishop of his diocese.

As many persons, who are not aware of all the consequences of Calvinistic opinions, have embraced those opinions, it would be unjust to say, that all Calvinists are enemies to our established form of Church-Government; but, that there is good reason for believing Calvinism to be hostile to that form, the history of England, and still more the history of Scotland, will furnish abundant proof. Had it not been for the Arminianism of England, there would be now, throughout the United Kingdom, no other than *titular* bishops. Now, before Calvinism is suffered to prevail among us, and more especially before it is suffered to be exclusively prevalent, it ought to be considered, whether this hostility to episcopal authority be accidental, or whether it  
arises

arises from the nature of Calvinism itself. One circumstance, which induces me to think the latter to be the case, is the disinclination, which Calvinism has ever manifested, to the use of a *prescribed form of prayer*; for Episcopacy and the use of a prescribed form of prayer will generally be found to rise and fall together. To this disinclination the peculiar pretensions of Calvinists to *inspiration* (peculiar at least in comparison with the pretensions of other professed members of the establishment) naturally lead. Those, who so far believe in the sensible operations of the Holy Spirit, as to think, that he suggests the matter and manner of public prayers, and furnishes what is called *the gift of prayer*, will never willingly submit to the use of a prescribed form. In the conference at the Savoy in 1660, held for the purpose of effecting an accomodation between the contending religious parties,

one



one of the proposals offered by Calvinists, who were professed friends to Episcopacy and the use of a Liturgy, was this:

“That the *gift of prayer* being one special qualification for the ministry, they desire the Liturgy may not be so strictly imposed, as totally to exclude the exercise of that faculty in any part of public worship: and that, in consequence of this, it may be left to the discretion of the minister to omit part of the stated service, as occasion shall require.” See Collier, vol. ii. p. 878.

It was pretty evident, that the admission of this proposal would have rendered the appointment of a Liturgy altogether nugatory. Accordingly, the Commissioners for the Church on that occasion, a phalanx of divines not inferiour to any, of whom the Church could ever boast, thus replied to it:

“Their proposal touching the *gift of prayer* makes the Liturgy, in effect, wholly insignificant.

insignificant. For, what else can be the consequence, if every minister may put in and leave out at discretion? As for the *gift*, or rather the *spirit* of prayer, it consists in the inward graces of the Holy Spirit, and not in extemporary expressions. Such unpremeditated effusions are only the effects of natural parts, of a voluble tongue, and of uncommon assurance. But, if there is any such gift as is really pretended, this extraordinary qualification must be subject to the prophets, and the order of the Church. Considering the mischiefs coming by impertinent, ridiculous, and sometimes seditious, wicked, and blasphemous expressions, under pretence of giving liberty for exercising the *gift of prayer*; considering the honour of God is so highly injured, and religion suffers so much this way, it is reasonable those, who desire such an indulgence in public devotions, should first give the Church security, that no private opinions should

should be put into their prayers; and that nothing contrary to the *faith*, should be uttered before God, or offered up to him in the Church. To prevent which mischiefs, the former ages knew no better way than forbidding the use of any prayers in public, excepting such as were prescribed by public authority." Page 881.

I am much mistaken, if many Calvinistic ministers of the establishment do not now wish for the liberty, which was then openly pleaded for; and, what is worse, if some of them do not exercise it. There are, I am told, Calvinistic ministers of the establishment, who indulge in the use of *extemporary* prayer in a way, which is altogether inconsistent with obedience to the discipline of the Church. Setting aside the guilt of disobedience, I will just observe, without entering fully into the merits of the question, that, though *extemporary* prayer in public, by its novelty, and sometimes by its extravagance, may

may gratify curiosity and please the fancy more than a set form, it by no means so well answers the intended ends of public prayer. "We come not," as Dr. Comber well observes, "to the house of God, as to a theatre for recreation; but to petition for the relief of our own general necessities, and those of the whole Church. Public wants, which are the subject of public prayers, being much the same, it is wantonness, and not devotion, that makes a variety of phrase necessary."\*

When a person prays in *private*, no reasonable objection can be made to his praying extemporally, if he has the ability of doing so; but, when he undertakes to direct the devotion of others, though it be only in *family* prayer, he ought, unless on

\* See the *prefaces* to his "Companion to the Temple," and to his "Short discourses on the Common Prayer." He evidently means *such* a variety, as is contended for by the advocates for extemporary prayer. Our Liturgy does not shut out *all* variety.

particular and urgent occasions, to make use of a prepared form. But, be the reason of the thing as it may, it is the evident design of our Church, in prescribing a Liturgy, to prohibit the practice of extemporary prayer in public. Whenever, therefore, a minister of the establishment, whether in addition to the Liturgy or otherwise, makes use of extemporary prayer in public, and contributes to confirm the notion respecting the *gift of prayer*, which the Church has thought it right to discountenance, he is, in my opinion, guilty of a breach of discipline; not to mention, that he thus induces a belief, whether well-founded or not, that he submits at all to the use of a Liturgy, not because it accords with his own sentiments, but because he is directed to do so by an authority, which he cannot entirely disregard. No defence of such a practice, so as to make it consistent with a right affection towards the Church, can be drawn from

from the fifty-fifth canon. For, though that canon, with respect to the prayer before the sermon, or rather the *exhortation* to prayer, leaves the minister at some liberty in the *words*, it prescribes the *subjects* of the prayer, and directs, with a seeming view to prevailing abuses in this particular, that the exhortation be as "*brief as conveniently may be.*"

Many Calvinists, it must be acknowledged, profess a great regard for discipline, and declare a strict adherence to it in their own practice. Were we, however, to put implicit confidence in such professions and declarations, we should show, that we have profited but little by past experience. Bishop Lavington, in his "*Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared,*" a book, to which, I fear, we shall always have but too much occasion to refer, addressing himself to Mr. Whitefield, says, "You often make yourself a champion in defence of our Liturgy, Articles, and  
Canons."

Canons." Part II. preface. With what consistency Mr. Whitefield, who acted in such open opposition to our Liturgy, Articles, and Canons, could do this, I cannot conceive. He must have had some method of settling the matter in his conscience, with which I am utterly unacquainted. Whether any Calvinistic ministers of the establishment, who follow Mr. Whitefield's example, or encourage his mode of conduct, make the same profession, I do not know; but, whether they do or not, I scruple not to say, that they are deserving of the severest censure. I am glad, that, on this point, you so unequivocally avow sentiments similar to my own; and it was with peculiar satisfaction, that I read this passage of your work; "The great body of these divines (the *Evangelical*) as sincerely lament the *schism* of Dr. Haweis, as the *heterodoxy* of some other Doctors." Without inquiring, however, into the particular instances, in which Dr. Haweis

Haweis has shown himself schismatical, I take the liberty of observing, that there are many methods, besides that of open schism, by which the attachment of the people to the established discipline may be weakened, and schism encouraged; and I cannot but wish, that you had been as particular in telling us what, according to your idea, *is* a breach of discipline, as you have been in telling us what *is not*. A friend of mine once observed to me, that “ the preaching, which is called *Evangelical*, may be considered as a *half-way house* between the Church and the Conventicle.” How far this observation is well-founded, I shall not undertake positively to determine; but if, in the preaching of Calvinistic ministers, so great a stress is laid on doctrines, and particularly on those doctrines, by which Calvinism is distinguished from Arminianism, as to make discipline appear of but little comparative importance, and (to use  
your



your expression\*) like the “ chaff to the wheat,” it is easy to see, that a way is gradually opened for a separation from the Church.

It is a very common thing for persons to withdraw their attendance on the public services of the ministers of their own parish, for the sake of attending on those of some neighbouring minister of the establishment, whose preaching is supposed to be more *Evangelical*. To this, if this were all, I should have no great objection: for, though one of the means, by which the unity of the Church is intended to be preserved, would thus be neglected, the unity of the Church would still not be broken. I will even admit, that circumstances may occur, in which such conduct would be strictly defensible. But the mischief is, that such irregularities seldom terminate so. Those, who have once brought themselves to think lightly of the

\* See page 401.

unity of the Church, and, for the sake of what they may imagine a more *edifying* way of preaching, to neglect the appointed means of preserving that unity, will soon go on to think, that the same imagination, should it happen to arise in them, furnishes a sufficient excuse for breaking the unity itself, and becoming *schismatical*. Thus will the preservation of the unity of the Church be left to depend on, what is certainly very inadequate to the purpose, the judgment of the people respecting the most edifying mode of instructing them. Accordingly, it is matter of experience, that many of those, who have been accustomed to hear Calvinistic preaching in the Church, will rather go to a Conventicle, where they may continue to hear such preaching, than remain in the Church under the ministry of an Arminian. Whether, taking the case in the most favourable view, this does not arise from a blamable inattention in Calvinistic

vinistic ministers to the subject of discipline, deserves well to be considered by them.\* There is, however, another method, by which the attachment of the people to the Church is weakened, and which is still less excusable than this; I mean, that of depreciating the ministry of those, who are supposed to entertain different opinions. That a Calvinistic minister should state and explain the doctrines of Scripture and of the Church according to his own mode of understanding them, is reasonable and fair; but, the moment he goes beyond this, and declares or insinuates, that the minister of the

\* I have heard a Calvinistic minister of the establishment mention, as a thing perfectly regular, that "the Methodist teacher in his Parish came to Church in the morning at the head of his flock;" nor did it, in his judgement, seem at all deserving of reprobation, that the same teacher led his flock to the Tabernacle in the evening. Though such ministers have, of late, been put a little more on their guard in this particular, to them it is in great measure to be attributed, that the sin of schism is made so light of, and the commission of it become so alarmingly prevalent.

neighbouring

neighbouring parish is a "blind guide," and does not preach the doctrines of Scripture or the Church, he becomes the promoter of schism in the Church, and betrays the sacred trust reposed in him. As I make some distinction between *preaching* and *printing*, I am not willing, from passages of this nature occurring in your book, to bring this charge against you; but I may observe, by way of instance, that if, when you enter the pulpit, you carry with you the same sentiments, by which you were actuated to write and to print, "*We are the true Churchmen, and Mr. Daubeny and his associates are dissenters,*"\* you are in great danger of doing that, which would justify me in bringing this charge.

The evil of schism is so great, and the sin of it so heinous, that every thing, which is likely to promote it, ought to be guarded against with the greatest care; and per-

\* See page 397.

haps there never was a time, when that care was more necessary than at present. There never was a time, when the duty of Church Communion was less understood in theory, or less attended to in practice. Many of the common people, taking upon themselves to judge what is true doctrine and what is not, consider it a sufficient excuse for frequenting a Conventicle, that "they hear there what is good." To break the unity of the Church, and to encourage the preaching of those, who, not having given any security for preaching true doctrine, *may* preach false, is considered as a very venial offence, if an offence at all. The *person*, from whom they hear doctrines, of which they approve, or the *place*, in which they hear them, is, it seems, a circumstance of but little importance.

"In the worship of God," I once heard a sensible lay-man say, "*place* signifies nothing, so that the *heart* be right." When  
 this

this maxim is taken by itself, what can be more true? When it is taken in reference to *social* worship among Christians, and alleged as an excuse for neglecting the discipline established in the Church, what can be more false? If individuals are to determine what *doctrines* are to be taught, and *who* is to teach them, what *places* and *times* are to be appropriated to public worship, and what *rites* and *ceremonies* are to be observed in it, what will soon become of Christianity among us? In the minds and hearts of true believers, indeed, it must ever reign as the guide of their lives, and the ground of their dearest hopes; but, considered as a *Church*, as a body of men united in the same faith and worship, of which Christ is the head, and of which it can truly be said, that "by joints and bands having nourishment administered and knit together, it increaseth with the increase of God," we shall probably look for it in vain. Besides,

sides, to return to the maxim itself, is it likely, that the heart can be altogether right, where there is a wilful neglect of observances, which, if not prescribed by Christ himself, are prescribed by those, who have received authority from Christ to direct the steps of that "flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers?\*

Now

\* I often wonder, that the obligation to maintain *social* Christianity, and to maintain it in *unity*, should be so little regarded. The very prayer, which was taught us by our Lord himself, is drawn up in a *social* form. "When ye pray, say, *Our Father*, which art in heaven." Frequently and earnestly does he exhort his disciples to *love* and *unity*. In his last prayer, he repeated the petition for their "being *one*," no less than five times. His Apostles also, in a great variety of places, which agree in substance, however they may differ in form, exhort us to "glorify God with *one mind and one mouth*."

It must be ignorance itself, which pleads, in excuse for leaving the established Church, that "Christ is not preached in it." For, if it could with truth be said, that the doctrine of salvation through Christ is not heard of in the *Sermons* of the divines of the Church of England, it cannot be pretended, that this doctrine is not  
acknow-

Now, it ought to be remembered, that all the principal schisms, by which our Church has been harassed and torn in pieces, from the days of the early Puritans to those of Whitefield and Wesley, have originated from Calvinism. It is, I know, a received notion, that the followers of *Whitefield* are Calvinists, and those of *Wesley* Arminians. This, however, is a fallacy. If the followers of Wesley can with any propriety be considered as Arminian, it is only because, in some few points, they are less Calvinistic than the followers of Whitefield. In many opinions, which are strictly and peculiarly Calvinistic, particularly on the subjects of

acknowledged and asserted in every part of the *Liturgy*. Generally speaking, the devotional part of our service is divided into short collects, and every collect is concluded with the words, "through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour," or words to the same effect; by which we plainly declare, that we expect no blessings, for the body or the soul, temporal or eternal, but for the sake, and through the merits, of Jesus Christ.

justi-



*justification by faith only*, the *new birth*, and the *assurance of salvation*, the followers of both as cordially agree, as they do in hostility to the *discipline* of the Church. Mr. Whitefield asks, "Who dares assert, that we are not justified merely by an act of faith, without any regard to works past, present, or to come?"\* This, to be sure, is being plain; but Mr. Wesley, who affirms, that "the *condition* of our justification is faith alone, and not good works," is not much more obscure; especially when it is considered, that, in his language, justification and salvation are synonymous terms. "The Methodists," he adds, "had wandered many years in the new path of *salvation* by *faith and works*, before God shewed them the old way of *salvation* by *faith only*." Mr. Whitefield makes *conversion* to be the same

\* This and the following quotations are taken from Bishop Lavington, and by him from the Journals of Whitefield and Wesley.

with the *new birth*, and this he speaks of as being *instantaneous*. He mentions a "woman seized with little less than the agonies of death: five days she travailed and groaned; then, in a *moment*, was full of love and joy." Mr. Wesley holds the same doctrine. "My being born of God," says he "was an *instantaneous* act, enabling me from that moment to be more than conqueror over those corruptions, which before I was always a slave to." With respect to the doctrine of *assurance*, Mr. Whitefield says, "All this while I was *assured* God had forgiven me. It is a dreadful mistake to deny the doctrine of *assurances*. All ought to labour after it. I know numbers, whose *salvation* is written upon their hearts, as it were with a sun-beam." Mr. Wesley is by no means behind-hand with him. "I felt faith in Christ," says he, "and an *assurance* was given me, that he had taken away my sins,

sins, even *mine*."\* It hence evidently appears, that, whatever the followers of Wesley

\* In two small tracts now circulating in the neighbourhood of Nottingham, one entitled, "An account of the experience and happy death of Mary Voce, who was executed at Nottingham, March 16, 1802, for the murder of her own child," the other, "An account of the conversion &c. of Ferdinando Davis, who was executed at Nottingham, March 31, 1802, for a highway robbery," I find the same doctrine. Of Mary Voce it is said, "While they were engaged in prayer for her, she suddenly stopped them, by exclaiming in a surprise of gratitude and joy, *Oh! what has the Lord done for me!* On being asked what he had done for her, she replied, *He has forgiven me all my sins; I feel it in my heart.* Her load of guilt and misery was instantly gone, peace and resignation flowed into her happy soul." Again, "She told them, that God had helped her to confess her sins, and that she was happy, that she knew the Lord had pardoned her, and that she was going to heaven." Of Ferdinando Davis it is said, "While he was breathing his desires to the Father of mercies in the hour of his great need, God abundantly poured out the spirit of adoption upon him, his fears were removed, an indubitable evidence was afforded him, and the bitterness of death yielded to the bright prospect of eternity." The unfortunate man is afterwards represented as saying, "My conscience tells me, that I am pardoned; for I feel peace within; I cannot doubt it." It is to be observed, that, in both cases, these persuasions are not stated to have

ley may think about *some* of the Lambeth Articles, they would freely enough subscribe to the fifth and sixth; and my opinion

have been felt, until all hope of escaping human punishment was taken away.

In the latter of the two publications, I find this passage, "Faith is the indisputable title to glory; and, if a believer was to live a thousand years, he would have no better title to heaven than he had the first day he believed." This assertion perfectly accords with the doctrine, that we are justified or saved on the condition of *faith only*; but it is entirely inconsistent with the notion, that this life is a state of *trial* and of *moral discipline*; that here those habits and dispositions of the soul are to be formed in us, by which we are to be prepared for a state of happiness hereafter; as also with the Scriptural declaration, that we shall be "rewarded *according* to our works." To say, when faith is spoken of as the *condition* of justification or salvation, that we are justified or saved by *faith only*, is to lead the people into a dangerous delusion. For, however an assertion of this sort may be afterwards attempted to be qualified, it will always leave a wrong impression on the minds of the hearers or readers; a persuasion, that the performance of good works, though a thing well enough in its way, and useful for present purposes, is yet rather below the attention of the *elect*, and not of any essential consequence to salvation. Whenever it is said, that we are justified or saved by *faith only*, it ought to be explicitly stated, that faith is spoken of, not as the *condition* of our justification

nion is, that, in doing so, they would, if certain hindrances did not stand in the way, be joined by the far greater part, if not the whole, of those, who are characterized by the term *Evangelical*. The opinions, to which I have referred, and of which I have given specimens, form the leading features of Methodism, as propagated both by Mr. Whitefield and Mr. Wesley. So far, therefore, as *doctrines* were concerned, Mr. Wesley must have separated from the Church, not as an *Arminian*, but as a *Calvinist*. If he *did* separate without any good reason with respect to doctrines, it will be difficult to reconcile his separation with *honesty*; it being a fact acknowledged by his warmest

tification or salvation, but as the *meritorious cause*; not as a virtue existing in ourselves, but as comprehending the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is in this sense only, that such an assertion is agreeable to Scripture. In this sense, it is an undoubted truth; for, as the Apostle saith, "there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved."

admirers

admirers, that he established a *discipline*, which differed from Episcopacy only or chiefly in his own assumption of the character and office of a bishop.\* Leaving you and the friends of Mr. Wesley to get clear of this *dilemma*, I challenge you to produce a single instance of an Arminian, who, on account of his being an Arminian, ever separated himself from the Church of England. Now, if all the schisms, which have happened among us, may justly be referred to the operation of Calvinistic principles, it surely is not unreasonable to conclude, that, with respect to the constitution of the Church of England, whether from a dislike of its doctrines or of its discipline, Calvinism has a schismatic tendency; that, if it should not effect a change in the constitution itself, it must ever be expected to produce, in a greater or less degree, the sin and mischiefs of schism. Thus you see, Sir, that, in pro-

\* See Whitehead's Life of Wesley

fessing

fessing myself willing to tolerate Calvinism in the Church, I do something more than sacrifice my love of abstract truth. For the sake of peace, and of extending, to the utmost bounds consistent with safety, freedom of opinion among the members of the Church, I give my voice for running some hazard of effects, which every friend of the Church would have reason to deplore. This, however, I do in the hope and belief, that, among a people, whose general character is *good sense*, who have the *Scriptures* so much in their hands, and who have before them the experience of *past times*, Calvinism will never again become so predominant, as to produce *all* the ill effects, which it has a tendency to produce.

It will not be foreign to this part of the subject to observe, that Calvinistic preaching encourages the error, too prevalent among the lower orders of the people, of preferring, in the public service, the *Ser-*

*mon* to the *Prayers*. I would not deny the usefulness of preaching, when judiciously conducted, nor refuse to it its due degree of estimation; but, certainly, when the Sermon is compared with the Prayers, it is of but inferior importance. In hearing a Sermon, we may, perhaps, be instructed in our duty, or excited to its performance; but, in joining with sincerity in the Prayers, we are actually performing a considerable branch of duty.\* Now, it has not escaped the observation of discerning persons, that, in the ministry of many of those, who are called *Evangelical* preachers, there is often a carelessness and haste in the reading of the Liturgy, well adapted to excite a belief, that the Prayers are not considered by the reader, what in fact they are, as the most important part of the service, but merely as a decent intro-

\* “Resort to sermons, but to prayers most:

“Praying’s the end of preaching.—”

Mr. George Herbert’s *Church Porch*.

duction



duction to the Sermon, which is to follow. How far the gratification of *vanity*, and the desire of “preaching *themselves*, not *Christ Jesus the Lord*,” may be concerned in this, or how far it may arise from disaffection to the Prayers themselves, I shall not presume to determine; but I am sure, that the thing itself is of very pernicious tendency.

It is sometimes alleged, as an apology for preaching Calvinistic doctrines, that, whether true or false in themselves, they are best adapted to excite the attention and operate on the feelings of the multitude. It is to be considered, however, that the multitude, taken generally, and for a long continuance of time, act principally from imitation of the higher orders of society. If, therefore, while we secure the attendance and attention of the multitude for a season, we disgust and eventually drive away the better informed, we shall, in this respect, be far from obtaining any  
 advantage

advantage. I do not mean by this, that we ought, in order to avoid giving offence to any one, to shrink from setting forth, as occasions may demand, all the truths of the Gospel, or by any consideration be deterred from declaring unto men the "whole counsel of God." It suggests, however, a powerful reason for our using circumspection, and for taking care, that no imagination of our own, which is of an offensive nature, be mixed with the pure truths of the Gospel, or represented by us as a part of the Gospel. Without such care, there is great danger, that a prejudice may be excited, even in the minds of well-disposed persons, if not against the whole of our religion, yet against many of its doctrines, which are both true and important. For, when such doctrines are delivered in connexion with others, which are evidently of a different character, they will by many, who have not ability or leisure to examine each particular

ticular by the proper standard, be rejected in a mass; and thus the pearl will be confounded with the rubbish, in which it is involved, the wheat thrown away with the chaff. Nor is this the whole of the evil. In the mixture of error with religious truth, there is a double danger. As some, disgusted with the error, will reject the truth, by which it is accompanied; so others, for the sake of the truth, will admit the error. If the whole, or even the greater part, of a discourse were false or foolish, it would not be likely to deceive any one; but, where there is a great deal, that is true and useful, the hearers are taken off their guard with respect to what is not so. Now, it is scarcely possible to discourse on religious subjects, or to bring the great dispensation of the Gospel into view, without saying many things, which are both true and useful; and this opens the way to a fallacy, which it is not in the power of vulgar minds to detect. Many

of

of these, as I have already observed, even think it a sufficient excuse for frequenting a Conventicle, that "they hear there what is good;" not considering, that the good may be mixed with what is not so, and that, if it be, they are but ill qualified to make the necessary distinction and separation. I might extend this observation on the mixture of truth and error in the *discourses* of Calvinists, to their *writings*, and might allege, as an instance, that the numerous truths, which occur in "The True Churchmen ascertained," and of which no Arminian will deny the importance, are very likely to hinder many of its readers from suspecting, and more from discerning, that they are accompanied by any thing erroneous. As I have given a specimen of what I think to be erroneous in it, I need not return to the consideration of particulars; nor shall I, on this occasion, enlarge on the mischievous effects, to which religious error may eventually

eventually give rise. That in the writings of those in general, by whom Calvinism is supported in the present day, there is, together with a great deal, that is true and useful,\* such a deficiency of good sense and sound reasoning, and such a consequent misinterpretation of Scripture, as must tend to mislead the ignorant, and to excite, in the minds of the better-informed, a prejudice against the things, which they undertake to explain and recommend, has been abundantly demonstrated by some of the ablest investigators of religious truth among us; particularly by the two Mr. Ludlams, a really *par nobile fratrum*, whose writings, worthy to rank with the best, will, I doubt not, in future times be

\* I can read the works of the truly pious *James Hervey* with pleasure; and I will not deny, that the works of many Calvinists, which I cannot read with pleasure, may, in some respects, be very useful; particularly in exciting awful sentiments of the divine justice, and in giving lively and awakening representations of the malignant nature of sin.

referred

referred to as works of first-rate authority.

Do not imagine, Sir, that I would diminish the religious zeal of any one. My only wish is, that such zeal should be properly directed. Upon this its utility entirely depends. Few things, perhaps, have been the cause of more mischiefs to mankind, than religious zeal mis-applied. I firmly believe, that both Mr. Whitefield and Mr. Wesley had a great deal of zeal in the cause of religion, and that both had the ability, if their zeal had been rightly directed, of doing much good. I have, however, no hesitation in saying, that, in fact, they did a great deal of harm. The good, of which they are by some said to have been the authors, appears to me of a *transient*, if not a *doubtful* nature; whereas the evils, to which they gave occasion, are *certain* and *permanent*. Professing, like many of their followers of the present day, a reverence for the *doctrines*  
of

of the Church, they set at defiance the *discipline*, by which alone her doctrines can long be preserved in purity; and they opened a door of schism, which, it is to be feared, will not be shut for ages. Even admitting the beneficial effects of their labours to the extent contended for, it may still be alleged, that those effects might all have been produced, and probably to a greater degree, by regular methods; that, with respect to the extra-parochial cases, in which their merits are most insisted on, they might, by proper representations and applications, have obtained liberty to exercise their ministry under episcopal authority, and thus have preserved, what it is of infinite importance to preserve, the *unity of the Church*. Let Calvinistic ministers of the establishment, then, be as zealous in the cause of religion as they please, they can scarcely be too much so; but let them be mindful, that their zeal be "according to knowledge." Let them

them endeavour to attain to a practical conviction, that it is then only "good to be zealously affected," when we are so affected "in a good cause;" and that no cause can be good, which is not founded on *truth*. To ensure their success in the search of truth, let them cultivate the qualities, and make use of the means, by which truth is most likely to be found. Above all things, let them beware of multiplying the occasions of schism, either by narrowing, without necessity, the terms of communion, or by any other methods. Thinking as I do, I cannot but wish, that, retaining their piety and zeal, they would renounce the peculiar opinions, which distinguish them from the rest of their brethren. If, indeed, they do not see the force of the arguments, which are addressed to them for this purpose, they will not be able to do so; but it may still very reasonably be expected of them, that they will grant to others the liberty, which they



they claim for themselves; that they will not be forward to charge the generality of the clergy with departing from the Articles, to which they have subscribed, and according to which they have solemnly engaged to teach, because they understand them in a somewhat different sense. It appears, from what I have stated, that the difference between an Arminian and a Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles is a case, to which the Apostle's rule may very properly be applied, and in which, therefore, it ought to be implicitly observed: "Let not him, that eateth, despise him, that eateth not; and let not him, which eateth not, judge him, that eateth." With respect to this difference, we are required, as has been seen, by the Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles, "to lay aside all further curious search, and to shut up these disputes in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the holy Scriptures, and in the general meaning of the

the Articles of the Church of England according to them." Perhaps, as the means of settling the dissensions, which prevail, or at least of preventing any mischievous effects from them, it might be expedient, in the present state of the Church, to adopt a measure similar to that I have referred to, and to declare, by authority, that it is not the intention of the Church of England so to narrow the terms of communion, as individuals, both Arminians and Calvinists, have sometimes been led to imagine. In the mean time, I beg leave to propose, as the conditions of a peace more honourable to the parties, because more voluntary, that the Calvinists, and, so far as they are concerned in them, the Arminians also, should agree to the faithful observance of following *Canons*:

1. To renounce, as a term of distinction, the title of *Evangelical*.
2. To abstain from all declarations and insinuations, that they alone preach

the

the true *doctrines* of Scripture and of the Church.

3. To avoid all proceedings in practice, which may tend to diminish, in the estimation of the people, the importance of an attention to the established *discipline*.

You see, Sir, by this offer, that, whatever preference I may give to the Arminian before the Calvinistic cause, and whatever might be my hopes of victory, were hostilities continued, I do not aim at the honour of a triumph, nor lose sight of the peaceable intentions professed in my motto:

“ Non ego, nec Teucris Italos parere jubebo,  
Nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambæ  
Invictæ gentes æterna in fœdera mittant.”

I am, Rev. Sir,

Your's, &c.

E. PEARSON.

REMPSTONE,  
June 1, 1802.

the true doctrine of Scripture and of  
 the Church.  
 3. To avoid all proceedings in practice,  
 which may tend to diminish, in the  
 estimation of the people, the im-  
 portance of an attention to the esta-  
 blished discipline.

You see, Sir, by this offer, that what-  
 ever preference I may give to the Arminian  
 before the Calvinistic cause, and whatever  
 might be my hopes of victory, were hos-  
 tilities continued, I do not aim at the ho-  
 nour of a triumph, nor lose sight of the  
 peaceable intentions professed in my motto:

*Non ego, nec Thebanus, sed pacis, sed obsequii  
 Nec mihi regni peto, paucis se laudibus ambo  
 Davida ferens, ut in hoc volumine.*

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

E. PEARSON

Perseus  
 June 1. 1681.

## Postscript.

**I**T is but just to add, that, when Mr. Overton was informed of my having received the anonymous Letter, of which a copy is given p. 59, he pronounced the sending of it to be “ a cowardly attempt;” assuring me, that “ he entertained very different ideas of such principles as mine, from those expressed in the anonymous Letter,” and that “ he viewed that Letter with as great disapprobation as I could do.”

Since these “ Remarks” were sent to the press, I have had the pleasure of reading a learned and ingenious treatise, written by Dr. Kipling, Deputy Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, in which he has proved, to a demonstration, that the Liturgy and Ar-  
 ticles

ticles of the Church of England are, in many instances, utterly inconsistent with the doctrine held by *Calvin*. As Mr Overton has not undertaken to defend Calvinism "to its full extent," the application of Dr. Kipling's proof to "The true Churchmen ascertained," depends on his success in endeavouring to show (what Calvin himself thought to be true) that there can be no such thing as *moderate* Calvinism. Many persons will think, that he has succeeded in this. Be this as it may, his treatise, with respect to the particular point he had in view, ought, in my opinion, to be considered as decisive, and to set it at rest for ever.

FINIS.

WRITTEN BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

AND SOLD BY

J. HATCHARD, PICCADILLY.

Remarks on the doctrine of *Justification by Faith*: in a Letter to the Reverend J. Overton. Price 1s. 6d.

ALSO,

1. Remarks on the *Theory of Morals*: in which is contained an Examination of the *Theoretical Part* of Dr. Paley's "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy." Price 5s. in boards.

2. Annotations on the *Practical Part* of Dr. Paley's "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy." Price 3s. in boards.

3. *Prayers for Families*: consisting of a Form, short but comprehensive, for the Morning and Evening of every day in the Week. Price 3s. in boards.

4. Discourses to *Academic Youth*. Price 3s. sewed.

5. Letter to a Member of the Senate of the University of Cambridge, containing a proposal respecting the mode of examination for a B. A. degree. Price 1s.

6. *The Sin of Schism*: a Sermon. Second Edition with Additions. Price 6d. each, or 5s. a dozen

7. *The Sinner's Complaint under Punishment*. Price 6d. each, or 5s. a dozen.

8. *The Measure and Manner of Distributing*: a Charity Sermon. Price 1s.

9. Appeals to Law reconciled with Christian Charity: an Assize Sermon. Price 1s.

WRITTEN BY THE SAME AUTHOR  
J. HATFIELD, BICCADILLA

Remarks on the doctrine of Jansenism, &c. Price 1s.

Remarks on the Treaty of Utrecht, in which is contained  
an Examination of the Assertion of Dr. Paley's  
Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. Price 1s.

An Examination of the Historical Part of Dr. Paley's  
Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy. Price 1s.

Remarks on the Logic consisting of a Treatise  
propounded for the Morning and Evening  
in the Year. Price 1s.

A Dissertation on the Nature of the  
of a Member of the Senate of the University of  
Cambridge, containing a proposal respecting the mode of  
Education for a B. A. degree. Price 1s.

The Life of Samuel Johnson, Second Edition with  
Additions. Price 6d. each, or 2s. when  
bound.

The Signer's Complaint under Parliament. Price 6d.  
each, or 2s. when bound.

The Message and Manner of Distributing a Charity  
Sermon. Price 1s.

An Appeal to Law reconciled with Christian Charity: an  
Address to the Legislature. Price 1s.