

THE ARTICLES
OF
THE CHURCH OF IRELAND
OF
1615



THE ARTICLES
OF
THE CHURCH OF IRELAND
OF
1615

Thesis
Submitted to
The University of Edinburgh
as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Raymond Leslie Wallace

PREFACE

The present study is an attempt to shed more light on the relatively obscure Articles which were adopted in the year 1615 by the Church of Ireland meeting in Convocation in Dublin. There are two main parts to the work; part I deals with the history of the Articles, and part II with their sources and contents. The introduction gives their historical background; and the conclusion shows their influence on later symbolism in Great Britain.

The aim of part II is not intended to be critical, but rather expository. A few critical points, however, have been noted. In this section, the Irish Articles with their sources have been given in parallel columns. Where no distinct source has been found, the Irish article has been listed by itself. Important differences which exist between the Articles and their sources, if those sources be earlier English formularies, have been underlined.

The Articles are commonly known to be Calvinistic in doctrine. To determine whether they present true Calvinistic doctrine has one one of the aims of this study. Because of this, full quotation from Calvin's

writings, especially from his systematic theology, the "Institutes", has been necessary.

A word should be said with reference to the order of the chapters in part II. It has been thought best to follow the order of subjects as found in Calvin's "Institutes", since the Articles naturally fall into this outline with the exception of four of the nineteen subjects. These four have been taken out of their chronological order in the Articles, and fitted into the outline for purposes of convenience.

There was no uniformity of spelling in the era in which these Articles were composed. The old spelling has been retained in the Articles and their sources in part II, but not elsewhere. Thus, such words as, "Sea of Rome", "Catholike", and "publike" are not to be regarded as misspelled.

The text of the Articles in part II is taken from the original edition of 1615, as appended to Dr. Elrington's Life of James Ussher (Whole Works of Ussher, Vol. I, Appendix IV.), and reprinted in Hardwick's History of the Articles, Appendix VI.

Where italics occur in the original of the Articles, they have been replaced by capitals, as the best means of representing the former. Also, in quotations, capitals, so lavishly used a few centuries ago, have been retained.

There have been several abbreviations used, which should here be noted: "Works", for "The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher"; "Instit.", for "Institutes of the Christian Religion", by John Calvin; "Schaff", for his "Creeds of Christendom"; and finally, "Hardwick", for "A History of the Articles of Religion", by Charles Hardwick.

CONTENTS

	page
<u>Preface</u>	iii-v

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

<u>POLITICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL BACKGROUND</u> .	1-15
--	------

Reformation in England, 1. Influence of Swiss Reformation in England, 2. Rise of Puritanism, 4. Predestinarian controversy, 6. Lambeth Articles, 7. Hampton Court Conference, 7. Early history of Irish Church, 8. Origination of Irish Parliament, 9. Reformation not well received in Ireland, 11. Puritans persecuted in Ireland, 13. Ireland under James I, 13.

PART I

THE HISTORY OF THE ARTICLES

CHAPTER II

<u>THE FORMATION OF THE ARTICLES</u>	17-39
--	-------

The Parliament of 1613, 17. Convocation of 1615, 18. Author of Articles, 20. Reasons for drafting of Articles, 28. Effect of the Articles, 31. Sanctioned by the Crown, 32. Composition of the Articles, 33. Sources of the Articles, 37.

CHAPTER III

page

THE AUTHORITY OF THE ARTICLES

40-69

1. Authority during period 1615-1634

Decree of Convocation of 1615, 40. Subscription to Articles, 42. Status of Articles uncertain, 43. Authorisation by King James, 44. Articles not sanctioned by Parliament, 46.

2. Proceedings of Convocation of 1634

Meeting of Parliament and Convocation, 48. Strafford, Laud, and Bramhall, 48. Policy of Strafford, 49. Progress of Arminianism, 50. Influence of Bramhall, 51. Opposition of Ussher to Strafford, 52. Irregular action of Lower House, 55. Action taken by Strafford, 56. Proceedings in Upper House, 60. Consistency of English and Irish Articles, 63.

3. Authority subsequent to 1634

Ussher's view, 64. Subscription by some bishops, 66. All authority lost after Rebellion of 1641, 68.

PART II

THE SOURCES AND CONTENTS OF THE ARTICLES

CHAPTER IV

<u>ON THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD THE CREATOR</u>	71-98
1. Of the Holy Scripture and the three Creeds. Articles 1-7	71
2. Of faith in the Holy Trinity. Articles 8-10	87
3. Of the creation and government of all things. Articles 18-21	94

<u>CHAPTER V</u>		page
<u>ON THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD THE REDEEMER</u> .		99-127
1.	Of the Fall of Man, original sin, and the state of Man before Justification . Articles 22-28	99
2.	Of the state of the Old and New Testament. Articles 81-84	114
3.	Of Christ, the Mediator of the Second Covenant. Articles 29-30	120

<u>CHAPTER VI</u>		
<u>ON THE MANNER OF RECEIVING THE GRACE OF CHRIST,</u>		
<u>THE BENEFITS WHICH WE DERIVE FROM IT, AND THE</u>		
<u>EFFECTS WHICH FOLLOW IT</u> . . .		128-194
1.	Of the communicating of the grace of Christ. Articles 31-33	128
2.	Of Justification and Faith. Articles 34-38	134
3.	Of Sanctification and Good Works. Articles 39-45	149
4.	Of the service of God. Articles 46-56	156
5.	Of our duty towards our Neighbours. Articles 63-67	169
6.	Of God's Eternal Decree, and Predestination. Articles 11-17	174
7.	Of the state of the souls of men, after they be departed out of this life: together with the general resurrection, and the last things. Articles 101-104	191

<u>CHAPTER VII</u>		page
<u>ON THE EXTERNAL MEANS BY WHICH GOD CALLS US INTO</u>		
<u>COMMUNION WITH CHRIST, AND RETAINS US IN IT</u>		195-242
1.	Of the Church and outward ministry of the Gospel. Articles 68-74	195
2.	Of the authority of the Church, General Councils, and Bishop of Rome. Articles 75-80	210
3.	Of the Sacraments of the New Testament. Articles 85-88	217
4.	Of Baptism. Articles 89-91	221
5.	Of the Lord's Supper. Articles 92-100	225
6.	Of the Civil Magistrate. Articles 57-62	236

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER VIII

<u>THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ARTICLES</u>	.	244-278
---	---	---------

Meeting of Westminster Assembly, 244. Revision of XXXIX Articles, 245. Comparison of XXXIX Articles as revised with Irish Articles, 246. Committee appointed for the purpose of preparing a new Confession of Faith, 248. Subjects assigned to sub-committees, transition from Irish Articles to Westminster Confession, 249. Irish Articles source of Westminster Confession, 250. Comparison of Irish Articles with Westminster Confession, 252.

<u>Bibliography</u>	. . .	279-285
---------------------	-------	---------

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: POLITICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL BACKGROUND.¹

The Reformation in England under Henry VIII was, as in other countries, political, religious, and social, all of which were closely interwoven. But perhaps the greatest factor in the movement for reformation was a strong feeling of anti-clericalism, which was occasioned by the corrupt lives of the clergy. Added to this was the hostility among the clergy themselves, for the bishops and parish priests had only contempt for the friars and monks. There was also a strong feeling against the Papal authority which had long exploited the Church in England, and which was not lessened by the actions of Wolsey, the

1 Books consulted:

- Fisher, The Reformation.
 Lindsay, History of the Reformation, Vol. II.
 Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, Vol. VII.
 Fuller, Church History of Britain, Vol. III.
 Trevelyan, History of the Stuarts.
 " Social History of England.
 Bagwell, Ireland under the Tudors, 3 Vols.
 " Ireland under the Stuarts, Vol. I.
 Killen, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, Vol. I.
 Mant, History of the Church of Ireland, Vol. I.
 Reid, Hist. of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Vol.
 Hardwick, History of the Articles.
 Schaff, History of the Creeds of Christendom.

Papal Legate, who overrode episcopal authority and the freedom of the clergy; so that of the King and the Pope, the former was regarded as the better choice for Convocation to make. But while the English Church repudiated Papal authority, and was undergoing reformation in general, Lutheranism found very little support, except at Cambridge, where the German Reformer's influence was felt by Cranmer, Ridley, Tyndale, and others.

Genevan doctrines began to spread in England during the reign of Edward VI. Calvin's writings were prohibited by Henry VIII, but he carried on a correspondence with King Edward and Archbishop Cranmer, urging upon them "a more thorough reformation of doctrine and discipline";² and Cranmer, in turn, requested Calvin to write often to King Edward.

During the persecution under Mary, the English exiles became intimate with the Swiss Reformers, and imbibed their theology; and upon their return to their own country under the regime of Elizabeth, they became the leaders in the Reformed Church of England. Bishop Jewel, the final reviser of the Thirty-nine Articles, wrote to Peter Martyr at Zurich in 1562: "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and we do not differ from you by a nail's breadth."³ And Bishop Horn, writing to Bullinger (13 Dec. 1563, after the Queen's

2 Schaff, I, 602.

3 Zurich Letters, I, 100; quoted in Schaff, I, 603.

alterations of the Thirty-nine Articles) says: "We have throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrine as yourselves."⁴ Even the Church of Rome clearly discerned the theological position of the Church of England, for when the Papal Bull of excommunication against Elizabeth was published in 1570, "the Queen was not anathematized in terms which could apply to Lutherans, but because she personally acknowledged and observed 'the impious constitutions and atrocious mysteries of Calvin', and had commanded that they should be observed by her subjects."⁵ Thus it is seen, that the dominant theology of the Elizabethan era in England was that of Calvin. Towards the close of the sixteenth century, and early in the seventeenth, it became even more powerful, for the immediate successors of the Reformers of the Church of England likewise held the Genevan Reformer in high esteem; e.g., Dr. Saunderson (1587-1662), who began to study theology in Oxford about 1606, and who was later chaplain to King Charles I, and after the Restoration Bishop of Lincoln, says:

When I began to set myself to the study of divinity as my proper business, Calvin's Institutions were recommended to me, as they were generally to all young scholars in those times, as the best and perfectest system of divinity, and fittest to be laid as a ground work in the study of that profession.⁶

Under Elizabeth the clergy were Erastian, that is, they accepted, in matters of religion, what was or-

4 Zurich Letters, I, 135.

5 Lindsay, History of the Reformation, II, 415.

6 Saunderson, Works, V, 297.

dained by the Crown and Parliament. The only exceptions were the Romanists and a few extreme Puritans. The majority of the clergy that had escaped persecution under Mary, or that had imbibed Calvinistic tenets during their exile in foreign cities such as Geneva and Strasbourg, were not Erastian in theory; they would not have accepted a Romanist prince, but they accepted Elizabeth's Church Compromise as a matter of expediency, hoping for something better in the future.

Although doctrinal differences were emphasized, the question of clerical dress, and of postures and places, asserted itself during Elizabeth's reign; it became a major issue between the Puritans and the Established Church, and the whole period of the Queen's rule was taken up by this struggle. The majority of the Puritans remained within the Church, and endeavoured to remodel the Church from that position; and as time passed, instead of decreasing in numbers and power, they became stronger, and found the support of many prominent laymen in England. Some of the bishops themselves were Puritans, and Grindal, Parker's successor as Archbishop of Canterbury, was strongly disposed to favour them; so much so, in fact, that Elizabeth suspended him for many years. Archbishop Whitgift, his successor in 1583, violently disliked the Puritan party, and waged war against it during the

twenty years of his rule.

In many counties the Puritans held conferences of ministers, which resembled Presbyterian synods; and in time, with the assistance of Parliament, they wrested authority from the bishops. However, when Archbishop Whitgift assumed office in 1583, he began by drawing up articles for the purpose of compelling Puritan ministers either to submit or leave the Church. The things required were: the acknowledgment of the Queen's supremacy, the use, without any alteration, of the Prayer Book in the services, and the acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles in their entirety. If any one refused, he was liable to suspension or deprivation. In 1584 the Puritans from all of England deluged Parliament with petitions for a renovation of the Church, but although they found strong support in the Commons and Privy Council, Elizabeth and Whitgift refused to give any ground. The more extreme Puritans were hanged, and many more were imprisoned, but the majority of them remained true to the Queen. However, at the time of her death in 1603, Puritanism had become well established in England, vieing for honours with Anglicanism, which had developed during the course of Elizabeth's reign from an ecclesiastical compromise to a genuine religion.

One of the chief writers of the Puritan party was Thomas Cartwright, the Lady Margaret Professor of

Divinity at Cambridge. About 1570 he began to set forth the principles of Church and State which the Puritan party later took for their creed. In this system the Scriptures, besides being the rule of faith, are also the rule for Church government and discipline. He contended that the Scriptures ordain a Presbyterian polity, and prelacy, therefore, is unlawful.

The controversy concerning the doctrine of predestination, which was a prominent member of the Puritan party's platform, increased during the Elizabethan period, and reached its zenith in the last decade of the sixteenth century. The University of Cambridge was the stronghold of Calvinism during this period, Cartwright having taught that system there before he was deposed in 1571 for his Puritanical views. Dr. Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity, was an even stronger advocate of the Calvinistic system, but he found firm opposition in Dr. Baro, the Lady Margaret Professor who had been appointed to the chair in 1574. Baro advocated views which were similar to those advanced in later years by the Arminians, and because of this, he was cited before the Vice-chancellor of the University, and in 1596 was forced to retire.

The heads of Cambridge, in 1595, to fix the points under controversy concerning the doctrine of predestination, sent Doctors Whitaker and Tyndal to London to confer with Archbishop Whitgift and others. The result

was the nine Calvinistic propositions known as the Lambeth Articles, which were drawn up by Whitaker, and modified and approved by the Bishops. Whitgift sent the Articles to the University of Cambridge, and strictly enjoined the students "to conform their judgments thereunto, and not to vary from, for the preservation of peace and quietness among them".⁷ But although the Articles were intended to prevent the broaching of new doctrines which would cause disputes and differences, they rather gave great offence, both in the University and at Court.

James I succeeded to the Throne in 1603 upon the death of Elizabeth, and in January 1604 the Hampton Court Conference was held, at which James presided. The Millenary Petition had been presented to him in 1603 by several hundred Puritan clergy for the purpose of securing a legalized sanction for their beliefs, and the conference was held to consider this petition. A large number of clergy, led by Dr. Reynolds, defended Presbyterian views, but James took the opposite side, and threatened to make them conform. In James' first Parliament, held in the Spring of 1604, the House of Commons supported the Millenary Petition and Dr. Reynolds; whereupon James offered an ultimatum to the dissident clergy to conform, or be deprived. Three hundred refused, and were ejected from the Church.

7 Strype, Life of Whitgift, 461.

At this conference, also, Dr. Reynolds moved that the Lambeth Articles be added to the Articles of the Church of England; but the king replied, "that when such questions happened amongst scholars, the best method was to determine them in the universities, and not stuff the articles with theological conclusions."⁸

The early history of the native Irish Church is wrapped in obscurity, but it is commonly acknowledged that St. Patrick and St. Columba were the founders of Christianity in that realm, the former's mission being dated A.D. 432-61. The Irish Church conformed to Rome early in the eighth century, following the Synod of Whitby (A.D. 664). The supremacy of the Church of Rome was acknowledged, although the Roman plan of Church organization was not adopted at that time; that came later, in 1151, when she accepted four archiepiscopal palls from Rome.

Henry II was the first King of England to turn his attention to Ireland. He sent to Rome for permission to conquer that island, "to root up the saplings of vice there, and to bring the wild Irish into the way of the true faith".⁹ Pope Adrian IV, the only Englishman ever to fill the Papal chair, granted the request, for by so doing, he could do no less than extend his own power, and

8 Collier, VII, 290.

9 Bagwell, Ireland under the Tudors, I, 37.

enhance his own position. There was no action taken, however, until after Adrian's death, when the grant was confirmed by his successor, Alexander III; and Henry, in 1171, annexed Ireland to the Crown of England. It has been shown that the Pope had no right to dispose of Ireland, for it never had belonged to him, the claim having rested upon a donation of Constantine, which is admitted to be spurious.¹⁰

The Synod of Cashel, which met in 1172, did what it could ecclesiastically to strengthen Henry's pretensions; and John, his son, in 1177 was nominated "Lord of Ireland, son of the King of England". At the Synod of Cashel, an ecclesiastical constitution was made

that all Divine Service in the Church of Ireland should be kept, used and observed in the like Order and Manner as it is in the Church of England, for it is meet and right, that as by God's Providence and Appointment, Ireland is now become subject to the King of England, so it should take from thence the Order, Rule, and Manner how to reform themselves, and live in better order.¹¹

The Irish Parliament originated as early as 1228, when representatives of the Church and the people were convoked to listen to the reading of Magna Charta; and it was probably about 1300 that it assumed anything like the shape that it had in more modern days. Two knights were appointed from each district, and they were to have full power to act for their constituencies. The clergy were also represented by their bishops, archbishops,

10 Ibid, 39.

11 Ware, Works, II, 78.

abbots, and priors, and these spiritual peers greatly outnumbered the temporal.

In the Irish Parliament of 1494 the two Poynings Acts (named after the Deputy, Sir Edward Poynings) were passed. The first declared, that no future Parliaments should be held in Ireland unless the Deputy and Council notify the king of the "causes and considerations, and all such acts as then seemeth should pass in the same Parliament",¹² and receive approval of the same. Then the Irish Parliament should be summoned under the great seal of England, and not otherwise. The second act provided that all public laws made in England should also be in force in Ireland. However, in the Parliament of 1537 the Poynings Acts were repealed, and it was enacted that the acts of the Irish Parliament should be valid, "provided they should be thought expedient for the King's honour, the increase of his revenue, and the common weal of Ireland".¹³

At the Parliament of 1541, Henry VIII was made King of Ireland, an act that was recommended because of the prevalence of the notion, disseminated by the friars, that the Pope was sovereign in that country. Thus, Henry repudiated all obligation to Rome, and declared himself King of Ireland by divine right. The friars inculcated the belief that Ireland was a fief of the Holy See, and that Henry had forfeited the country by treason to the Pope.

12 Bagwell, Ireland under the Tudors, I, 112.

13 Mant, History of the Church of Ireland, I, 116.

However, the Reformation was not well received in Ireland. Most of the clergy were unwilling to acknowledge the royal supremacy, or to denounce the Pope's authority. Popular feeling and prejudice were also on the side of Rome, and these were strengthened by the crowds of men preaching in the peoples' own language. Also, Protestantism had become identified in the Irish mind with conquest and confiscation, and this view was encouraged by the Jesuits who had invaded the island from the Continent. Neither was the Reformation advanced by the unfriendly relations which existed between Archbishop Browne and Bishop Staples, the two chief supporters of the Reformation in that country. These two men were practically alone in their belief and understanding of the Reformation doctrines, and neither of them could speak the native Irish tongue; so that most of the people did not even hear of the Reformation.

Under Mary the Roman religion was restored except for the yielding up of the royal supremacy; but upon the accession of Elizabeth the Protestant ritual was reintroduced. At the Parliament of 1560 the Queen's title was established, and the ecclesiastical legislation of Henry and Edward was restored. The Church was also made more dependent on the State than was the case in England, for Royal Commissioners, or Parliament, if necessary,

were to be the judges of heresy without reference to any synod or convocation. Also, the conge d'elire (licence to proceed to election) was abolished, and the nominations to bishopricks left to the appointment of the Crown by letters patent.

The Irish Church was in a miserable condition in Elizabeth's reign. Sir Henry Sidney, the Lord Deputy, informed the Queen concerning the diocese of Meath, the richest in Ireland, "that upon the face of the earth, where Christ is professed, there is not a Church in so miserable a case."¹⁴ There were 224 parish churches, 105 of which belonged to manors or holders of monasteries which had come into the hands of the Crown. In none of these churches was there a resident clergyman, and only eighteen of the "very simple and sorry curates", appointed to do duty in the churches, could speak English; the rest were "Irish priests, or rather Irish rogues, having very little Latin, less learning or civility". Many of the churches were completely down, and most of them were without roofs. If this was the situation in the most prosperous diocese, it can be imagined what it was like in the rest of the country.

In the beginning of the Queen's reign, outward uniformity was the goal in Ireland, and to this end the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were passed, but only

14 Bagwell, Ireland under the Tudors, II, 319.

as a mere formality, and an effort was made to treat the Irish tenderly.

As early as 1565 the Queen's government were harrying the Puritans in Ireland. Robert Daly, the Bishop of Kildare, "a sincere and energetic Calvinist", wrote to Cecil complaining of the measures taken against them, saying that the "poor Protestants" often resorted to him to inquire as to the reasons for their being persecuted. Bagwell, a disinterested historian, remarks, that Irish Protestantism was naturally Puritanical, since it was the religion of a minority in a Roman Catholic country, and the attempt to conform it to the Anglican views of Parker, Whitgift, Laud, and others, destroyed any chance that the State Church might have had.¹⁵

Politically, at the close of Elizabeth's reign Ireland was conquered; but only after a long and exhausting war, exhausting not only to Ireland, but to England as well. The war resulted in the breaking of the power of the Irish chiefs, who were the greatest obstacles to the commercial colonization of that country.

James I carried on the good work begun by Elizabeth, and he reduced Ireland to a much quieter and more prosperous condition than any of his predecessors had been able to do. Sir John Davies, who was made Solicitor General of Ireland in 1604, claimed, that "in the first nine years

15 Ibid, 362.

of James' reign... there hath been more done in the work and reformation of this kingdom than in the 440 years which are past since the conquest was first attempted."¹⁶ The reform consisted in the establishment of stricter order and discipline in all departments of the State, which was most evident in the impartial administration of justice. This was effected in every shire in the country, where formerly every man was at the mercy of the native Irish chief. By the proper administration of justice, the common people were protected from the exactions of their chiefs; and by the payment of fixed rents in place of arbitrary exactions, the land rose in value, and the population were less willing to engage in insurrections.

Religiously, a different situation held. At Elizabeth's death in 1603, Ireland was devoted to Rome. This was due mainly to the efforts of the Jesuits and friars, who instituted schools in nearly every town, and who preached tirelessly up and down the land, Under James I the situation does not seem to have improved, for Bishop Knox, in 1611 in Dublin, "found that congregations of several hundreds had been reduced to half a dozen, that the clergy of the Establishment, with few exceptions, were careless and inefficient, and that the Papal clergy were active and well supported."¹⁷

16 Quoted in Intro., Carew MSS., xii.

17 Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 98.

At the Hampton Court Conference the King proposed to send preachers into Ireland, but nothing was done to bring the Irish further into the Reformation until after 1607. At that time, some noblemen of the north left Ireland with their families, and left their estates to the king's disposal. With these lands the Ulster Plantation was undertaken by the City of London. It was the Scots who settled this province, transporting numerous colonies to the sister island. Most of these persons were of Presbyterian persuasion, and bringing their own preachers with them, they strongly established that Church in the north. As was to be expected, Episcopacy was not advanced by this settlement.

PART I

THE HISTORY OF THE ARTICLES

CHAPTER II

THE FORMATION OF THE ARTICLES.

In the year 1613 there was held in Ireland the first Parliament "which can be considered as anything like a representation of the various interests of the country."¹ The King had signified to Sir Arthur Chichester, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, about Michaelmas 1611, that such a Parliament should be held in that country "for the better settling and reforming of that State."² There had not been a Parliament held in Ireland for the previous twenty-eight years, the last one having been Perroth's Parliament in 1586.³ The principal objects in view were, first, legal sanction for the Uister settlement, and second, the general establishment of English law.⁴ However, there were but four bishops and four temporal peers alive who had served in the previous Parliament; and as a result, the law and practice of Parliament were almost forgotten.⁵ To deal with this problem, Bradley, the clerk of the proposed Lower House, was sent over to England to confer with officials in that

1 Killen, Eccles. Hist. of Ireland, I, 491.

2 Carew MSS., 280.

3 Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 108; Cox, Hist. of Ireland, Bk. II, 18.

4 Bagwell, I, 108.

5 Ibid.

country, and he returned with instructions in parliamentary procedure.⁶

In September 1612 the Lord Deputy published a proclamation of the intended Parliament, inviting the subjects "to exhibit their Grievances, and to consider of Proposals for the Publick Good, to be passed into Acts."⁷ Upon this, certain nobility of Ireland wrote to Chichester:

It pleased you this last summer to give some public notice of the King's pleasure touching a Parliament to be held in this kingdom, of which great joy was conceived by all, both because his affection to the good of this poor realm was thereby expressed, and relief for many grievances of the subjects expected.⁸

A Protestant majority was a necessity in order to carry out James' policy in Ireland, and the method decided upon to effect this was the creation of new constituencies, especially in Ulster, which had a large Protestant population.⁹ As a precautionary measure, Carew advised that every member of the House of Commons should take the oath of Supremacy, or be disqualified. But the King decided not to have the oath administered, choosing rather to rely on the new boroughs.¹⁰

Parliament met on 18 May 1613, but according to the best evidence, Convocation did not meet until 1615, or at the earliest, late in 1614.¹¹ Parliament assembled for the second time in October 1614,¹² so Convocation prob-

6 Ibid.

7 Cox, Hist. of Ireland, Bk. II, 18.

8 Carew MSS., 226.

9 Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 108.

10 Ibid, 110.

11 Elrington, Life of Ussher, 39.

12 Bagwell, I, 116.

ably met shortly after that date. However, some writers refer to Convocation as having met in the year 1613: e.g., Bagwell says: "The first regular Convocation of the Irish Church was held in connection with the Parliament of 1613, being summoned by the King's writ. It met in St. Patrick's Cathedral on May 24 of that year..."¹³ On the other hand, Cox asserts that Convocation was held the year that the Parliament was dissolved, which was 1615.¹⁴

Parr, following Bernard, says: "There was now a Parliament at Dublin, and so a Convocation of the clergy ..." ¹⁵; which seems to imply that there had been convocations held in Ireland previous to this time. Mant also takes this view, saying: "It should seem that the assembling of a convocation of the clergy was a customary accompaniment of the assembling of a Parliament in Ireland as well as in England."¹⁶ And Ware also: "A Parliament was held in Ireland, and according to custom, a convocation of the clergy."¹⁷ But Elrington maintains that this Convocation was the first of its kind held in Ireland; and he holds this view because of the proceedings of that body, which argued "novelty and imperfection".¹⁸ He is supported in his view by Killen.¹⁹ Elrington points out, that besides several other innovations, the only business recorded to

¹³ Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 227.

¹⁴ History of Ireland, Bk. II, 31.

¹⁵ Life of Ussher, 14; Bernard, Life of Ussher, 49.

¹⁶ Hist. of the Church of Ireland, I, 381.

¹⁷ Ware, Works, I, 103

¹⁸ Life of Ussher, 39.

¹⁹ Eccles. Hist. of Ireland, I, 492.

have been transacted, the formation of the Articles, was not concluded in proper form; for instead of being signed by all the members of Convocation, as was the practice in England, they were signed by Archbishop Jones, Speaker of the House in Convocation, and the Prolocutor of the House of the Clergy in their names.²⁰

Convocation consisted of the bishops and of representatives from the four provincial synods,²¹ and on the meeting of this body, Randolph Barlow, Chaplain to the Lord Deputy Chichester, was elected Prolocutor of the Lower House, and Thomas Jones, Archbishop of Dublin and Chancellor of Ireland, presided in the House of the Bishops.²² The main business of this Convocation was to pass the Irish Articles of religion;²³ for inasmuch as the Church of Ireland was a national body independent of that in England, it was deemed necessary to declare its faith formally.²⁴ The person who supposedly was assigned to the task of formulating the Articles was Dr. James Ussher, then Professor of Divinity at the University of Dublin.

James Ussher was born in the parish of Saint Nicholas, Dublin, on 4 January 1580, "an eminent New Year's gift to the benefit of the whole Church of God."²⁵ His father was Arnold Ussher, a clerk in the Court of

20 Life of Ussher, 39.

21 Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 227.

22 Elrington, 43.

23 Bagwell, Op. Cit., I, 227.

24 Reid, Hist. of Presbyterian Church in Ireland, I, 92.

25 Bernard, Life of Ussher, 19.

Chancery; and his mother was Margaret, daughter of James Stanihurst, a Master in Chancery, Recorder of Dublin, and Speaker of the Irish House of Commons in three successive parliaments. Ussher was taught to read by two blind aunts, who possessed amazing memories; and from them he received his first religious impressions. From his earliest years he devoted his attention to the "Book of Books".²⁶ Some years after her husband's death, Ussher's mother became a Roman Catholic.²⁷

From his ninth year to his fourteenth Ussher received his education from James Fullerton and James Hamilton, two men sent from Scotland by James VI in 1587 for the purpose of maintaining contact with influential Protestants in the city of Dublin. Fullerton had been a pupil of Andrew Melville at Glasgow University,²⁸ who, it is recorded, in the course of his lectures there, went through all the common heads of divinity, following the order of Calvin's "Institutes".²⁹

On 9 January 1593/4 Trinity College, Dublin, was first opened. Fullerton and Hamilton were appointed Fellows, and Ussher was admitted as a student under the tuition of the latter. His main interests were in the fields of history and chronology; but he also devoted much time to the study of polemical divinity, studying both Protestant and Roman Catholic writers. The study of

26 Elrington, 1, 2.

27 Ibid, 5, note h.

28 Ibid, 2-4.

29 Ibid, 5, note g.

Stapleton's "Fortress of the Faith", which was an attempt to establish the novelty of the Protestant Church as compared to the antiquity of the Romanist faith, led him to read through the entire works of the Fathers, a task which took him eighteen years to complete.³⁰

He took his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1597, and the Master of Arts in the year 1600, following which he was appointed a lecturer at Trinity College. He was also appointed Catechist to the College, and also the first Proctor.³¹ He was ordained in May 1602,³² being ordained both deacon and priest by his uncle, Henry Archbishop of Armagh, securing a special dispensation for want of canonical age.³³ About the year 1605 he was presented to the chancellorship of St. Patrick's Cathedral.³⁴

In 1607, Ussher took the degree of Bachelor of Divinity; whereupon he was appointed Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, where his principal lectures were taken up in answering the controversies of Bellarmine,³⁵ "the most learned and able disputant of the Romish Church."³⁶ He took his degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1612, reading two Latin treatises on, The seventy Weeks

30 Elrington, 5-9.

31 Ibid, 10, 14, 15.

32 Killen, I, 493, note 4. Elrington, 19, gives the date as being in 1601, but he is evidently wrong.

33 Elrington, 18, 19.

34 Ibid, 24.

35 Ibid, 26.

36 Ibid, 27.

of Daniel, and, The Reign of the Saints with Christ for a thousand years, Rev. xx. 4, "explaining these texts so misapplied by the millenarists both in elder and latter times."³⁷

In January 1620/1 Dr. Montgomery, Bishop of Meath, died, and the King named Dr. Ussher the new Bishop,³⁸ after which time Ussher resigned his Professorship of Divinity in the University of Dublin.³⁹ He succeeded to the Primacy of the Church of Ireland in March 1624/5, following the death of Archbishop Hampton.⁴⁰

Ussher was a rigid Calvinist at the time of the Convocation of 1615. There are several possible explanations for his holding these views. One reason given is, that it was a natural reaction from the Roman Catholic leanings of some members of his family.⁴¹ But according to Elrington, the greatest influence was exerted upon him during his years at Trinity College. He maintains that Lord Burleigh, Chancellor of the University of Dublin, and others of his party must have considered the new college "a proper refuge for Puritans who would not have been tolerated in any similar position in England." One of these was Mr. Travers, a Non-conformist, who was selected to be the first Provost of Trinity College.⁴² He was succeeded by Henry Alvey, a Fellow of St. John's College,

37 Ibid, 33.

38 Ibid, 52.

39 Ibid, 55.

40 Ibid, 67.

41 Carr, Life and Times of Archbishop Ussher, 62.

42 Elrington, 15-17.

Cambridge, who was connected with Cartwright and other "Puritans".

However, the most natural explanation to account for the "Calvinistic" views of Ussher, is the influence upon him in his formative years by the two Scots, Hamilton and Fullerton; and supplemented by his intense study, in later years, of the Fathers, especially St. Augustine, in which he had been engaged for fifteen years at the time that Convocation met. That he held views similar to those of Calvin is seen in his "History of Gotteschalculus",⁴³ a ninth-century Benedictine monk of Germany, whom Ussher defends as an Augustinian;⁴⁴ and also his "Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and British", in which he demonstrates that Sedulius and Claudius, two ancient Irish scholars, held predestinarian doctrine.⁴⁵

It is generally accepted that Ussher was the author of the Irish Articles. Bernard says of him: "he being then a Member of that Synod, was appointed to draw up those Articles."⁴⁶ Parr follows Bernard in saying the same.⁴⁷ And Heylin, a contemporary of Ussher, speaks of the Articles as having been "contrived" by him, so "that all the Sabbatarian and Calvinistic Rigours were declared therein to be the doctrine of that Church."⁴⁸ Elsewhere

43 Ibid, 126; Works, IV, 192 ff.

44 Carr, 202.

45 Elrington, 133; Works, IV, 235 ff.

46 Life of Ussher, 49.

47 Life of Ussher, 14.

48 Life of Laud, 271.

he refers to Ussher's "compiling the Articles of Ireland"; and in doing so, Ussher followed the Calvinists, or Contra-Remonstrants "point per point".⁴⁹

That Ussher was the author of the Articles is the opinion also of Elrington, although he questions whether he were formally appointed to the task of drawing them up.⁵⁰ He says: "he must have had the principal share in their formation from his high character, and from the situation he held as Professor of Divinity in the University."⁵¹ And he gives as another reason, that "there is not anything contained in the Articles, which is not in strict conformity with the opinions he entertained at that period of his life."⁵²

Carte, also, ascribes the authorship to Ussher, "who having not yet got over the tincture he received in his first studies from the modern authority of foreign Divines, inserted in it... the Lambeth Articles."⁵³ Bishop Mant likewise complains of the practice of "studying divinity in the systems of modern divines, instead of learning the true doctrines of Christianity, and the real sense of Scripture in difficult or controverted passages, by having recourse to the guidance of the Primitive Church and the writings of the early fathers."⁵⁴ But this is an unwarranted criticism against Ussher, for he had, by that

49 Respondet Petrus, 134.

50 Life of Ussher, 43.

51 Ibid, 44.

52 Ibid.

53 Life of Ormonde, 77.

54 Hist. of the Church of Ireland, I, 384.

date, mastered the writings of the Fathers.

James Tyrrell, Ussher's grandson, comes to the defence of Ussher in answering Heylin, who had asserted that Ussher differed from the Church of England in seven different points of doctrine, as determined by the doctrine contained in the Articles which Ussher had formulated.⁵⁵ Tyrrell argues, that because Ussher was not a bishop at that time, and only a Professor of Divinity in the University, he could not have been influential in determining the doctrine of the Church of Ireland. To use his words: "that the scribe of any synod or council should make it pass what Acts or Articles he pleases; or that one private Divine should be able to manage the whole Church of Ireland."⁵⁶

The basis of Tyrrell's argument is, that all Articles are first debated, then proposed by question by the President and Prolocutor of either House, after which they are drawn into form, and then put into Latin by some one appointed for that task.⁵⁷ But this was the first Convocation in Ireland, and, as has already been pointed out, everything was not done in proper order. According to Tyrrell, Ussher was nothing more than the scribe of the House, and thus he could not be held personally responsible for the doctrine expressed in the Articles. However,

55 Heylin, Respondet Petrus, 96 ff.

56 A Vindication of the Opinions of Ussher, Works, I, App. VII, clxxxī.

57 Ibid.

Tyrrell stands alone in suggesting this view; and a study of Ussher's writings lends it no support, for nothing is asserted in the Articles that is contradicted by Ussher elsewhere.

In 1566 the Eleven Articles of 1559 were adopted "verbatim" by the Church of Ireland "by order and authority as well of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Sidney, General Deputy, as by the Archbishop and Bishops, and others her Majesty's High Commissioners for causes Ecclesiastical in the same realm."⁵⁸ They were entitled: "A Breve Declaration of Certain Principall Articles of Religion";⁵⁹ and they are twelve in number, article Eleven of the English set having been divided into two articles.

It does not appear as though the Thirty-nine Articles had been accepted by the Church of Ireland, in spite of a statement made by Ussher which points to the contrary. In a sermon preached before Parliament in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, 18 February 1620, he declared:

We all agree that the Scriptures of God are the perfect rule of our faith: we all consent in the main grounds of religion drawn from thence: we all subscribe to the Articles of doctrine agreed upon in the synod of the year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true religion...⁶⁰

Mant concludes from Ussher's statement, that the

58 Hardwick, History of the Articles, 121.

59 Works, I, App. III, xxi ff.

60 Works, II, 421.

Irish clergy subscribed to the English Articles;⁶¹ but Elrington suggests, that "he might have used them in a general sense as merely expressive of assent";⁶² and necessarily so, "for many of the persons he addressed had never subscribed the Articles."⁶³ Ussher may have meant, too, that he himself had subscribed them voluntarily. Besides, he was addressing an English Parliament, and not an Irish one, so he would not have been implicating any of the Irish clergy. Elrington also argues, that inasmuch as the Book of Articles received by the Church of Ireland in 1566 was copied (verbatim) from the Eleven Articles of 1559 of the Church of England; and, that as that formulary was designed to supply the want of an authorized confession in England, the probability was, that there was also a corresponding want in Ireland.⁶⁴

There was evidently a need felt among the clergy in Ireland for a confession of faith of their own. Why they desired to have their own confession, and were loath to accept the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, has been explained in various ways. Mant believes, that the strongest motive was, by incorporating the Lambeth Articles into their own, to make their Church closer to Geneva in doctrine.⁶⁵ Hardwick maintains, that the Irish clergy must have felt that the English Articles, in some respects,

61 Hist. of the Church of Ireland, I, 382.

62 Life of Ussher, 43.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid., 42.

65 History, I, 383.

fell short of the teachings of Calvin.⁶⁶ But he adds: "It is not unlikely that the want of some minuter test than the Eleven Articles of Archbishop Parker was one of the reasons which operated in the mind of the Irish prelates when they consented, in 1615, to the compilation of the longer series."⁶⁷

But a "more questionable agency" was working among the divines in the Church of Ireland. This was the rigorous Calvinistic spirit, which, while strong in England, was "even stronger at this period in the whole of the neighbouring Kingdom."⁶⁸ Elrington also is of this opinion.⁶⁹

Reid says, that some of the clergy proposed to adopt the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, "but the majority conceived it more consistent with the character and independence of their national Church, to frame a new confession of their own."⁷⁰ But he believes that this was only "the ostensible reason" for this action, and that the real reason was "most probably a secret dislike to many of the English Articles."⁷¹

Heylin went so far as to say, that "the passing of the Irish Articles was an absolute plot of the Sabbatarians and Calvinians in England to make themselves so

66 History of the Articles, 205.

67 Ibid, 175.

68 Ibid.

69 Life of Ussher, 45.

70 Hist. of Presbyterian Church in Ireland, I, 93.

71 Ibid.

strong a party in Ireland, as to obtain what they pleased in this convocation."⁷² But Parr disagrees with this writer, saying:

I cannot be of the opinion of that author... unless he will suppose that the Bishops and Clergy of that Church, could be so inveigled by I know not what Inchantments, as to pass those things for Articles of their Belief, which they had never so much as studied nor understood the true meaning of: and that the then Lord Deputy and King James, were likewise drawn in to be of the Plot, to sign and confirm those Articles, which they knew to be heterodox to the Doctrine, and Articles of the Church of England.⁷³

Elrington thinks that Heylin "may have gone too far" in saying what he did; but, he adds, "certainly they were framed with a strong desire to conciliate the Nonconformists, and an utter disregard of the proceedings in England, which must have been fresh in the recollection of the compilers."⁷⁴ Another, and the most plausible view, is, that they were framed for the purpose of compromising the differences between the High-Churchmen and the Nonconformists.⁷⁵

The disparity of viewpoints between Anglican and Nonconformist is seen quite clearly in regard to the reasons given for the existence in Ireland of the men responsible for influencing the formation of the Irish Articles. The Anglican view is, that the English Government

72 Respondet Petrus, 87; quoted in Elrington, 46.

73 Life of Ussher, 15.

74 Life of Ussher, 46-7.

75 Reid, I, 94.

was guilty of "unjustifiable conduct... in their selection of persons for the high offices of the Church".⁷⁶ The Nonconformist opinion is expressed by Reid, who says, that because of the "extravagant claims" of the Anglican hierarchy, the Nonconformists had been obliged to leave the Kingdom. "Many of them fled to Ireland, and were advanced to influential situations, both in the university and the church; for provided they were removed out of England and Scotland... James cared little for their existence and influence in this remote and turbulent country."⁷⁷

The effect which these Articles had upon Church and religious life, both in England and Ireland, was mixed. Carte says: "Several of them gave great offence to the Roman Catholics, and hindered their conversion; and others of them gave as much encouragement to the Puritans brought out of Scotland into Ulster; and both made their advantage of them to the prejudice of the Church of Ireland."⁷⁸ That the adoption of these Articles by the Church of Ireland was an inducement for Scottish ministers to settle in Ireland, is also the opinion of Killen⁷⁹ and Reid.⁸⁰ Heylin avers, that the acceptance of the Articles caused "a great matter of division" to the Romanists, "that in three Kingdoms, under the obedience of One Sovereign Prince, there should be three distinct and contrary Pro-

76 Elrington, 43.

77 Hist. of Presbyterian Church in Ireland, I, 94.

78 Life of Ormonde, I, 78 (page misprinted)

79 Eccles. Hist. of Ireland, I, 495.

80 Op. Cit., I, 96.

fessions, and yet pretending every one to the same religion."⁸¹

The sanction given to the Irish Articles by King James, in spite of the fact that he differed with some of the articles, causes a question as to his motives for doing so. Collier gives several probable reasons which may have induced him to lend them his authority. The first is, that Archbishop Abbot and Bishop Montague, men who had formerly defended most of the opinions expressed in the Articles, were influential in Church affairs at James' court.⁸² It was said of the latter of these two men, that he had "cunningly fashioned King James unto certain Calvinian opinions, to which the King's education in the Kirk of Scotland had before inclined him."⁸³

The second reason which Collier gives, is, that the King took part with the Prince of Orange against Barneveldt and the Remonstrants; and to remain consistent, he sanctioned the Irish Articles, which contained the same doctrine as that promulgated in Holland.⁸⁴ Thirdly, James made a practice of "playing both ends against the middle"; which practice was especially true in regard to the Puritans and the Romanists, so that they might act as a check upon each other, and thus advance the English Reformation and the Established Church.⁸⁵ Elrington says, that the

81 Life of Laud, Bk. II, 271.

82 Eccles. Hist. of Great Britain, VII, 385.

83 Elrington, 48; quoted from Wood, Athenae, II, 854.

84 Op. Cit., VII, 385.

85 Ibid.

Lord Deputy Chichester, who had studied under "the notorious Puritan Cartwright" at Cambridge, also helped to influence James.⁸⁶ And finally it may be said, that James wanted to please the Scottish settlers in Ulster, who were instrumental in maintaining "the balance of power" against the Roman Catholic natives.⁸⁷

The Articles are introduced by these words: "Agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Clergy of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin in the year of our Lord God 1615, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true religion."⁸⁸ And they clearly define the doctrine by which the Church of Ireland was at that time regulated.⁸⁹

These Articles are of a "long and discursive" nature.⁹⁰ The formulary is divided into one-hundred and four articles or paragraphs, which are, in turn, arranged under nineteen sections. In the original edition, printed in 1615, the individual articles are numbered from one to one-hundred and four, but the general headings are not numbered.⁹¹ The nineteen doctrinal headings are as follows:

1. Of the Holy Scripture and the three Creeds.
2. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

86 Life of Ussher, 48.

87 Ibid.

88 Works, I, App. IV, xxxi.

89 Reid, 93.

90 Hardwick, 176.

91 A copy of the original edition is printed in Works, I, App. IV.

3. Of God's Eternal Decree, and Predestination.
4. Of the Creation and Government of all things.
5. Of the Fall of Man, Original Sin, and the State of Man before Justification.
6. Of Christ, the Mediator of the second Covenant.
7. Of the Communicating of the grace of Christ.
8. Of Justification and Faith.
9. Of Sanctification and Good Works.
10. Of the Service of God.
11. Of the Civil Magistrate.
12. Of our duty towards our Neighbours.
13. Of the Church, and outward Ministry of the Gospel.
14. Of the authority of the Church, General Councils, and Bishop of Rome.
15. Of the State of the Old and New Testament.
16. Of the Sacraments of the New Testament.
17. Of Baptism.
18. Of the Lord's Supper.
19. Of the state of the souls of Men, after they be departed out of this life: together with the general Resurrection, and the last Judgment.

The formulary has several outstanding characteristics; and as Leland says, "so large a formulary could not but contain several minute decisions, and even dangerous expositions of what is generally revealed in the Scriptures."⁹²

Some of the articles are of a more discursive character than usually belong to confessions of faith.⁹³ Such are the seventh, Of Justification and Faith; the tenth, Of the Service of God; and the twelfth, Of our duty towards our Neighbours. The Articles are strongly Calvinistic; and one (article 80) asserts that the Pope is "the man of sin", or Antichrist. Others deal with speculative questions, such as the fall of angels, and the original state of man.⁹⁴ Another (article 9), unique in Church confessions, asserts the mode of the generation of the Son from the Father; while another (56) asserts the morality of the Sabbath.⁹⁵ But the greatest objection taken to the Articles was the introduction into them of the Lambeth Articles; these Articles are dispersed throughout the Irish formulary.⁹⁶

Mant says, that a notice prefixed to the Irish Articles had stated that they contain the Nine Articles agreed on at Lambeth, and that "each of these Lambeth Articles, and its respective number, are pointed at by an index in the margin."⁹⁷ But Elrington declares that he is mistaken, for "in the original edition published in Dublin in 1615, there is no allusion whatever to the Lambeth Articles, no notice prefixed, no index in the margin."⁹⁸ Mant

93 Mant, I, 385.

94 Hardwick, 177.

95 Mant, I, 386, note 5.

96 Hardwick, 177.

97 Hist. of the Church of Ireland, I, 383-4.

98 Life of Ussher, 44, note f.

must have been referring to the edition of 1629, published in London, or a copy of them appended to Neal's History of the Puritans; in which editions there appears the notice which Mant mentions, and also an index in the margin pointing out the words in the Lambeth Articles.⁹⁹

The general order of the doctrinal headings has a marked similarity to that which Calvin follows in his "Institutes of the Christian Religion"; and because of this, it may be concluded that Ussher followed Calvin's order. Fifteen of the nineteen headings are in the same sequence as the "Institutes", while the order of the remaining four subjects has been changed. These four are as follows: first, chapter Three, Of Predestination, which is found in Book Three of the "Institutes", is here found immediately after the chapter, Of the Holy Trinity, which in the "Institutes" would be found in Book One. Secondly, chapter Eleven, Of the Civil Magistrate, which in the "Institutes" is located at the close of Book Four, is in the Irish Articles in a position following the chapter, Of the Service of God, which would correspond to a place in Book Three of Calvin's work. Thirdly, chapter Fifteen, Of the state of the Old and New Testament, which appears in the Articles between the sections, Of the Church, and, Of the Sacraments, is found in the "Institutes" in Book Two, between the Fall of Man and the Mediator. Fourthly, and finally, chapter Nineteen, dealing with the resurrection

99 Ibid; Neal, III, 506 ff.

and last things, which is the closing section of the Articles, in the "Institutes" follows the chapter on Predestination, and is the final chapter of Book Three.

The Articles have been drawn from various sources, but mainly from earlier formularies of the Church of England: viz., the Thirty-nine Articles, the Lambeth Articles, the Eleven Articles of 1559 (otherwise the twelve articles of the Church of Ireland of 1566), the two Books of Homilies, and the Anglican Catechism. Some phraseology also has been taken from a few of the Continental confessions of faith, but in comparison to the native sources, the amount is negligible.

The minute comparison of the individual articles with their sources will be made below in Part II; but a summary of the Articles and their sources will be given here. The Thirty-nine Articles have been incorporated into those of the Church of Ireland almost in toto. The only ones omitted were articles Thirty-five and Thirty-six, the former dealing with the Homilies of the Church of England, and the latter with the Book of the consecration of bishops and ministers. Also omitted were parts of articles Twenty and Thirty-four, the former asserting the power of the Church, and the latter dealing with the traditions of the Church.

The Nine Articles of Lambeth have been incorporated into the Irish Articles in their entirety, although the

order of the words is frequently changed, and the phraseology is sometimes altered. The third chapter, Of God's Eternal Decree, and Predestination, contains the first four of the Lambeth group. The eighth section, Of Justification and Faith, incorporates numbers Five and Six of the earlier formulary; while the seventh, eighth, and ninth of the Lambeth Articles are found in the seventh section of the Irish Articles, Of the communicating of the grace of Christ.

The Irish Articles make use of seven of the Twelve Articles of 1566 of the Church of Ireland. Articles Three and Four of the latter are incorporated into the section, Of the Church and the outward ministry of the Gospel; article Six is found in the section, Of the authority of the Church; article Eight is found in the section, Of Baptism; articles Nine and Ten are contained in the section, Of the Lord's Supper; and part of article Eleven finds a place in the section, Of the service of God.

The Anglican Catechism contributes towards two of the articles of the Irish formulary. These two are articles Forty-six and Sixty-three; the former, Of our duty towards God, and the latter, Of our duty towards our Neighbours.

The First and Second Books of Homilies have made a substantial contribution towards the formation of the

Irish Articles. Four homilies from the first book, and five from the second book have been used. Article Five has been taken from the Homily of Holy Scripture; articles One and Eighty-two have their source in the Homily of Faith. Four articles in the section, Of Justification and Faith, viz., Thirty-four, Thirty-five, Thirty-six, and Thirty-seven, have been taken, either partly or entirely, from the Homily of Salvation; while article Forty-two has its source in the Homily of Good Works.

Almost the entire section, Of the service of God, is made up of excerpts from four homilies of the second book. Article Forty-seven is taken from the Homily concerning Prayer; article Forty-eight is found in the Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments; articles Forty-nine, Fifty, Fifty-one, and Fifty-four, in their entirety, are taken from the Homily of Fasting. All of article Fifty-six comes from the Homily on Time and Place of Prayer. And finally, articles Fifty-nine and Sixty, both in the section, Of the Civil Magistrate, are found in the Homily against Wilful Rebellion.

Thus, it can not be said that the Irish Articles are an original work, since it is so clearly of a composite nature. On the other hand, no record can be found of any claim of originality ever having been made for the Articles.

CHAPTER III

THE AUTHORITY OF THE ARTICLES.

1. Authority during the period 1615-1634.

The decree appended to the Irish Articles by the Synod of 1615 reads as follows:

If any minister, of what degree or qualitie soeuer he be, shall publikely teach any doctrine contrary to these Articles agreed upon, If, after due admonition, he doe not conforme himselfe, and cease to disturbe the peace of the Church, let him bee silenced, and depriued of all spirituall promotions he doth enjoy.¹

According to Archdeacon Stöpford, this was the only canon made in that convocation;² and about this canon there are two things which should be noted: first, what it claims for the Articles; and secondly, what it does not claim.

In regard to the first, the claim is made, that if any minister in the Church of Ireland teaches in public any doctrine contrary to that contained in the Articles, he shall be "silenced". Thus, the Articles may be said to have had a negative force in preventing any contrary, and especially Arminian, doctrine from being promulgated from the pulpit. Because of this negative emphasis, it has been

1 Works, I, App. IV, 1.

2 Intro., MS. Irish Prayer Book, III, lix.

argued by Hardwick that they were intended to be articles of "discipline and peace" rather than positive articles of faith.³ And there is an instance recorded of a threat of their being invoked for this purpose, for Ussher writes to an anonymous friend, 8 Dec. 1626:

It is reported unto me by some who are well acquainted with the course of your ministry, that you trouble the Church with certain unsound opinions touching predestination, free-will, falling from grace, and some other points, which are repugnant both to Scriptures, and to the Articles agreed upon by the Convocation held at the time of the last Parliament.⁴

Concerning the second, the decree does not entail subscription to the Articles, such as was required for the Thirty-nine Articles in the Church of England. Because of the lack of such subscription, it may, and has, been argued, that the Articles possessed no official authority in the Church of Ireland during the period under discussion. This argument is possible only because there is nothing to show whether they were originally offered to the clergy for subscription, or whether at any future time during the Convocation of 1615 an authorization was made to demand subscription from the clergy.

William Maskell, the Vicar of St. Mary's Church near Torquay, and a member of the High-Church party in the Church of England, in the year 1850, argued that the Church of Ireland, because of its original acceptance of the Irish

³ History of the Articles, 179-80.

⁴ Works, XVI, 439.

Articles, was in heresy; and because the Church of England was in union with the Church of Ireland, she too was guilty of heresy. In the course of his argument, he affirms that the Church of Ireland "had obliged its clergy to subscribe and to accept articles of faith"⁵, which articles differed from the Articles of England, and were heretical. But he offers no evidence for his assertion.

It is true that individual bishops may have exacted subscription from the men under their jurisdiction. Dean Bernard, Ussher's biographer, cites an instance in which Bishop Bedell examined a Fellow of the College of Dublin, Mr. Thomas Price (later Archbishop of Cashel), "in each or most of the Articles", adding, that he himself was present at the examination.⁶ And Ussher's grandson, James Tyrrell, in his reference to "An Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge", a book written by the Lord Primate while he was still a bishop, refers to Ussher as having subscribed to the Articles of the Church of Ireland "alone", which he "was bound to maintain".⁷ The use of this language indicates that it was more than a voluntary subscription on Ussher's part; and if such a subscription were demanded of him, why not of the other clergy in that Church? However, Hardwick claims, that if bishops demanded such subscription to the Articles, they were "overstretching the

5 Second Letter on Irish Articles, 23.

6 Quoted in Bramhall's Works, V, 81, note p.

7 A Vindication of Ussher's Opinions, Works, I, App. VII, clx.

authority conceded to them by the synod", because of the decree appended to the Articles, in which "no wish is manifested to impose those Articles 'absolutely' on the Church of Ireland, either by the agency of subscription or by any other apparatus."⁸

It is almost impossible to determine the exact status of the Articles during this period, due to the official proceedings of the Convocation of 1615 having been lost.⁹ Dean Bernard gives the fullest statement on the subject when he says, referring to Ussher:

Whereas some have doubted whether they were fully established as the Articles of Ireland, I can testify that I heard him say, that in the fore-named year 1615 he saw them signed by Archbishop Jones then Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and Speaker of the House of the Bishops in Convocation, signed by the Prolocutor of the House of the Clergy in their names, and also signed by the then Lord Deputy Chichester by order from King James in his name.¹⁰

But Archdeacon Stopford, referring to the prolocutor signing for the House of the Clergy, says that this "could only have been for the ratification of the decree; it could not have been a personal profession of belief, including a dissentient minority."¹¹ He also discredits Bernard's testimony by impugning his character; he says of him:

8 History of the Articles, 179.

9 Stopford declares, that "the Convocation of 1703 state that 'they have with the utmost care and diligence searched into all the remains of Convocations now left in this kingdom', and they could find none earlier than 1639." Intro., MS. Irish Prayer Book, III, xcii.

10 Life of Ussher, 50.

11 Op. Cit., lx.

who, from corrupt and personal motives, and relying on his influence with Ussher, had the face to resist the reforming of pluralities... Next, we meet the Dean as Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell; and again, after the Restoration, a beneficed Clergyman in the Church of England. As an historian, we find him guilty of gross suppression of truth and distortion of fact...¹²

Other evidence may be produced, however, to substantiate Bernard's statement that the Lord Deputy Chichester signed in the name of King James. First, in a speech of the King on 20 April 1614, concerning the miscarriage of certain recusant Lords of the Irish Parliament, he says: "... you would have a visible body head of the Church over all the earth, and acknowledge a temporal head under Christ. Ye may likewise acknowledge my Viceroy or Deputy in Ireland."¹³ According to this statement, it is evident that Chichester had supreme authority to act in the King's name.

Also, Dr. Heylin, an anti-Calvinist and an admirer of Archbishop Laud, and also his biographer, complains, that "when the Sabbath quarrels were revived, and the Arminian controversies in agitation, no argument was more hotly prest by those of the Puritan faction, than the authority of these Articles, and the infallible judgment of King James to confirm the same."¹⁴ This statement implies, that in the years immediately following 1615, it was common knowledge that King James had authorized his Deputy to sign in his name. Just because Bernard's statement did not appear until 1656,

¹² Ibid, xciii.
¹³ Calendar of Carew MSS. 289.
¹⁴ Respondet Petrus, 87.

it is quite gratuitous to regard it as an isolated testimony without foundation in fact. Bernard may have been vacillating in his allegiance to the "powers that be", but such a fact does not vitiate any and every assertion he might make. That King James probably did make such an authorization is suggested by his sympathy with the predestinarian doctrine, and in his sending four official representatives to the Synod of Dort in 1619.

Bramhall, who at the time of the following convocation (1634) was Bishop of Derry, in referring to Bernard's statement regarding Mr. Price being examined in the Irish Articles, says: "for then they were in force and authority; then the English Articles were not yet introduced into Ireland."¹⁵ That Bramhall recognized such an authority in the Irish Articles is noteworthy, for, inasmuch as he was a leading figure in getting the Thirty-nine Articles introduced into the Church of Ireland, he would be in a position to know the status of the Articles of Ireland at that particular time.

Vesey, in his Life of Bramhall, relates a discussion which took place in the Convocation of 1634. Someone remarked, that "the Articles of this Church passed in Convocation and confirmed by King James, Anno 1615" should be confirmed and strengthened "by the authority of this present synod." To which Bramhall replied that he did not

15 Bramhall's Works, V, 81-2.

know what was meant by the confirmation of the Articles of 1615, and "wished the propounder to consider, whether such an act would not instead of ratifying what was desired, rather tend to the diminution of that authority by which they were enacted, and seem to question the value of that synod." And he added, that the Synod of 1634 had no more power than the one of 1615, and thus could not give any more authority to the Articles than the previous one.¹⁶

Elrington declares, that Bernard's statement is insufficient to prove that the Irish Articles were fully sanctioned; he gives as his reason, that "it does not appear that they ever were submitted to Parliament." And he observes, that "without that sanction they could not be legally enforced."¹⁷ This seems to be in accord with all the extant evidence.

That Ussher himself regarded the Irish Articles as less than fully authoritative may be argued from a speech made by him in 1622 against certain officers who had refused

16 Life of Bramhall, xviii. However, this account which Vesey gives is to be questioned for various reasons: first, because Mr. Price, his source, was Archdeacon of Kilmore at the time of the Convocation of 1634, and therefore a member of the Lower House; and the possibility of his knowing the transactions of the House of the Bishops was small; secondly, because it doesn't agree with Strafford's explicit testimony as seen in his letter to Laud of 16 Dec. 1634; and thirdly, because "the acts of a council might be approved and confirmed by a succeeding one, without impairing the authority of either the one or the other." Elrington, Life of Ussher, Works, I, 175.

17 Works, I, 49.

to take the oath of supremacy. Ussher, at that time Bishop of Meath, refers as his authority to the thirty-seventh article of "the Book of Articles agreed upon in the Convocation holden in London in 1562." He says:

If it be here objected that the authority of Convocation is not a sufficient ground for the exposition of that which was enacted in Parliament; I answer that these Articles stand confirmed, not only by the Royal assent of the Prince (for the establishing of whose supremacy the oath was framed), but also by a special act of Parliament, 13 Eliz. c. 12.¹⁸

Elrington draws from this speech a "curious proof ... that the Irish Articles never were fully sanctioned." He says: "Now he might have quoted the very same words from the Irish Articles, and it would have been more suited to his subject to have done so, if he had not been impeded by the want of sanction to the Irish Articles which the English possessed."¹⁹

2. Proceedings of Convocation of 1634.

Whatever was the status of the Irish Articles during the period 1615-1634, it is fairly well agreed among historians, that after the latter date they lost whatever authority they had possessed. But to come to this conclusion, it is necessary first to inquire into the proceedings of the Convocation of 1634.

18 Works, II, 459; quoted in Works I, 61, note e.

19 Works, I, 61, note e.

On the fourteenth of July, 1634, the Parliament met in Dublin, and "in great state proceeded with the Lord Deputy to Saint Patrick's Cathedral, where the Archbishop of Armagh preached before them."²⁰ At the Convocation, which was called to meet upon the twenty-first of the same month,²¹ Dean Lesley was chosen Prolocutor of the Lower House, or the House of the Clergy,²² and Ussher, being Primate of Ireland, was President of the Convocation. Nothing much was done in Convocation during the first short session of Parliament; but when it reassembled in November of that year, it was incumbent upon Convocation to establish canons for the Church of Ireland, which included the Articles of Religion.²³

Before going into the question of the convocation proceedings, a few words should be said in regard to three of the leading characters involved in the transactions of the Church of Ireland. The first of these was Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Strafford, who was appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland 12 January, 1632, although he did not arrive in Ireland until the twenty-third of July of the following year.²⁴ Wentworth's first aim in his new position was to strengthen the power and influence of the Established Church, for the Church was a powerful weapon

20 Ibid, 166.

21 Wilkins, Concilia, IV, 496.

22 Works, I, 166.

23 Ibid, 168, 170.

24 Dict. of National Biography, LX, 273.

in combatting foreign hostile influences. As has been said: "For the Deputy, as for many men of his time, religion was an affair of State... The English Church was for him one of the chief supports of the English Throne."²⁵ And Bagwell says: "a close union between Church and State formed a necessary part of Wentworth's political system", and "he hated sectaries, though he does not seem to have had any very strong theological bias."²⁶ Thus, it was only natural for Strafford to show determination to bring the Church of Ireland into the closest possible connection with the Church of England. In this policy he was supported by Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, with whom he had been in correspondence about Irish affairs even before he left England to assume his duties in the sister Island. In one of these letters, Laud had advised Wentworth to "go thorough"²⁷, which he accordingly did.

The united policy of Laud and Wentworth has been described in these words:

25 Intro., Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1633-47, xvi.

26 Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 192. A Roman Catholic writer says of him: "the Viceroy is a stern man, and desirous of maintaining peace amongst us, not through any affection which he bears ourselves, but because the laity are always... agitated by our dissensions.... As soon as the Parliament... will have closed its sessions, we will see an exercise of authority which will not be pleasing to everyone." Bishop of Ferns to Secretary of Propaganda, 15 Nov. 1634. Moran: Spicilegium Ossoriense, 199.

27 Laud: Works, VII, 77. This expression, as used in this case, has been defined as: "... founded on a complete disregard of private interests, with a view to the establishment, for the good of the whole community, of the royal power as the embodiment of the State." Dict. of National Biography, LX, 273.

With the succession of Laud the Church became strict, active, and militant. The power of the State was to be used to stamp out dissent wherever it could be found...

Wentworth's and Laud's ecclesiastical views in Ireland could be carried into effect without in any way imperilling the success of Wentworth's political task. Conversely, the Church, if fortified and disciplined as Laud wished, could not but be a great support to the State.²⁸

The remaining character was John Bramhall, who had gone to Ireland in July 1633 as Wentworth's Chaplain. He became Archdeacon of Meath soon afterwards, and on 16 May, 1634, was consecrated Bishop of Derry.²⁹ Bramhall was "the most trusted of Laud's agents, a man whose heart and soul were in the defence and extension of the power of the Crown and Church."³⁰

The first item on the agenda of Laud and Strafford was the imposing of the Thirty-nine Articles upon the Church of Ireland, which implied the setting aside of the Articles of the Church of Ireland. Although the primary reason for effecting this change in doctrinal standards may be said to have been the policy of Strafford, there seems also to have been other factors involved. One of these factors was the increase of Arminianism in the Church of England; and since the Irish Articles were decidedly more strongly Calvinistic than the Thirty-nine Articles, it was only natural that under this influence a change

28 Intro., Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1633-47, xvi.

29 Dict. of National Biog., VI, 203-4.

30 Intro., Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1633-47, xvii.

would be desired. Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, writing in 1630 to Dr. Ward, one of the four English Commissioners to the Synod of Dort, says: "I am sorry that Arminianism finds such favour in the Low-Countries, and amongst ourselves."³¹ And Professor George Park Fisher declares, that at the time of the Lambeth Articles (1595), "dissent from Calvinism had begun to manifest itself; and gradually the Arminian doctrine spread in England until during the next reign, it became prevalent in the Established Church."³²

Another factor contributing towards the change in doctrinal standards, if we are to believe the testimony of Carte, was the influence of King Charles I. This writer says:

The King, who had the honour and interest of religion and the Church of England more truly at heart than any prince that ever sat upon the throne, had given the Lord Deputy particular orders to use his utmost endeavors for the service of both; and particularly to bring the Kingdom of Ireland to a conformity in worship, doctrine, and discipline with the Church of England.³³

But the influence of Bramhall contributed as much as any other single factor to impose the English Articles on the Church of Ireland. In a letter to Laud, who was then Bishop of London, 10 August, 1633, he writes:

... I doubt very much whether the clergy be very orthodox, and could wish both the Articles and Canons of the Church of England were established here by Act of Parliament, or State; that as we live all under one king, so we might both in doctrine and discipline

31 Works, XV, 520.

32 The Reformation, 339.

33 Life of James, Duke of Ormonde, 68.



observe an uniformity.³⁴

Bramhall's ideal was to have as broad a basis as possible in the Church, so "that those nicer accuracies, that divide the greatest wits in the world, might not be made the characteristics of reformation, and give occasion to one party to excommunicate and censure another."³⁵

According to a letter of Strafford's to Laud of 23 August, 1634, Archbishop Ussher was causing the Lord Deputy some difficulty in regard to the Irish Articles. He writes:

It is true, my Lord Primate seemed to disallow these Articles of Ireland, but when it comes to the upshot, I can not find he doth it so absolutely as I expected; some little trouble there hath been in it, and we are all bound not to advertise it over, hoping amongst ourselves to reconcile it. But this will I promise your Lordship, that unless I can carry it so as to have the Articles of England received in 'ipsissimis verbis', leaving the other as no ways concerned in the state they now are, either affirmed or disaffirmed, you shall hear from me roundly, and have the whole matter...³⁶

The contents of this letter reveals Strafford's determination to impose the Thirty-nine Articles on the Church of Ireland, and also, that he was confident in his ability to do so, in spite of the Primate's opposition. Laud, in answering this letter, says:

I knew how you would find my Lord Primate affected to the Articles of Ireland; but I am glad the trouble that hath been in it will end there without advertising of it over to us. And whereas you propose to have the Articles of England received in 'ipsissimis verbis', and leave the other as no way concerned, neither

34 Bramhall's Works, I, lxxx.

35 Vesey: Life of Bramhall, ix.

36 Strafford Letters, I, 298.

affirmed nor denied, you are certainly in the right, and so says the king (to whom I imparted it) as well as I; go, hold close, and you will do a great service in it.³⁷

All that had taken place before the meeting of Convocation between Strafford and Ussher concerning the Articles of Ireland can not be determined because of several letters having been lost; but a hint as to what did take place is given by Strafford in his letter to Laud of 16 December, 1634, in which he says:

In a former letter of mine I mentioned a way propounded by my Lord Primate, how to bring upon this clergy the Articles of England, and silence those of Ireland, without noise, as it were 'aliud agens', which he was confident would pass amongst them.

In my last I related unto you how his Grace grew fearful he should not be able to effect it, which awakened me, that had rested hitherto secure upon that belief so long, as had I not bestirred myself ... I had been fatally surprised to my extreme grief for as many days as I have to live.³⁸

According to this letter, it was the Lord Primate who "propounded" a plan for introducing the English Articles into the Church of Ireland, and "silencing" those of his own Church. But such an action on the part of Ussher seems incongruous with his intentions; for it must be remembered, that Ussher himself has been credited with the drawing up of those same Articles. Thus, according to this reading, it was natural to conclude, as Elrington did: "we are at a loss to ascertain what was the Primate's plan, or to discover the reasons which influenced him to despair of

37 Letter of 20 October, 1634, Ibid, 329.

38 Ibid, 342.

carrying it."³⁹

However, Archdeacon Stopford offers a solution to the problem. He points out, that if Strafford's printed letter be correct, Ussher could most certainly be charged with deliberate deception, since the plan proposed in that "former letter" was the one which the Lord Deputy afterwards put into effect. And if this particular plan had originally been propounded by the Primate, and then after it had been effected, he had assured his friend, Dr. Ward, that the Irish Articles were "let stand as they did before", he would have been guilty of a great deception. Stopford declares that he has "found evidence which entirely clears his honored name from such a stain". This evidence is a manuscript copy of Strafford's printed letter to Laud (found in MSS. Library of Trinity College, Dublin), which reads as follows: "In a former letter I mentioned a way propounded 'to' (not 'by') my Lord Primate how to bring upon their clergy the Articles of England, and silence those of Ireland, etc." This reading is confirmed by Laud's reply, as has already been stated, viz., "I knew how you would find my Lord Primate affected to the Articles of Ireland: but I am glad the trouble that hath been in it will end there, etc." Thus, Stopford concludes, "Ussher did no more than say that he thought such a Canon could be passed, but it is evident that he never liked it."⁴⁰

39 Life of Ussher, Works, I, 167.

40 Intro., MS. Irish Prayer Book, III, civ-v. This MS. copy, and the others mentioned in this chapter, have been examined personally by me in Trinity College Library, Dublin.

Strafford was so engrossed in the affairs of Parliament that he neglected the proceedings in Convocation for several days, resting his confidence in the Lord Primate. And when he did turn to the affairs of the clergy, he received a great surprise, to his dismay, as he writes to Laud:

The Lower-House of Convocation had appointed a select committee to consider the Canons of the Church of England, that they did proceed in the examination without conferring at all with the Bishops, that they had gone through the Book of Canons, and noted in the margin such as they allowed with an A, and on others they had entered a D which stood for 'Deliberandum'; that into the Fifth Article⁴¹ they had brought the Articles of Ireland to be allowed and received under the pain of excommunication; and that they had drawn up their Canons into a body, and were ready that afternoon to make report in the Convocation.⁴²

The new canon, as proposed by the Lower-House,
reads as follows:

Those which shall affirm any of the Articles agreed upon by the Clergy of Ireland at Dublin, 1615, or any of the 39 concluded of in the Convocation at London, 1562, and received by the Convocation at Dublin, 1634, to be in any part superstitious, or such as may not with a good conscience be received and allowed, shall be excommunicated and not restored but only by the Archbishop.⁴³

41 He is referring to the fifth English canon, which calls for subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.

42 16 Dec. 1634, Strafford Letters, I, 343.

43 Intro., MS. Irish Prayer Book, III, App. IV, cxviii. Canon 5, Hib. MS., entitled, "Dean Andrews; his deliberations about the Canons of England and Ireland, examined." A note at the end reads: "This is a true copy of the MS. so entitled, now in the Library of the Honorable Mr. Wentworth, of R.G. Wentworth, Woodhouse in Yorkshire." (MS. in Trinity College Library, Dublin). In the margin opposite the Canon are the words: "Here the form of subscribing in the English Canons is changed into receiving and allowing; for what reason I see not, except they suppose men that truly receive and allow would be loath to subscribe." This commentary was probably by Bramhall.

Strafford immediately sent for Dean Andrews, the chairman of the Committee, to bring the Book of Canons which they had noted. He adds:

When I came to open the Book, and run over their 'Deliberandums' in the margin, I confess I was not so much moved since I came into Ireland. I told him certainly not a Dean of Limerick, but an Ananias had sat in the chair of that Committee; however sure I was, Ananias had been there in Spirit if not in Body with all the Fraternities and Conventicals of Amsterdam.⁴⁴

He next proceeded to call a meeting of the Primate, the Bishops of Meath, Kilmore, Rapho, and Derry (Martin, Bedell, John Lesley, and Bramhall, respectively), Dean Lesley the Prolocutor, and the members of the Committee, and informed them "how unlike Clergymen, that ought Canonical obedience to their superiors, they had proceeded in their Committee; how unheard a part it was for a few petty clerks to presume to make Articles of Faith, without the Privy or Consent of State or Bishop." He saw in their 'Deliberandums' "a spirit of 'Brownism'", and derided them for purposing "to take away all Government and Order forth of the Church, and leave every man to choose his own high place, where liked him best."⁴⁵ Strafford then took the following steps to prevent the matter going any further:

First, then I required Dean Andrews... that he should report nothing from the Committee to the House.

Secondly, I enjoined Dean Leisley, their Prolocutor, that in case any of the Committee should propound any question herein, yet that he should not put it, but

44 Strafford Letters, I, 343.

45 Ibid.

break up the Sitting for that time, and acquaint me with all.

Thirdly, That he should put no question at all, touching the receiving or not of the Articles of the Church of Ireland.

Fourthly, That he should put the question for allowing and receiving the Articles of England, wherein he was by Name and in Writing to take their votes, barely, Content or Not Content, without admitting any other discourse at all, for I would not endure that the Articles of the Church of England should be disputed.

And finally, because there should be no question in the Canon that was thus to be voted, I did desire my Lord Primate would be pleased to frame it, and after I had perused it, I would send the Prolocutor a Draught of the Canon to be propounded, inclosed in a letter of my own...⁴⁶

Archbishop Ussher carried out his commission by drawing up a canon, and submitted it to the Lord Deputy for approval. It failed to satisfy Strafford, so he himself framed another canon, "more after the words of the Canon in England", and then sent it to Ussher. He then relates:

His Grace came instantly unto me, and told me, he feared the Canon would never pass in such form as I had made it, but he was hopeful as he had drawn it, it might; besought me therefore to think a little better of it.

But I confess having taken a little jealousy that his proceedings were not open and free to those ends that I had my eye upon, it was too late now either to persuade or affright me. I told his Lordship I was resolved to put it to them in those very words, and was most confident there were not six in the Houses, that would refute them, telling him by the sequel we should see, whether his Lordship or myself better understood their minds in that point, and by that I would be content to be judged; only for order sake I desired his Lordship would vote this Canon first in the Upper House of Convocation; and so voted, then to pass the question beneath also.⁴⁷

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

Strafford then wrote a letter to Dean Lesley, enclosing the canon which he had drawn up.⁴⁸ The canon reads as follows:

For the Manifestation of our agreement with the Church of England in the confession of the same Christian faith, and the doctrine of the Sacraments; we do receive and approve the book of Articles of religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops, and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God MDLXII for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion. And therefore if any hereafter shall affirm that any of those Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved, before he make a public revocation of his error.⁴⁹

Strafford affirms that his canon was voted unanimously with the bishops, and in the Lower-House with the exception of one man "who singly did deliberate upon the receiving of the Articles of England."⁵⁰ However, this account is at variance with that of Bramhall, who says, in a letter to Laud of 20 December, 1634, that "the Articles of England have passed the Lower-House of Convocation with

48 The letter reads: "I send you here enclosed the form of a Canon to be passed by the votes of the Lower-House of Convocation. Which I require you to put to the question for their Consents without admitting any debate or other discourse, for I hold it not fit, nor will suffer that the Articles of the Church of England be disputed.

"Therefore I expect from you to take only the voices consenting or dissenting, and to give me a particular account how each man gives his vote.

"The time admits no delay, so I further require you to perform the contents of this letter forthwith, and so I rest..." Intro., MS. Irish Prayer Book, III, cxix. MS. Copy of Strafford's Letter to Prolocutor of Lower House, 10 Dec. 1634, Trinity College Library, Dublin.

49 Wilkins: Concilia, IV, 498.

50 Strafford Letters, I, 343.

two objectors, Dr. Hoyle and Mr. Fitzgerald."⁵¹ The latter account is to be preferred, inasmuch as Bishop Bramhall was more likely to have known what actually took place in Convocation than the Lord Deputy; for Bramhall says: "I was the man who acquainted the Earl of Strafford with what the Convocation had done; which he thankfully accepted, and readily ratified."⁵²

From the account of the proceedings which is given in Strafford's letter to Laud, it appears that Wentworth thought ill of the Lord Primate's dealings with him. He says: "... for all the Primate's silence, it was not possible but he knew how near they were to have brought in those Articles of Ireland, to the infinite disturbance and scandal of the Church, as I conceive; and certainly could have been content I had been surprised."⁵³ But Strafford's admiration for Ussher refused to allow such actions to lessen his respect for the Primate, for he adds: "... he is so learned a Prelate, and so good a Man, as I do beseech your Grace it may never be imputed unto him."⁵⁴

Strafford closes his letter to Laud in justifying his actions in regard to the Articles. He states: "I have gone herein with an upright heart, to prevent a breach, seeming at least, betwixt the Churches of England and Ireland."⁵⁵

51 Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1633-47, 88.

52 Bramhall's Works, V, 82.

53 Strafford Letters, I, 343.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibid.

Concerning the proceedings in the Upper House, Bramhall says, that the question was debated regarding the English and Irish Articles, "whether of them were fitter in point of uncontroverted truth, and unity, and uniformity, and prudential compliance with tender consciences, to be imposed upon the Irish clergy."⁵⁶ This was opposed by Ussher and Dr. Martin, the Bishop of Meath, "not out of any disaffection in either of them to the English Articles... but out of love to the Irish."⁵⁷ He adds, that he did not remember any more than these two who spoke in favour of the Irish Articles at that time.

Bramhall gives the following account of what took place regarding the receiving of the Articles of England:

No man can imagine that this change could be made without some sort of reluctance, on the part of some (very few) Bishops, who perhaps had had a hand in framing the Irish Articles; rather out of a tender resentment of the honour of their Church, lest another Church should seem to give laws to them, than out of an opinion of the necessity of those Articles. But concluded it was; and a precedent found of an ancient Synod at Cashel,⁵⁸ which decreed the conformity of the Irish Church to the customs of the Church of England: and my Lord Primate himself, being President of the Convocation, did send for the Prolocutor of the House of the Clerks, and the rest of the Clergy, and declare to them the votes of the Bishops, and move them to assent thereunto, which they did accordingly: all which the Acts and Records of that Convocation do sufficiently testify.⁵⁹

56 Bramhall's Works, V, 80.

57 Ibid, 81.

58 A.D. 1172, when Henry II visited Ireland in person to receive its submission. Bramhall's Works, V, 82, note s; Wilkins: Concilia, I, 471-3. See above, 9.

59 Bramhall's Works, V, 82. Mahaffey says, that it is to Ussher's credit, "that he accepted a change derogatory to his own work rather than face a conflict which would be discreditable to the Church." Intro., State Papers relating to Ireland, 1633-47, xix.

Bramhall affirms, concerning his relations with Strafford, that he was "the only man employed from him to the Convocation, and the Convocation to him"⁶⁰; but he was evidently unaware of the dealings of Wentworth with the Lord Primate, as seen in Strafford's letter to Laud, as shown above.

Archbishop Laud answered Strafford's letter in these words:

I am heartily glad the Articles of England are so canonically admitted; it is a great step to piety and peace... Indeed, my Lord, had the Articles of Ireland slipped into a confirmation, you would have had cause to be sorry for it, in regard both of Church and State. You knew my fears of this, when I did not think you should have found so much by experience as you now find. And I am as confident as yourself, that you were under a design to be surprised. But since you desire it, it shall not be imputed to the Primate. I have newly received a letter from him; in it, a brief relation that the Articles of England are admitted, but not any one word more, than of your great care and dexterity in manageing that business.⁶¹

Laud also wrote to Ussher, in regard to the passing of the Thirty-nine Articles:

And for your Canons, to speak truth, and with wonted liberty and freedom; though I cannot but think the English Canons entire, (especially with some few amendments) would have done better; yet since you and that Church have thought otherwise, I do very easily submit to it, and you shall have my prayers that God

60 Bramhall's Works, V, 83.

61 12 January 1634/5, Laud: Works, VII, 98-9. Laud and Strafford frequently wrote to each other using code. He adds in the same letter: "But the best of this business (next the admittance itself of the Articles) was the double Canon, the one shot by 133, (the Primate) and the other by 130 (your Lordship). And certainly you had no reason to trust him so far, whom you had good cause to suspect had not dealt openly with you in a business of such consequence."

would bless it. As for the particulars about subscription, I think you have couched that well, since, as it seems, there was some necessity to carry that article closely. And God forbid you should, upon any occasion, have rolled back upon your former controversy about the Articles. For if you should have risen from this convocation in heat, God knows when or how that Church would have cooled again, had the cause of difference been never so slight.⁶²

Strafford, in a letter to Laud of 10 March 1635, shows concern as to the course taken by himself in the Irish Convocation, in requesting a letter of commendation from the King. He writes:

By my last save one a letter was desired from his majesty, allowing of the course I held in the admission of the English Articles... I desire to have one, and that it might be specially reciting the matter in fact, as it is set forth in my dispatch to your Lordship, that so, if a Company of Puritans in England may chance in Parliament to have a Month's Mind a Man's Ears should be Horns, I might be able to show his Majesty at least approved of the proceedings: There is not anything hath passed since my coming to the Government I am liker to hear of than this.⁶³

Bishop Vesey, in his Life of Bramhall, declares, that Ussher was "outwitted" by Strafford in the matter of the Articles, and that he and some others thought to maintain the reputation of the Irish Articles by affirming that the English Articles were received only "in the sense of, and as they might be propounded by, those of Ireland."⁶⁴

62 10 May 1635, Works, XVI, 7. Laud seems to ascribe the credit to Ussher for the drawing up of the canon, in his saying, "I think you have couched that well..."; he probably knew otherwise, for Strafford had informed him in his letter of 16 Dec. 1634, that he himself had framed the canon. Laud, in this instance, may be justly accused of political "back-slapping".

63 Strafford Letters, I, 381.

64 xviii.

But such an assertion has no basis in fact; for it is quite evident, from Strafford's account in his letter to Laud, that his dealings with Ussher were open and above-board. Parr, in his *Life of Ussher*, comes to the Primate's defence; he says:

It is highly improbable that the Lord Primate should be so outwitted by the Lord Deputy or his chaplains... but that he very well understood the Articles of both Churches, and did then know, that they were so far from being inconsistent, or contradictory to each other, that he thought the Irish Articles did only contain the doctrine of the Church of England more fully, or else he would never have been so easily persuaded to an Act which would amount to a repeal of those Articles, which... he himself made...⁶⁵

In regard to the question of the consistency of the two sets of Articles, it is fairly well agreed, and a comparison of the Articles reveals, that they are not inconsistent. For instance, Parr argues that the two sets differ only in the fact of the Irish Articles being fuller than the Thirty-nine Articles. His words are: "... if they differ no more than the Nicene does from the Apostles' Creed (which, though it contains more, yet does not annul the former) then without doubt the receiving of the Articles of the Church of England was no abrogation of those of Ireland."⁶⁶ Another writer speaks of them in these words: "The faith of both was the same in the main, only with this difference, that the Irish Articles were more rigid and Calvinistic",⁶⁷ which he attributed to the

65 42.

66 Ibid.

67 Life, prefixed to Bramhall's Works, I, xix.

endeavors of the early Reformers in Ireland in guarding against the Romanist element in that country. And Dean Waterland, certainly no friend of the Irish Articles, maintains that the Irish Convocation of 1634 "received the Thirty-nine Articles, without formally laying aside the Lambeth Articles (having inserted the Lambeth Articles into their confession)." ⁶⁸ From this he deduces, that Ussher and the Convocation thought those two confessions consistent: "which they might be, though there were not a syllable of Calvinism in ours, if they were not plainly Anti-Calvinistic." ⁶⁹

3. Authority subsequent to 1634.

According to the testimony of Ussher, the Irish Articles did not lose their authority by the acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles by the Convocation of 1634. For in a letter to Dr. Ward of 15 September, 1635, he says:

The Articles of religion agreed upon in our former synod, Anno MDCXV we let stand as they did before. But for the manifesting of our agreement with the Church of England, We have received and approved your articles also, concluded in the year MDLXII as you may see in the first of our canons. ⁷⁰

The first clause of this statement by the Primate is in accord with what Strafford had written to Laud; he had said, that his purpose was to leave the Irish Arti-

68 Waterland: Works, II, 346.

69 Ibid.

70 Works, XVI, 9.

cles "as no ways concerned in the state they now are, either affirmed or disaffirmed."⁷¹ However, it was not Strafford's intention to have the English Articles received "also", as Ussher had said was actually the case. The Lord Deputy's plan in bringing the English Articles into the Church of Ireland was to "silence" those of Ireland, which, according to the best evidence, seems to have been what actually happened.

Heylin went beyond the facts of the case by affirming: "The whole Book being now called in, and in the place thereof, the Articles of the Church of England confirmed by Parliament, in that Kingdom, Anno 1634."⁷² He was well answered by Ussher himself, who, in reply to the first assertion, styled it "a notorious untruth"; and, in regard to Heylin's statement that the English Articles were confirmed by the Irish Parliament in 1634, Ussher answers:

it is well known that they were not so much as once propounded to either house of Parliament, or ever intended to be propounded. The truth is, that the House of Convocation, in the beginning of their canons, 'for the manifesting of their agreement with the Church of England, in the confession of the same Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments', as they themselves profess, and for no other end in the world, did receive and approve of the Articles of England; but that either the Articles of Ireland were ever called in, or any articles, or canons at all, were ever here confirmed by act of Parliament, may well be reckoned among Dr. Heylin's fancies.⁷³

71 Strafford Letters, I, 298.

72 History of the Sabbath, Part II, Chap. VIII, 259.

73 Judgment of the Late Archbishop Of Armagh, Works, XII, 594-5.

There is evidence to the effect, that certain bishops in the Church of Ireland required subscription to both sets of Articles for some years after the Convocation of 1634. Parr affirms, that besides Archbishop Ussher, "most of the rest of the Bishops at that time... always at all ordinations took the subscription of the Party ordained to both Articles; the Articles of England, not being received instead, but with those of Ireland."⁷⁴ He gives Dean Bernard as his source, and adds, that this course "was continued by the Lord Primate, and most part of the Bishops, till the confusion of that Church by the Irish Rebellion."⁷⁵

Heylin, however, in his *Life of Laud*, first printed in 1668, limits the period to which subscription was required to the "next ordination". He says, that when the canon for receiving the English Articles was passed, Ussher and his party saw too late "that by receiving and approving the English Articles, they had abrogated and repealed the Irish";⁷⁶ and then he adds:

To salve this sore, it concerned them to bestir themselves with utmost diligence, and so accordingly they did, for first the Primate, and some Bishops of his opinions, required subscription to the Articles of both Churches of all such as came to be ordained at the next ordination. But it went no further than the next...⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Life of Ussher, 43.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Heylin: Life of Laud, 272.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 272-3.

Stopford indicates, that the authority used for both Parr's and Heylin's statements was a comment by Dean Bernard, which reads as follows:

The Articles of England are received not instead, but with those of Ireland. And that it was the sense then apprehended not only by the Primate, but by the other Bishops (at least divers of them), appears in this, that afterwards, at an ordination, they took the subscription of the party ordained to both Articles.⁷⁸

It appears as though Parr dressed up Bernard's statement somewhat, for he says, that "most of the rest of the bishops always at all ordinations took the subscription of the Party ordained", whereas Bernard had said merely, that the Primate and "divers" of the bishops, at "an" ordination, had taken the subscription of the party ordained to both Articles. Heylin had followed Bernard accurately in saying, that "the Primate, and some Bishops of his opinions, required subscription to the Articles of both Churches of all such as came to be ordained at the next ordination." Vesey's testimony, that "some few bishops required subscription for some time to both confessions",⁷⁹ supports Heylin rather than Parr; and he is an independent witness, inasmuch as his authority was Archbishop Price, who at the period under discussion was Archdeacon of Kilmore. Hardwick, in his discussion of their authority, is of the opinion, that inasmuch as there

78 The Judgment of the Late Archbishop of Armagh, 121.

79 Life of Bramhall, xviii.

is insufficient proof as to whether any order was given prohibiting their use by individual bishops, and that Ussher himself required subscription to both sets of Articles, it may be concluded, that they were still, in "some degree", permitted.⁸⁰

Thus it is seen, that the Irish Articles retained some measure of authority for a short period, and certainly no later than the outbreak of the Rebellion in 1641. In the words of Bishop Vesey: "those Articles were... immediately considered as dead, though kept a little while above ground."⁸¹ Collier gives expression to what earlier writers had said in various ways, in affirming, that the receiving of the Thirty-nine Articles implied a "virtual abrogating their own"; but he is careful to add, that this was true only insofar "as there is any inconsistency between the English and Irish Articles."⁸²

It is quite evident that this was the view taken by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who, preaching in 1663 at the funeral of Archbishop Bramhall, expressed the advantage to be derived from the receiving of the English Articles, as the unity of the two Churches,

that they and we might be 'populus labii', of one heart and one lip, building up our hopes of Heaven on a most holy faith; and taking away that Shibboleth which made this Church lisp too undecently, or rather

80 History of the Articles, 182.

81 Op. Cit., xviii.

82 Ecclesiastical Hist. of Great Britain, VIII, 85.

in some little degree to speak the speech of Ashdod, and not the language of Canaan.⁸³

The Irish Articles were unnoticed during the Convocation of 1661-5;⁸⁴ which fact indicates, that they had become practically forgotten during the period of the Rebellion. Not many years later, in 1677, Vesey writes:

But now they are not only dead and buried, but forgotten also, those of the Church of England being the only standard of our communion, and the Rule to 'try the Spirits of the Prophets', and the Principles of such as are admitted into the orders and preferments of the Church.⁸⁵

83 Bramhall's Works, I, lxii.

84 Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, June 1850, 82.

85 Life of Bramhall, xviii.

PART II

THE SOURCES AND CONTENTS OF THE ARTICLES

CHAPTER IVON THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD THE CREATOR1. Of the holy Scripture and the three Creeds.IRISHSOURCE

1. The ground of our religion, and the rule of faith and all saving truth is the word of God, contained in the holy Scripture.

... all truth of God's most holy word, contained in the holy Scripture.¹

2. By the name of holy Scripture we understand all the Canonick Bookes of the Old and New Testament, viz.:

In the name of holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonick bookes of the Olde and Newe Testament, of whose auctoritie was neuer any doubt in the Church.²

1 Book of Homilies, Homily of Faith, 37.

2 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. VI, Hardwick, History of the Articles, 273.

Of the Old Testament.

The 5 Bookes of Moses.
 Iosua.
 Iudges.
 Ruth.
 The first and second of
 Samuel.
 The first and second of Kings.
 The first and second of
 Chronicles.
 Esra.
 Nehemiah.
 Esther.
 Iob.
 Psalmes.
 Prouerbes.
 Ecclesiastes.
 The Song of Salomon.
 Isaiah.
 Ieremiah, his Prophesie and
 Lamentation.
 Ezechiel.
 Daniel.
 The 12 lesse Prophets.

Of the New Testament.

The Gospells according to
 Matthew.
 Marke.
 Luke.
 Iohn.
 The Actes or the Apostles.
 The Epistle of S. Paul to
 the Romaines.
 Corinthians 2.
 Galathians.
 Ephesians.
 Philippians.
 Colossians.
 Thessalonians 2.
 Timothie 2.

Of the names and number of
the Canonically Bookes.

Genesis.
 Exodus.
 Leuiticus.
 Numerie.
 Deuteronomium.
 Iosue.
 Iudges.
 Ruth.
 The.1.boke of Samuel.
 The.2.boke of Samuel.
 The.1.booke of Kinges.
 The.2.booke of Kinges.
 The.1.booke of Chroni.
 The.2.booke of Chroni.
 The.1.booke of Esdras.
 The.2.booke of Esdras.
 The booke of Hester.
 The booke of Iob.
 The Psalmes.
 The Prouerbes.
 Ecclesia, or preacher.
 Cantica, or Songes of Sa.
 4. Prophetes the greater.
 12. Prophetes the lesse.

All the bookes of the newe
 Testament, as they are com-
 monly receaued, we do re-
 ceaued and accompt them for
 Canonically.³

3 Ibid, 275.

Titus.
 Philemon.
 Hebrewes.
 The Epistle of S. Iames.
 Saint Peter 2.
 Saint Iohn 3.
 Saint Iude.
 The Reuelation of S. Iohn.

All which wee acknowledge
 to be giuen by the inspira-
 tion of God, and in that re-
 gard to be of most certaine
 credit and highest authority.

3. The other Bookes, common-
 ly called APOCRYPHALL, did
 not proceede from such in-
 spiration, and therefore are
 not of sufficient authoritie
 to establish any point of doc-
 trine; but the Church doth
 reade them as Bookes contain-
 ing many worthy things for
 example of life and instruc-
 tion of maners.

Such are these following:

The thirde booke of Esdras.
 The fourth booke or Esdras.
 The booke of Tobias.
 The booke of Iudith.

... of whose auctoritie
 was neuer any doubt in the
 Church.⁴

And the other bookes, (as
 Hierome sayth) the Church
 doth reade for example of
 lyfe and instruction of
 maners; but yet doth it not
 applie them to establishe
 any doctrine. Such are these
 followyng.

The third boke of Esdras.
 The fourth boke of Esdras.
 The booke of Tobias.
 The booke of Iudith.

4 Ibid, 273.

Additions to the booke of
Esther.
The booke of Wisedome.
The booke of Iesus, the
Sonne of Sirach, called
Ecclesiasticus.
Baruch, with the Epistle
of Ieremiah.
The Song of the three
Children.
Susanna.
Bell and the Dragon.
The praier of Manasses.
The first booke of Maccha-
bees.
The second booke of Maccha-
bees.

The rest of the booke of
Hester.
The booke of Wisdome.
Iesus the sonne of Sirach.

Baruch, the prophet.

Song of the.3.Children.

The storie of Susanna.
Of Bel and the Dragon.
The prayer of Manasses.
The.1.boke of Machab.

The.2.booke of Macha.⁵

4. The Scriptures ought to
be translated out of the orig-
inall tongues into all lan-
guages for the common use of
all men: neither is any person
to be discouraged from reading
the Bible in such a language,
as he doth vnderstand, but
seriously exhorted to read the
same with great humilitie and
reuerence, as a speciall
meanes to bring him to the
true knowledge of God, and
of his owne duty.

5 Ibid, 273, 275.

5. Although there bee some hard things in the Scripture (especially such as haue proper relation to the times in which they were first vttered, and prophecies of things which were afterwarde to bee fulfilled), yet all things necessary to be knowen vnto euerlasting saluation are cleerely deliuered therein: and nothing of that kinde is spoken vnder darke mysteries in one place, which is not in other places spoken more familiarly and plainely, to the capacitie both of learned and vnlearned.

6. The holy Scriptures containe all things necessary to saluation, and are able to instruct sufficiently in all points of faith that we are bound to beleue, and all

Although many things in the Scripture be spoken in obscure mysteries, yet there is nothing spoken under dark mysteries in one place, but the self-same thing in other places is spoken more familiarly and plainly, to the capacity both of learned and unlearned. And those things in the Scripture that be plain to understand, and necessary to saluation, every man's duty is to learn them.⁶

Holye Scripture conteyneth all thinges necessarie to saluation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proued therby, is not to be required of anye

6 Book Of Homilies, Homily of Holy Scripture, 15.

good duties that we are bound to practise.

man, that it shoulde be beleued as an article of the fayth, or be thought requisite necessarie to saluation.⁷

7. All and euerie the Articles contained in the Nicene Creede, the Creede of Athanasius, and that which is commonly called the Apostles Creede, ought firmly to be receiued and beleued, for they may be proued by most certayne warrant of holy Scripture.

The three Credes, Nicene Crede, Athanasius Crede, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Crede, ought throughlye to be receaued and beleued: for they may be proued by most certayne warrauntes of holy Scripture.⁸

The first Irish article, the "Rule of Faith", is not found in the English formulary of 1562, but it may be traced, in part, to the Book of Homilies of the Church of England. It is a proclamation of the prevalent Reformed principle, that of the Scriptures as the norm by which Christian doctrine is to be measured, apart from any and all tradition.

⁷ Thirty-nine Articles, Art. VI, Hardwick, 271, 273.

⁸ Ibid, Art. VIII, 277,

The last clause of article One, while not unique among formularies of the Reformation, nevertheless merits attention. It reads: "... the word of God, contained in the holy Scripture." The French Confession of 1559, the first draft of which was drawn up by Calvin, reads: "We believe that the Word contained (contenue) in these books has proceeded from God, and receives its authority from him alone, and not from men."⁹ Calvin likewise, in his Genevan Catechism, expresses it in the same words, viz., "... God has left us his holy word... in the Holy Scriptures, in which it is contained".¹⁰ And finally, a catechism drawn up by Ussher in his twenty-third year, but not printed until near his death, in answer to the first question, "what sure ground have we to build our Religion upon?" answers: "The word of God, contained in the Scriptures."¹¹ Thus it is seen, that the Protestant scholars of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were not bound to a limited conception of the Word. Professor Paterson, in speaking of the Reformers, asserts that "the object of their affirmations was not so much the library of Scripture as the system of saving truth which is contained in Scripture."¹²

A question arises as to what this expression means, and if it is inconsistent with statements in other formularies, which equate Scripture with the Word of God;

9 Art. V, Schaff, III, 362.

10 Calvin's Tracts, II, 82.

11 Works, XI, 181.

12 Rule of Faith, 61.

e.g., such as is found in the later Westminster Confession.¹³

A recent writer seems to think, that in these instances it has been employed to define the extent of the canon,¹⁴ but, that it is "an ambiguous term, and there is no doubt that it was hailed by many who took it in the other sense, and used it as a warrant for Biblical eclecticism."¹⁵ However, it is doubtful whether the interpretation which Hendry puts on the expression can be accepted in this particular instance, for Ussher defines the limit of the Canon in the article immediately following. In any event, in the remaining articles of the first section of the Irish Articles, there is enough evidence given to prevent any one from taking too loose a view of the doctrine of Scripture expressed in this article. The language used in the article does show, on the other hand, that Ussher was not bound to a rigorous verbal view of holy Scripture.

Article Two, as seen above, is taken almost verbatim from the Thirty-nine Articles. But whereas the latter speaks of "those ^{IV}Canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church", the Irish Articles use the expression, "all the Canonical books of the Old and New Testament". In this respect, Ussher seems to have used discretion in making the change, for in the early centuries of the Church's history, the Antilo-

13 Chap. I, Part IV, Schaff, III, 602.

14 G.S.Hendry, Scottish Journal of Theology, June 1948, 31.

15 Ibid.

gomena were not generally accepted. The change was made to accord with historical fact.

Hardwick, commenting on the phrase, "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church", says: "This mode of ascertaining the component parts of the Canon did not satisfy the French and Belgic reformers."¹⁶ For instance, the French Confession reads:

We know these books to be Canonical, and the sure rule of our faith, non tant par le commun accord et consentement de l'Eglise, as by the testimony and inward illumination of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to distinguish them from other ecclesiastical books upon which, however useful, we cannot found any articles of faith.¹⁷

And the Belgic Confession also: "... non pas tant parce que l'Eglise les recoit et approuve tels, but more especially because the Holy Ghost witnesseth in our hearts that they are from God, whereof they carry the evidence in themselves."¹⁸

In essence, Ussher follows these two formularies and the Reformed theologians in making the authority of Scripture rest, not on the Church, but on the Spirit of God. The same fulness of expression is not found in the Irish Articles as is found in the above confessions, however. It is limited to these words: "... given by the inspiration of God...", but the meaning is the same, although it is not so explicitly stated. The fact of the inspiration

16 History of the Articles, 363.

17 Art. IV, Schaff, III, 361.

18 Art. V, Ibid, 386.

of Scripture is the ground of our deference to its teaching.

The later Anglican approach is given by Bishop Burnet, who says: "I will not urge that of the testimony of the Spirit, which many have had recourse to: this is only an argument to him that feels it, if it is one at all; and therefore it proves nothing to another person."¹⁹ He says again: "... it does not from this appear how he should know that such books and such passages in them should come from a divine original, or that he should be able to distinguish what is genuine in them from what is spurious."²⁰ But from this language, it is evident that Burnet misunderstands the Reformed conception of the "Testimonium Spiritus Sancti". This testimony is not claimed for determining the extent of the Canon, but rather, giving credence to the Canon as we have received it from the early Church. This is the view taken by Professor Warfield, who says, in an article on Calvin's knowledge of God:

He who recognized that the conviction of the divinity of Scripture wrought by the testimony of the Spirit rests as its ground on the 'indicia' of the divinity of Scripture spiritually discerned in their true weight, could not imagine that the determination of the canon of Scripture or the establishment of its text could be wholly separated from their proper basis in evidence and grounded solely in a blind testimony of the Spirit alone: which... would be fundamentally indistinguishable from that 'revelation' which he rebuked the Anabaptists for claiming to be recipients of.²¹

19 An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, 102.

20 Ibid.

21 Armstrong, Calvin and the Reformation, 194-5.

Warfield is of the opinion that the term "Canonical" was current in the two senses of "belonging to the list of authoritative Scriptures", and "God-given" or "divine". And he thinks that the French and Belgic Confessions (as quoted above) use the term "canonical" in the qualitative sense rather than the quantitative, or, as equivalent to "divine".²² Thus, Burnet's statement²³ loses its force.

While the Irish Articles base the authority of Scripture on inspiration, there is no indication given of the mode of inspiration. In this respect it differs from some other Reformed confessions, viz., the Belgic, which reads: "God... commanded his servants, the prophets and Apostles, to commit his revealed Word to writing; and he himself wrote with his own finger the two tables of the law."²⁴

One further difference in article Two is, that the Irish Articles list the New Testament books, whereas the Thirty-nine Articles merely refer to them "as they are commonly received".

Article Three, on the Apocrypha, follows the Thirty-nine Articles, except that it again makes inspiration, or rather in this instance, the lack of it, the ground for rejecting these books as a basis for doctrine.

22 Op. Cit., 192.

23 Above, 80.

24 Art. III, Schaff, III, 385.

The Anglican Articles had appealed to the Fathers: "(as Hierome sayth)"²⁵

There are a few verbal differences in the list of the Apocryphal books, and also one addition; whereas the English have merely, "Baruch, the prophet", the Irish have, "Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremiah".

Article Four has no direct source to which it can be traced, although the second clause has striking resemblances to the language in the Book of Homilies.²⁶ The first clause, on the translation of the Scriptures, is a principle which had been laid down at the beginning of the Reformation, in opposition to the Roman tenet, that the Vulgate was the only authoritative version, and that the Church alone could interpret the Scriptures for the laity. Protestantism affirmed that the common man could read the Scriptures for himself, and he would be guided by the Holy Spirit to understand them. Professor Paterson says: "Protestantism affirmed the efficacy of Scripture in the sense that Bible-reading is a chief means of grace, and in accordance with this principle it promoted the circulation of the Bible in the common tongue."²⁷

25 Above, 73. Schaff claims that the first symbolical exclusion of the Apocrypha from the Canon occurs in the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), for the Lutherans had left the question open. (Creeds, I, 396, note 2) But he is in error, for the Thirty-nine Articles, its predecessor by four years, also exclude the Apocrypha; and there is an implicit exclusion of them in the French Confession of 1559. (Art. IV, Schaff, III, 361)

26 Homily of Scripture, 15, 16.

27 Rule of Faith, 60-1.

This was a principle which needed to be safely guarded, however. For instance, the ninety-fourth Canon of the Church of Ireland (1634), following the policy of Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, who translated the Scriptures into the Irish language,²⁸ provided for the use of the Bible and Prayer Book in the vernacular in an Irish-speaking district. Bramhall, later Primate of Ireland, who regarded the Irish tongue as "a symbol of Barbarism", opposed the Canon; he "failed to see the necessity of instructing a people through the medium of a language they understood."²⁹ It is strange, too, to find Ussher himself (c. 1630) censuring Bedell for that individual's attempt to convert the Irish by appealing to them in their own language; for besides translating the Bible into Irish, Bedell had also circulated a short catechism with the Irish and English on opposite pages. As Elrington says:

Blinded by the false notion of upholding English influence by exterminating the Irish language, and taught to reverence the policy which dictated an Act of Parliament in direct opposition to the principles of the Reformation, the Primate censured as a mode of confirming superstition and idolatry, the first judicious attempt that had been made to spread the doctrines of the Reformation through the country.³⁰

Article Five, of the interpretation of Scripture, is intimately connected with article Four. As shown above,

28 Dict. of National Biography, IV, 108.

29 Ibid, VI, 204.

30 Life of Ussher, 118.

it has its source in the Book of Homilies, and is originally taken from St. Augustine. Article Four had stated that the Bible is a "special means to bring (man) to the true knowledge of God, and of his own duty", but it did not claim for it explicit and exhaustive knowledge on any subject other than those which were "necessary to be known unto everlasting salvation". These things are "clearly delivered therein". Although they may be ambiguous and somewhat hidden in meaning in one place, they can be interpreted clearly by taking the general consensus of Scripture. This is the doctrine of perspicuity of Scripture; and "in virtue of its perspicuity, Scripture was declared to be its own interpreter".³¹ The Church was not needed as the interpreter of holy Writ.

Article Six, of the sufficiency of holy Scripture, differs somewhat in wording from the corresponding article of the Thirty-nine Articles. The first clause is identical to the first clause of the XXXIX; its original purpose is given by Hardwick:

It asserted the necessity of Scriptural proof for every doctrine of the Church, in reply to scholastic and Tridentine errors on the subject of 'the Word unwritten'; and also condemned the opposite misbelievers (Anabaptists), whom we have seen disparaging the authority of the Bible, as compared with the immediate and fanatical inspirations, of which they were the favoured channel.³²

31 Paterson, Rule of Faith, 60.

32 History of the Articles, 99.

Of the second clause of Art. V of the Forty-two Articles, which was reproduced in the Thirty-nine, Hardwick adds: "It is at the same time careful to guard against a prevailing error, which maintained that all the usages of the Church must be clearly deducible from holy Scripture."³³ On this point Paterson says:

The Lutheran Church was content to retain traditional elements so long as they were not in proved conflict with Scripture, while the Churches of the Reformed group acted on the rigorist canon that express Scriptural warrant was required to justify anything which entered into the staple of the system of doctrine of worship... In this matter the Church of England associated itself with the Lutheran rather than with the Reformed maxim.³⁴

The Irish Articles have not reproduced the second clause of the Thirty-nine, but rather have elaborated on the first clause. Thus, Ussher's silence as regards the second clause indicates, at least possibly, that he favoured the Reformed maxim.

Article Seven, of the three Creeds, is taken almost verbatim from the Thirty-nine Articles. The acceptance of these three creeds had been made an article of faith in the English Church from the very beginning of the Reformation. They are the principal subject of the first article of the Ten Articles of 1536. This formulary uses much stronger language than its successors:

They ought and must believe, repute, and take all the articles of our faith contained in the said

33 Ibid.

34 Rule of Faith, 10-11.

creeds to be so necessary to be believed for man's salvation, that whosoever being taught will not believe them... or will obstinately affirm the contrary of them, he or they cannot be the very members of Christ and his espouse the Church, but be very infidels or heretics, and members of the Devil, with whom they shall perpetually be damned.³⁵

This article was "manifestly directed against the tenets of the Anabaptists, many of whom denied... the entire doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of our Saviour's Incarnation."³⁶ The Continental confessions also include the three Creeds ; e.g., the French Confession says that they are to be accepted "because they are in accordance with the Word of God".³⁷

This article follows logically from article Six, for as Burnet says: "every just inference from (Scripture) must be as true as the proposition itself is."³⁸

These Creeds were to be accepted, not because the Church had used them from the early centuries of its history, but because, measured by the Rule of Faith, they were found to be in harmony with its teaching.

35 Hardwick, 235.

36 Ibid, 52.

37 Art. V, Schaff, III, 362.

38 Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, 99.

2. Of Faith in the holy Trinity.IRISHSOURCE

8. There is but one liuing and true God, euerlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preseruer of all things, both visible, and inuisible. And in vnitie of this Godhead, there be three persons of one and the same substance power and eternitie: the Father, the Sone, and the holy Ghost.

There is but one lyuyng and true God, euerlastyng, without body, partes, or passions, of infinite power, wysdome, and goodnesse, the maker and preseruer of all things both visible and inuisible. And in vnitie of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substaunce, power, and eternitie, the father, the sonne, and the holy ghost.³⁹

9. The Essence of the Father doth not begett the essence of the Sonne; but the person of the Father begetteth the person of the Sonne, by communicating his whole essence

39 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. I, Hardwick, 269.

to the person begotten from
eternitie.

<p>10. The holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father, and the Sonne, is of one substance, maiestie, and glory, with the Father and the Sonne, very and eternall God.</p>	<p>The holy ghost, proceeding from the father and the sonne, is of one substaunce, maiestie, and glorie, with the father and the sonne, very and eternall God.⁴⁰</p>
---	---

The articles in this section reassert the doctrine of the Trinity, of all Christian doctrines the most mysterious, and therefore, the most difficult to comprehend. Natural theology has nothing to offer on the subject. Man would have had no idea of it had it not been revealed to him in the Scriptures. As Barth expresses it: "it was... not the standard of a foolhardy speculative intuition on the Church's part, but certainly the standard of an unheard-of encounter, confronting the Church in Holy Scripture."⁴¹

Article Eight, of the unity of the Godhead, is taken almost verbatim from the Thirty-nine Articles, differing only in one point. Whereas the latter use the words, "three persons of one substance", the Irish article reads:

40 Ibid, Art. V, 271.

41 The Doctrine of the Word of God, 505.

"three persons of one and the same substance". The addition may have been made to emphasize the unity of the substance. Such reiteration is found in other Reformed confessions; e.g., the French Confession has: "in this one sole and simple (seule et simple) divine essence... there are three persons..."⁴² And the Second Helvetic Confession: "the same infinite, one, and indivisible God is in person inseparable and without confusion distinguished into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit;"⁴³ while the Belgic Confession uses the same phrase as the Irish: "... the third person of the holy Trinity; of one and the same (d'une meme) essence, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son."⁴⁴

This article logically follows article Seven, for it "may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture"; at least to satisfy the mind which is not over-curious. In the Thirty-nine Articles the order is inverted, for that formulary begins with the Holy Trinity, and the article on Scripture follows later, as shown above under the section on Scripture.

The language used in this article is originally from the Augsburg Confession.⁴⁵ And the same article is found in the Eleven Articles, but in a shorter form.⁴⁶

42 Art. VI, Schaff, III, 362.

43 Chap. III, Ibid, 835.

44 Art. XI, Ibid, 394.

45 Hardwick, 251.

46 Art. I, Ibid, 327.

Article Nine is one of the relatively few articles of the Irish collection that has no direct source; it is not found in the Thirty-nine Articles, nor in any other confession, either Lutheran or Reformed. And rightly so, for a confession of faith, formed "for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true religion", is not the place for a question so mysterious as the mode of the generation of the Son from the Father. Caution in the use of language on this subject is found especially in the Second Helvetic Confession, which reads: "... as the Father has begotten the Son from eternity, the Son is begotten in an unspeakable manner."⁴⁷

The original text of the Nicene Creed, formulated in A.D. 325, advanced the opposite theory, viz., that the Son was begotten of the essence, rather than of the person, of the Father. It says: "one Lord Jesus Christ... the only-begotten; that is, of the essence of the Father..."⁴⁸ The later, and enlarged, form of the Creed (A.D. 381) omitted this clause, on which, says Westcott, "stress was laid at Nicea".⁴⁹ He adds: "The first and third (phrases) ("only-begotten", and "of one essence with the Father") ... together... are sufficient to preserve the full integ-

47 Chap. III, Schaff, III, 835.

48 Schaff, I, 29.

49 The Historic Faith, 196.

rity of the ancient belief without seeming to intrude into regions inaccessible by human thought."⁵⁰

It seems evident, from the language used in this article, that Ussher followed Calvin quite closely. Calvin devotes much attention to the problem, and to showing, by deduction from Scripture, why Christ was begotten of the person, rather than of the essence, of the Father. In so doing, he exerts caution, as he says, "lest either our ideas or our language should proceed beyond the limits of the Divine word."⁵¹ His premise is, that "the word GOD denotes a single and simple essence, in which we comprehend three persons, or hypostases."⁵² He is very careful to maintain the unity of the essence, and inveighs against some who maintain that the Father is the sole possessor of the Divine essence, asking, "But how shall the Creator (in this case, the Son), who gives existence to all, not be self-existent, but derive his essence from another?"⁵³ And again: "some distinctive character is necessary... to discriminate the Father from the Son. They who place this in the essence, manifestly destroy the true deity of Christ, which cannot exist independently of the... entire essence."⁵⁴ Ussher's language is in keeping with this, for the last clause of article

50 Ibid, 201.

51 Instit., I. xiii. 21.

52 Ibid, I. xiii. 20.

53 Ibid, I. xiii. 23.(parenthesis mine)

54 Ibid.

Nine reads: "by communicating his whole essence to the person begotten from eternity"

The first clause of this article, a negative one, affirms that "the essence of the Father does not beget the essence of the Son". It is just this that Calvin emphasizes; he says: "for although we confess, in point of order and degree, that the Father is the fountain of the Deity, yet we pronounce it a detestable figment, that the essence belongs exclusively to the Father, as though he were the author of the Deity of the Son."⁵⁵ Again: "If they admit that the Son is God, but inferior to the Father, then in him the essence must be begotten and created, which in the Father is unbegotten and uncreated."⁵⁶ And finally: "... the Son, as God, independently of the consideration of Person, is self-existent; but as the Son, we say, that he is of the Father. Thus, his essence is unoriginated; but the origin of his Person is God himself."⁵⁷ Between Calvin and Ussher there may be a slight difference in expression, but the thoughts are the same.

Article Ten, of the Holy Ghost, is taken verbatim from the Thirty-nine Articles, and follows the Western form of the Nicene Creed: "... the Holy Ghost ... who proceedeth from the Father and the Son..."⁵⁸

55 Ibid, I. xiii. 24.

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid, I. xiii. 25.

58 Schaff, II, 59.

One of the great issues between the Eastern and Western Churches has been over this point. The Eastern Church declares, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone. The addition concerning the procession from the Son, was added in the Western Church about the end of the sixth century at the Council of Toledo, in Spain.⁵⁹

The Athanasian Creed, which was never adopted in the Eastern Church,⁶⁰ reads: "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding."⁶¹

59 Burnet, Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, 89.

60 Schaff, II, 70.

61 Art. 23, Ibid, 68. Ussher, in his Greek translation and Latin text of this creed, following the Greek doctrine, omits 'et Filio' (of the Son). Ibid, 71; Works, VII, 314.

3. Of the creation and gouernment of all things.IRISHSOURCE

18. In the beginning of time, when no creature had any being, God by his word alone, in the space of sixe dayes, created all things, and afterwarde by his prouidence ^o dth continue, propagate, and order them according to his owne will.

19. The principall creatures are Angels and men.

Among all the creatures, the angels and men are most excellent.⁶²

20. Of Angels, some continued in that holy state wherein they were created, and are by Gods grace for euer established therein: others fell from the same, and are reserued in chaines of darknesse vnto the iudgement of the great day.

And the angels... left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.⁶³

62 Second Helvetic Confession, Chap. VII, Schaff, III, 841.

63 Jude 6.

21. Man being at the beginning created according to the image of God (which consisted especially in the Wisedome of his minde and the true Holyness of his free will) had the couenant of the lawe ingrafted in his heart: whereby God did promise vnto him euerlasting life, vpon condition that he performed entire and perfect obedience vnto his Commandments, according to that measure of strength wherewith hee was endued in his creation, and threatned death vnto him if he did not performe the same.

This subject, of the creation and government of all things, is the only one of the Irish formulary not dealt with by the Thirty-nine Articles; neither do the Lutheran confessions handle it, but it does find a place in most of the Reformed confessions.

Article Eighteen deals with creation and providence in general. It has some points in common with other confessions, while in other points it is unique. In the

first place, it claims that creation was accomplished "by his word alone". This is in harmony with the Belgic and Second Helvetic Confessions. The former says: "... the Father, by the Word - that is, by his Son - created of nothing the heaven, the earth, and all creatures."⁶⁴ The Latter: "... God created all things... by his eternal Word."⁶⁵ The French Confession ascribes creation to God "in three co-working persons".⁶⁶ The Scots Confession, also: "ane onelie God... in thre personnis... by whom we confesse and beleve all thingis in hevin and eirth... to have been created".⁶⁷ Calvin's teaching is, that "God, by the power of his Word and Spirit, created out of nothing the heaven and the earth."⁶⁸ The above comparison reveals that there was not much unity of opinion in the Reformed school of thought on this particular subject.

The Irish Articles, contrary to its predecessors, state the period of time involved in creation: "in the space of six days".

After creation, all things are ruled according to the Divine sovereignty. Nothing happens according to chance. This clause of the article is decidedly Calvinistic in tone. Calvin says: "... in the creatures there is no erratic power, or action or motion; but that they are

64 Art. XII, Schaff, III, 395.

65 Chap. VII, Ibid, 841.

66 Art. VII, Ibid, 363.

67 Art. I, Ibid, 439.

68 Instit., I. xiv. 20.

so governed by the secret counsel of God, that nothing can happen but what is subject to his knowledge, and decreed by his will."⁶⁹

A possible source for article Nineteen has been shown to be a phrase from the Second Helvetic Confession. That Ussher drew from this source is suggested by the fact, that all four articles in this section are found in the same chronological order in the seventh chapter of the Swiss formulary, and, that these articles alone are found in that particular section, the title of which is: "Of the Creation of all things; of Angels, the Devil, and Man."⁷⁰

Article Twenty, of angels, is hardly to be classified as an article of faith. But it found a place, besides, and previous in time to, the Irish Articles, in the French, Belgic, and Second Helvetic Confessions. The Scriptures teach very little about the nature of angels, especially fallen ones. Thus, it is a subject on which one ought not dogmatize. In all fairness to Ussher, however, it must be said that he did not go beyond Scripture in stating the article.

Article Twenty-one deals with the creation of man, and his original state. The language used is similar to that used in the other Reformed confessions, although it does not agree in every point with any particular one of the others. They all agree that man was made in the

69 Ibid, I. xvi. 3.

70 Schaff, III, 841.

image of God, but they differ as to the details in which the similitude consists. The Irish have: "the wisdom of his mind, the true holiness of his free will"; this follows the Scots Confession, which reads: "to whom he gave wisdom... justice, free-wil..."⁷¹ But it closer approximates the language of Calvin, who says: "For all the parts of his soul were formed with the utmost rectitude; he enjoyed soundness of mind, and a will free to the choice of good."⁷²

The "Covenant of Works" is stated in this article:

Man... had the covenant of the law ingrafted in his heart, whereby God did promise unto him everlasting life, upon condition that he performed entire and perfect obedience unto his commandments, according to that measure of strength wherewith he was endued in his creation, and threatened death unto him if he did not perform the same.

Such language is only hinted at in the earlier confessions, and perhaps the clearest is the Belgic, in which it is stated, that "the commandment of life, which he received, he transgressed..."⁷³

71 Art. II, Schaff, III, 440.

72 Instit., I. xv. 8.

73 Art. XIV, Schaff, III, 398.

CHAPTER VON THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD THE REDEEMER

1. Of the fall of man, originall sinne, and the state of man before iustification.

IRISHSOURCE

22. By one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne; and so death went ouer all men, for as much as all haue sinned.

by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.¹

23. Originall sinne standeth not in the imitation of Adam (as the Pelagians dreame) but is the fault and corruption of the nature of euery person that naturally is engendred and propagated from Adam:

Originall sinne standeth not in the folowing of Adam (as the Pelagians do vaynely talke) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of euery man, that naturally is engendred of the ofspring

1 Romans v. 12.

whereby it commeth to passe that man is deprived of originall righteousnes, and by nature is bent vnto sinne. And therefore, in euery person borne into the world, it deserueth Gods wrath and damnation.

24. This corruption of nature doth remaine euen in those that are regenerated, whereby the flesh alwaies lusteth against the spirit, and cannot bee made subject to the lawe of God. And howsoeuer, for Christs sake there bee no condemnation to such as are regenerate and doe beleue: yet doth the Apostle acknowledge that in it selfe this concupiscence hath the nature of sinne.

of Adam, whereby man is very farre gone from originall ryghteousnes, and is of his owne nature enclined to euyll so that the fleshe lusteth alwayes contrary to the spirite, and therefore in euery person borne into this worlde, it deserueth Gods wrath and damnation.²

And this infection of nature doth remayne, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the luste of the fleshe, called in Greke 'Phronama sarkos', which some do expounde the wisdome, some sensualitie, some the affection, some the desyre of the fleshe, is not subiect to the lawe of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that beleue and are baptized: yet the Apostle

2 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. IX, Hardwick, 277.

doth confesse that concupis-
cence and luste hath of it
selfe the nature of synne.³

25. The condition of man af-
ter the fall of Adam is such
that he cannot turne, and pre-
pare himselfe by his owne
naturall strength and good
workes, to faith, and calling
upon God. Wherefore we haue
no power to doe good workes,
pleasing and acceptable vnto
God, without the grace of God
preuenting us, that we may
haue a good will, and working
with vs when wee haue that
good will.

26. Workes done before the
grace of Christ, and the in-
spiration of his spirit, are
not pleasing vnto God, for as
much as they spring not of

The condition of man af-
ter the fall of Adam is suche,
that he can not turne and
prepare hym selfe by his owne
naturall strength and good
workes, to fayth and calling
vpon God: Wherefore we haue
no power to do good workes
pleasaunt and acceptable to
God, without the grace of
God by Christe preuenting us,
that we may haue a good wyll,
and workyng with vs, when we
haue that good wyll.⁴

Workes done before the
grace of Christe, and the
inspiration of his spirite,
are not pleasaunt to God,
forasmuche as they spring

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid, Art. X, 279.

faith in Iesus Christ, neither do they make men meete to receaue grace, or (as the Schoole Authors say) deserue grace of congruitie: yea rather, for that they are not done in suche sorte as God hath willed and commaunded them to be done, we doubt not but they are sinfull.

not of fayth in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men meete to receaue grace, or (as the schole aucthours saye) deserue grace of congruitie: yea rather for that they are not done as GOD hath wylled and commaunded them to be done, we doubt not but they haue the nature of synne.⁵

27. All sinnes are not equall, but some farre more heynous than others; yet the very least is of its owne nature mortall, and without Gods mercy maketh the offendor lyable vnto euerlasting damnation.

... sins are not equal ... but... some are more grievous than others.⁶

28. God is not the author of sinne: howbeit he doth not onely permitt, but also by his prouidence gouerne and order the same, guiding it in such

... not that he is the author of evil. ... he hath wonderful means of so making use of devils... that he can turn to good the evil which

5 Ibid, Art. XIII, 281, 283.

6 Second Helvetic Confession, VIII, Schaff, III, 843.

sorte by his infinite wisdom, as it turneth to the manifestation of his own glory and to the good of his elect.

they do...⁷ God... directs it... that... though it be of itself evil, it nevertheless turns to the salvation of the elect of God.⁸

Article Twenty-two, as is characteristic of several of the Irish Articles, is a quotation verbatim from Scripture. In this instance, it is from Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and states the universality of sin, and the consequences which follow it. It is a concise statement of the doctrine of original sin.

Article Twenty-three defines this term "original sin". As shown above,⁹ the article is taken from the Thirty-nine Articles, but with one notable difference: whereas the English Article has: "man is very far gone from original righteousness", the Irish reads: "man is deprived of original righteousness". This change brought the article into closer harmony with Calvinistic doctrine.

The article is directed against the teaching of Pelagius - that Adam's sin ruined only himself, and did not affect his descendants. Calvin says of Pelagius: "when it was evinced by the plain testimony of the Scripture, that sin was communicated from the first man to all his

7 French Confession, VIII, Schaff, III, 364.

8 Formula of Concord, Art. XI, Ibid, 166.

9 p. 100.

posterity, he... urged that it was communicated by imitation, not by propagation."¹⁰

Calvin defines "original sin" as follows: "an hereditary pravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all the parts of the soul, rendering us obnoxious to the Divine wrath, and producing in us those works which the Scripture calls 'works of the flesh'."¹¹ He adds, in explanation: "Our nature being so totally vitiated and depraved, we are, on account of this very corruption, considered as convicted and justly condemned in the sight of God..."¹²

Calvin makes a distinction between natural talents and supernatural ones, and says: "the natural talents in man have been corrupted by sin, but... the supernatural ones he has been wholly deprived."¹³ In this latter category he includes faith and righteousness, which would have been sufficient for the attainment of eternal life. Among the natural talents he includes the soundness of the intellect and the integrity of the will.

The French Confession is even more strongly worded than the Irish:

by his own guilt he fell from the grace which he received, and is thus alienated from God, the fountain of justice and of all good, so that his nature

10 Instit., II. 1. 5.

11 Ibid, II. 1. 8.

12 Ibid.

13 Ibid, II. 11. 12.

is totally corrupt (sa nature est du tout corrompue). And being blinded in mind, and depraved in heart, he has lost all integrity, and there is no good in him (perdu toute integrite sans avoir rien de reste).¹⁴

The language of the Council of Trent in regard to the doctrine is also in harmony with the Reformed teaching: "this sin of Adam, - which in its origin is one, and being transfused into all by propagation, not by imitation, is in each one as his own..."¹⁵

By the phrase "original righteousness", the scholastic theologians usually described the moral and spiritual condition of man anterior to the fall.¹⁶

Article Twenty-four also has its source in the Thirty-nine Articles. Again there have been a few important changes made in the transition. The language of the Irish Articles is more Calvinistic. For instance, where the English article reads: "infection of nature", the Irish article reads: "corruption of nature"; where the XXXIX has: "no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized", the Irish has: "no condemnation to such as are regenerate and do believe"; also adding, that it is "for Christ's sake", which the English Articles of 1571 do not have.

There is no doubt that Ussher went back to the Latin edition of the Thirty-nine Articles of 1562 for the

14 Art. IX, Schaff, III, 365.

15 Fifth Session, par. 3. Schaff, II, 85.

16 History of the Articles, 365.

source of his article. There had been a few changes made in the Thirty-nine Articles between 1562 and 1571, and this is one instance. The Latin of 1562 reads: "Et quamquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio",¹⁷ which is identical with the Irish article.

The Irish agrees with its source in saying, that this "concupiscence hath the nature of sin". Hardwick points out, that the Westminster Assembly Divines expressed "concupiscence" as "truly and properly sin",¹⁸ and also, that the Council of Trent apparently contradicts itself on the subject; for in one instance it refers to it as, "that which has the true and proper nature of sin", and later in the same paragraph, "This concupiscence, which the apostle sometimes calls sin, the holy synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood it to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in those 'born again', but because it is of sin, and inclines to sin."¹⁹ The Romanist teaching is, that it is not sin until one consents to the desire.

That this doctrine is in harmony with Calvin's doctrine is seen from a few quotations from Calvin's writings: on "corruption of nature" Calvin says: "the soul, immersed in this gulf of iniquity, is not only the subject of vices, but totally destitute of everything

17 Art. IX, Hardwick, 277.

18 Op. Cit., 366; Westminster Confession, Chap. VI, par. V, Schaff, III, 616.

19 Hardwick, 366; Session V, par. V, Schaff, II, 88.

that is good."²⁰ But he adds:

we should not consider human nature to be totally corrupted; since, from its instinctive bias, some men have not only been eminent for noble actions, but have uniformly conducted themselves in a most virtuous manner through the whole course of their lives. But here we ought to remember, that amidst this corruption of nature there is some room for Divine grace, not to purify it, but internally to restrain its operations.²¹

Regarding concupiscence, he is quite clear that it is sin: "... all the desires of men are evil; and we consider them to be sinful, not as they are natural, but because they are inordinate; and we affirm they are inordinate, because nothing pure or immaculate can proceed from a corrupted and polluted nature."²²

Article Twenty-five, of the condition of man subsequent to the fall, is taken almost verbatim from the XXXIX Articles. In the English formulary the article is entitled "of free will". The only difference occurs near the end of the article, where the English uses the words, "by Christ", which the Irish article omits.

The article's original purpose was "to repel the Anabaptist errors on the subject of preventing and co-operating grace".²³ The latter clause of the article was taken by the framers of the XXXIX Articles "almost verbatim from St. Augustine, 'De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio', c. XVII, al. xxxiii."²⁴

20 Instit., II. iii. 2.

21 Ibid, II, iii. 3.

22 Ibid, III. iii. 12.

23 Hardwick, 100.

24 Ibid, 366.

Calvin's opinion on the subject of free-will is, that man is a slave to sin, and although he has a certain freedom in regard to natural things, as regards spiritual things he is free only to sin. e.g., he says: "The will... is so bound by the slavery of sin, that it cannot ^cexite itself, much less devote itself, to anything good; for such a disposition is the beginning of a conversion to God, which in the Scriptures is attributed solely to Divine grace."²⁵

It might appear that the latter clause of this article (the one from Augustine) gives some credit to man. Calvin makes this comment on Augustine's teaching:

Some... concede that the will, being... averse to what is good, is converted solely by the power of the Lord; yet in such a manner that being previously prepared, it has also its own share in that work; that grace, as Augustine teaches, precedes every good work, the will following grace, not leading it, being its companion, not its guide.²⁶

Calvin calls this statement an "unobjectable observation of that holy man", and adds this comment: "As (the will) is preceded by grace, I allow you to style it an attendant; but since its reformation is the work of the Lord, it is wrong to attribute to man a voluntary obedience in following the guidance of grace."²⁷ And he quotes the words of the Apostle to substantiate his argument: "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do."²⁸

25 Instit., II. 111. 5.

26 Ibid, II. 111. 7.

27 Ibid.

28 Phil., 11. 13.

The influence of Augustine and Calvin is seen in all the works of Ussher, although, due to the polemical nature of his work, mainly against the Romanists, he cites the authority of the former almost to the exclusion of the latter, which one would expect. The following statement emphasizes his views on the freedom of the will:

When we deny therefore that a natural man hath any free will unto good, by a natural man we understand one that is without Christ, and destitute of his renewing grace; by free will... a thing that is in our own power to do; and by good, a theological, not a philosophical good... a spiritual good and tending to salvation.²⁹

Quoting Augustine, from his argument against the Semi-Pelagians, Ussher says:

If we will truly defend free will, let us not oppugn that by which it is made free. For whose oppugneth grace, whereby our will is made free to incline from evil and to do good, he will have his will to be still captive.³⁰

Article Twenty-six has been taken almost verbatim from the XXXIX Articles. Again there is a slight difference: the Irish reading "they are sinful" for the former's "they have the nature of sin". In the previous article, as regards concupiscence in a believer, the Irish article agreed with the XXXIX in saying, that it had "the nature of sin"; but in this article, as regards works before justification, it deviates from the language of the former, and uses unambiguous terminology to express the absolute sinfulness of the efforts of the unregenerate to please God.

29 An Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland, 1625, Works, III, 517.

30 Ibid, 536.

The original purpose of this article (26) was to reveal

the error of certain 'school authors', who had affirmed... that the favour of God is recoverable (or that man may be ENTITLED TO RECEIVE GRACE), in consideration of the merits of actions, which resulted from his own strength, or had been wrought independently of the Holy Spirit.³¹

The Council of Trent a few years before (1547) had made these proclamations on the subject: First, they had affirmed, that man could not be justified before God by his own works, apart from the grace of God through Christ.³² And secondly, that man could not do good works "without the prevenient inspiration of the Holy Ghost."³³ But - it had added, that "if any one saith, that all works done before Justification, in whatsoever way they be done, are truly sins... let him be anathema."³⁴

The Romanists themselves were divided on this question at the Council of Trent. Hardwick, quoting Sarpi, says that the Dominicans condemned as Pelagian the idea of "grace of congruity".³⁵ Sarpi adds, that the Council of Orange had "déclaré que la Grace n'est précédée d'aucun mérite et que c'est à Dieu qu'on doit attribuer le commencement du bien."³⁶

Articles Twenty-seven and Twenty-eight, so far

31 Hardwick, 101.

32 Session VI, Can. I, Schaff, II, 110.

33 Ibid, Can. III.

34 Ibid, Can. VII, 111, 112.

35 Op. Cit., 101. note 3; Sarpi, Histoire du Concile de Trente, I, 344.

36 Sarpi, Ibid.

as can be determined, have no direct source, although as shown above,³⁷ there is a remarkable similarity of language in earlier Lutheran and Reformed confessions.

The Second Helvetic Confession is the only earlier formulary that mentions the inequality of sins, and in so doing, it specifically condemns "Pelagius, and all the Pelagians, together with the Jovinianists, who, with the Stoics, count all sins equal."³⁸ Evidence was given in the previous section (on Creation) to show that the Irish Articles drew from that confession of Bullinger, and it is probable that the first clause of article Twenty-seven was taken from the same source.

Article Twenty-eight is definitely Calvinistic teaching. That God is not the author of sin is affirmed in the French,³⁹ Belgic,⁴⁰ and Second Helvetic Confessions;⁴¹ and it is also found in the Lutheran Formula of Concord.⁴² To say that Calvin's doctrine makes God the author of sin, is a travesty of his teaching. He emphatically denies this to be true, saying:

They err in seeking for the work of God in their own pollution, whereas they should rather seek it in the nature of Adam while yet innocent and uncorrupted. Our perdition, therefore, proceeds from the sinfulness of our flesh, not from God; it being only a consequence of our degenerating from our primitive condition.⁴³

37 p. 102.

38 Chap. VII, Schaff, III, 843.

39 Art. VIII, Ibid, 364.

40 Art. XIII, Ibid, 396.

41 Chap. VIII, Ibid, 843.

42 Art. XI, part III, Ibid, 165.

43 Instit., II. 1. 10.

Ussher himself advocated this doctrine, making sin a negative thing, and thus relieving God of the responsibility of being its author. He says, in a sermon preached at Oxford in 1640:

Sin is the absence of that positive being, which is... either in our nature or works. ... If sin were a positive thing, all the world cannot avoid it, but God must be the author of it; for there is nothing can have a being, but it must derive its being from the first being, God. Now, how can we avoid God's being the author of sin? Why thus; it is nothing... a nothing primitive, an absence of that should be, and that a man ought to have.⁴⁴

After denying that God is the author of sin, this article goes on to affirm, that the course of sin is not controlled by the mere permissive will of God, but by his absolute will, and that he "governs and orders the same". Calvin had rejected the distinction between permission and the will of God, saying: "... how insipid it is, instead of the providence of God, to substitute a bare permission; as though God were sitting in a watchtower, expecting fortuitous events, and so his decisions were dependent on the will of men."⁴⁵

The Lutheran Formula of Concord is as "Calvinistic" as Calvin himself on this point, and, as shown above, it is probable that article Twenty-eight has its

44 Works, XIII, 241. Ussher and Calvin received this doctrine from St. Thomas Aquinas; but it is open to criticism. Quick says: "If sin itself were a mere lack or privation, all that man could require for deliverance would be the supply of that which he lacks... But the terms forgiveness, conversion, and new... creation, imply something different in kind from the mere supply of a defect." The Gospel of the New World, 22.

45 Instit., I. xviii. 1.

source in this formulary. The complete statement of this doctrine in the Lutheran Confession is as follows:

But the foreknowledge of God disposes evil and sets bounds to it, how far it may proceed and how long endure, and directs it in such wise that, though it be of itself evil, it nevertheless turns to the salvation of the elect of God.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Art. XI, par. III, Schaff, III, 166.

2. Of the State of the Old and New Testament.IRISHSOURCE

81. In the Old Testament the Commandements of the Law were more largely, and the promises of Christ more sparingly and darkely propounded, shaddowed with a multitude of types and figures, and so much the more generally and obscurely deliuered, as the manifesting of them was further off.

... the holy fathers... saw only at a distance, and under shadows, what we now contemplate in open day.⁴⁷
... prophets... preaching is obscure, as relating to things very distant, and is comprehended in types.⁴⁸

82. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New. For both in the Old and New Testament euerlasting life is offered to mankinde by Christ, who is the onely mediator betweene God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are

The olde Testament is not contrary to the newe, for both in the olde and newe Testament euerlastyng lyfe is offered to mankynde by Christe who is the onlye mediatour betweene God and man. Wherefore they are not to be

47 Instit., II. vii. 16.

48 Ibid, II. xi. 6.

not to be heard, which faine that the old Fathers did looke onely for transitory promises. For they looked for all benefits of God the Father through the merits of his Sonne Iesus Christ, as we now doe: onely they beleueed in Christ which should come, we in Christ already come.

hearde whiche faine that the olde fathers dyd looke onely for transitorie promises.⁴⁹ ... for they looked for all benefits of God the father, through the merits of his son Jesu Christ, as we now do. This difference is between them and us, that they looked when Christ should come, and we be in the time when he is come.⁵⁰

83. The New Testament is full of grace and truth, bringing ioyfull tidings vnto mankinde, that whatsoever formerly was promised of Christ, is now accomplished: and so in stead of the auncient types and ceremonies, exhibiteth the things themselues, with a large and cleere declaration of all the benefits of the Gospell. Nei-

49 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. VII, Hardwick, 275.
50 Book of Homilies, Homily of Faith, 42.

ther is the ministry thereof restrained any longer to one circumcised nation, but is indifferently propounded vnto all people, whether they be Iewes or Gentils. So that there is now no Nation which can truly complaine that they be shut forth from the communion of Saints and the liberties of the people of God.

84. Although the Law giuen from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites be abolished, and the Ciuill precepts thereof be not of necessitie to be receaued in any Common-wealth: yet notwithstanding no Christian man whatsoeuer is freed from the obedience of the Commaundments, which are called Morall.

Although the lawe geuen from God by Moyses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bynde Christian men, nor the ciuile preceptes thereof, ought of necessitie to be receaued in any commonwealth: yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoeuer, is free from the obedience of the commaundementes, whiche are called morall.⁵¹

51 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. VII, Hardwick, 275, 277.

This subject, of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, has, for sake of convenience, been placed under this chapter on the Knowledge of God the Redeemer. In the Irish Articles it is found in a position between the sections dealing with the Church and the Sacraments; but since it deals with the work of Christ, Calvin places it in Book Two of his "Institutes", which is the more logical place for it.

Articles Eighty-one and Eighty-three cannot be traced to any specific source, although as shown above, there is a striking similarity of language in the "Institutes" to that of the former article. Articles Eighty-two and Eighty-four are taken almost verbatim from the Thirty-nine Articles and the second part of the Homily of Faith.

This subject is dealt with more at length in the Irish Articles than in any other earlier confession. The Lutheran formularies do not mention it; but it is found, though somewhat differently, in the French⁵² and Belgic⁵³ Confessions. It is also found in the Second Helvetic Confession in a form somewhat analogous to the Irish, though not as specific.⁵⁴

Since the subject is confined to the Reformed confessions, it is only natural that it be originally

52 Art. XXIII, Schaff, III, 372.

53 Art. XXV, Ibid, 412.

54 Chap. XIII, Ibid, 856.

found in Calvin's writings. He devotes five chapters to it in his "Institutes",⁵⁵ between the sections on Man's Sinful Estate, and Christ the Mediator. Article Eighty-four deals with the moral law, and appropriately enough, a lengthy discussion of that theme occupies a full chapter of the five chapters mentioned.

Article Eighty-two differs from the seventh article of the XXXIX only in the addition of the words, "being both God and man", which were taken from the article as originally found in the XLII Articles of 1552.⁵⁶ This article affirms, that "both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ"; and it was "manifestly levelled at the Anabaptist teachers, many of whom, like Servetus, denied that the elder worthies had even the most indefinite expectation of a life beyond the present."⁵⁷ Calvin refers to the same teaching in these words: "... Servetus and some madmen of the sect of the Anabaptists, who entertain no other ideas of the Israelitish nation, than of a herd of swine, whom they pretend to have been pampered by the Lord in this world, without the least hope of a future immortality in heaven."⁵⁸ And Calvin anticipates the language of article Eighty-four by saying: "the fathers were partakers with us of the same inheritance, and hoped for the same sal-

55 Instit., II. vii-xi.

56 Art. VI, Hardwick, 274.

57 Hardwick, 99-100.

58 Instit., II. x. 1.

vation through the grace of our common Mediator."⁵⁹

Article Eighty-four follows article Seven of the XXXIX closely, except for the substitution of the phrase, "be abolished" for, "do not bind Christian men". This article (the nineteenth of the XLII of 1552) was "directed against another branch of (the Anabaptists), who, under the plea of internal illumination had dispensed with the moral law, and circulated opinions respecting it 'most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture'".⁶⁰

59 Ibid.

60 Hardwick, 102.

3. Of Christ, the mediator of the second Covenant.IRISHSOURCE

29. The Sonne, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from euerlasting of the Father, the true and eternall God, of one substance with the Father, tooke mans nature in the wombe of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhoode were inseparably ioyned in one person, making one Christ very God and very man.

The Sonne, which is the worde of the Father, begotten from euerlastyng of the Father, the very and eternall GOD, of one substaunce with the father, toke mans nature in the wombe of the blessed Virgin, of her substaunce: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and manhood, were ioyned together in one person, neuer to be diuided, whereof is one Christe, very GOD and very man.⁶¹

30. Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like vnto vs in all things, sinne only excepted, from which he

Christe in the trueth of our nature, was made lyke vnto vs in al thinges (sin only except) from which he was

61 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. II, Hardwick, 269.

was cleerely voyd, both in his life and in his nature. He came as a Lambe without spott, to take away the sins of the world, by the sacrifice of himselfe once made, and sinne (as Saint Iohn saith) was not in him. He fulfilled the law for vs perfectly: For our sakes he endured most grievous torments immediately in his soule, and most painefull sufferings in his body. He was crucified, and dyed to reconcile his Father vnto vs, and to be a sacrifice not onely for originall guilt, but also for all our actuall transgressions. He was buried and descended into hell, and the third day rose from the dead, and tooke againe his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the

clearley voyde, both in his fleshe, and in his spirite. He came to be the lambe without spot, who by the sacrifice of hym self once made, shoulde take away the sinnes of the worlde: and sinne, (as S. John sayeth) was not in hym.⁶²

... who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for originall gylt, but also for all actuall sinnes of men.⁶³

... he went downe into hell.⁶⁴
... Christe dyd truely aryse agayne from death, and toke agayne his body, with flesh, bones, and all thinges appar- teyning to the perfection of

62 Ibid, Art. XV, 283.

63 Ibid, Art. II, 269.

64 Ibid, Art. III, 271.

<p>perfection of mans nature: wherewith he ascended into Heauen, and there sitteth <u>at</u> <u>the right hand of his Father,</u> vntill hee returne to iudge all men at the last day.</p>	<p>mans nature, wherewith he ascended into heauen, and there sitteth, vntyll he returne to iudge all men at the last day.⁶⁵</p>
---	--

This section deals with the person and work of Christ, and it has been given the appellation of "Mediator", a name which may be traced to the influence of Calvin.

The material covered in this section, which in the Thirty-nine Articles is found in several articles, not all consecutive, is found in the Irish Articles in a logical and chronological order. It follows the second part of the Apostles' Creed:

... and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead...⁶⁶

Article Twenty-nine, of the two natures of Christ, is taken almost verbatim, with only one minor difference, from the Thirty-nine Articles, which came originally from the Augsburg Confession.⁶⁷

65 Ibid, Art. IV, 271.

66 Schaff, II, 45.

67 Art. III, Ibid, III, 9.

The language used in this article is essentially that of the Orthodox Creeds in the assertion of the two natures of Christ; e.g., the words of the Athanasius Creed are:

... Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the Substance of the Father; begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born in the world... Who although he be God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ.⁶⁸

The Symbol of Chalcedon reads: "... Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures... indivisibly, inseparably."⁶⁹ The Irish Articles use the latter of these two words, whereas the XXXIX Articles use the former. Schaff says that they were both "in opposition to Nestorianism, which so emphasized the duality of natures, and the continued distinction between the human and the divine in Christ, as to lose sight of the unity of person."⁷⁰

This God-Man, this entire Person, is the Being to whom the title of Mediator is applied. As Calvin says: "those things which relate to the office of the Mediator, are not spoken simply of his Divine or of his human nature."⁷¹

Article Thirty is made up of several of the Thirty-nine Articles: the first clause of the fifteenth, the last clause of the second, the latter clause of the third, and the entire fourth.

68 30, 31, 34, Schaff, II, 68-9.

69 Schaff, II, 62.

70 II, 65, note 6.

71 Instit., II. xiv. 3.

Again there are several differences: first, the Irish article says that Christ was without sin in both his "life and nature", whereas the English has "flesh and spirit"; the Irish adds the phrase, "He fulfilled the law for us perfectly", which the XXXIX does not have. And whereas the XXXIX has merely, "who truly suffered", the Irish article elaborates, and reads: "For our sakes he endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body."

Ussher has been accused, because of his use of the statement that Christ suffered "grievous torments in his soul", of following Calvin's doctrine of Christ's descent into hell. That such is not the case can be seen quite clearly. Calvin says, that "he suffered in his soul the dreadful torments of a person condemned and irretrievably lost."⁷² And he uses this phrase in explanation of the article of the Creed, "he descended into hell". But Ussher does not use it in this sense, for later in the same article (30), in its proper chronological order, he uses the simple phrase, "descended into hell". Evidence to support this contention may be introduced from other of Ussher's writings; e.g., in a sermon preached at Oxford in 1640, he says:

He suffered not only bodily sufferings, but sufferings in soul, and that he did in a most unknown and incomprehensible manner; but now may some say, Did Christ suffer the pains and torments of hell? No, he

72 Instit., II. xvi. 10.

5 suffered those things that such an innocent lamb might suffer, but he could not suffer the pains of hell. The reason is, because one thing which makes hell to be hell, is the gnawing worm of an accusing conscience. Now Christ had no such worm. He had so clear a conscience, as that he could not be stung with any such evil.⁷³

Peter Heylin, a High-Anglican, claims that this is one of the seven points of doctrine in which Ussher differed from the Church of England, stating, that the Church of England maintains a local descent into hell by Christ.⁷⁴ The corresponding article in the XLII Articles of 1552 had explained the nature of the descent, reading:

he went down into hell. For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection: but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell, and did preache to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.⁷⁵

Heylin maintains, that although this passage was left out of the Articles of the Church of England of 1562, it cannot be used as an argument to prove that the Church has altered her opinion on the subject. He gives as the reasons for the change the following: first, that it appeared to incline too much toward the Romish doctrine, which made the purpose of Christ's descent to be for the purpose of releasing the Fathers from Limbo; and secondly, because some scholars had declared that the text from St. Peter was capable of another interpretation.⁷⁶

73 Works, XIII, 155.

74 Respondet Petrus, 111.

75 Art. III, Hardwick, 268, 270.

76 Respondet Petrus, 111.

Ussher questioned "whether any such controverted matter may fitly be brought in to expound the 'Rule of Faith' by, which being 'common both to the great and the small ones in the Church', must contain such verities only as are generally agreed upon by the common consent of all true Christians."⁷⁷

Another phrase of article Thirty which warrants comment is the one in which the Thirty-nine Articles is followed in affirming, that "Christ died to reconcile his Father unto us". This language, expressive of the thought that God, an angry deity, was offended by the actions of his creatures, and needed to be reconciled to them, was common in Reformation and post-Reformation theology. Calvin uses it frequently,⁷⁸ and in one instance misreads a Scripture reference to support his theory, whether intentionally, or otherwise, saying, "he was our enemy till he was reconciled by the death of Christ."⁷⁹ The Scripture reads: "when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son."⁸⁰ However, Calvin uses more thoughtful language elsewhere. Referring to this same passage of Scripture, he says: "the apostle teaches, that man is an enemy to God, till he be reconciled to him through Christ."⁸¹ The phrase, "they have

77 Works, III, 418.

78 Instit., III. ii. 28; III. iv. 26; etc.

79 Ibid, II. xvi. 4.

80 Romans v. 10.

81 Instit., III. xi. 21.

God reconciled to them" is also found in the Lutheran Formula of Concord.⁸²

More recent writers have pointed out the fallacy of such a statement; e.g., Principal Denney says:

Where reconciliation is spoken of in Saint Paul, the subject is always God, and the object is always man. The work of reconciling is one in which the initiative is taken by God, and the cost borne by him; men are reconciled in the passive, or allow themselves to be reconciled, or receive the reconciliation. We never read that God has been reconciled.⁸³

82 Art. III, par. VI, Schaff, III, 117.

83 Death of Christ, 143-4.

CHAPTER VION THE MANNER OF RECEIVING THE GRACE OF CHRIST, THE BENEFITS WHICH WE DERIVE FROM IT, AND THE EFFECTS WHICH FOLLOW IT.1. Of the communicating of the grace of Christ.IRISHSOURCE

31. They are to be condemned, that presume to say that euery man shalbe saued by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out vnto vs only the name of Iesus Christ whereby men must be saued.

They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that euery man shal be saued by the lawe or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his lyfe accordyng to that lawe, and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out vnto vs onely the name of Iesus Christe, whereby men must be saued.¹

1 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XVIII, Hardwick, 289.

32. None can come vnto Christ, vnlesse it bee giuen vnto him, and vnlesse the Father drawe him. And all men are not so drawen by the Father that they may come vnto the Son. Neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto euerie man whereby he is enabled to come vnto everlasting life.

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.² Saving grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.³ It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved.⁴

33. All Gods elect are in their time inseperablye vnited vnto Christ by the effectuall and vitall influence of the holy Ghost, deriued from him as from the head vnto euey true member of his mysticall body. And being thus made one with Christ, they are truely regenerated, and made partakers of him and all his benefits.

2 Lambeth Articles, Art. VIII, Schaff, III, 524.

3 Ibid, Art. VII.

4 Ibid, Art. IX.

Article Thirty-one, on the subject of salvation by Christ alone, is taken almost verbatim from article eighteen of the XXXIX, the only difference being the substitution of the word "condemned" for "accursed". The article had originally appeared in the XLII Articles, and in that formulary the reading was, "accursed and abhorred".⁵ At that time (1552), it was directed against an erroneous Anabaptist tenet, promulgated by Hans Denk and others, who

affirmed that man may earn salvation by his own virtuous actions, and regarded the Founder of Christianity chiefly in his character of a teacher. In Him, as one of the purest of our race, God was peculiarly manifested to the world, but to assert that He was our Saviour, in the received meaning of that term, was, in their view, to convert Him into an idol.⁶

This article is Scriptural. Jesus said: "no man cometh unto the Father but by me."⁷

That such teaching as was condemned in 1552 continued to remain evident until the time of the formation of the Irish Articles, and even much longer, can be seen from a passage in a sermon preached by Ussher at Oxford in 1640:

Strange conceits men have now adays, and strange divinity is brought forth into the world: that if a man does as much as lies in him, and what he is of himself able to do; nay farther, though he be a heathen, that knows not Christ, yet if he doth the best he can; if he live honestly toward men, according to the conduct of his reason, and hath a good

5 Hardwick, 288.

6 Ibid, 91, 102.

7 John xiv. 6. Zwingli's Ten Theses of Bern (1528), one of the earliest of the Reformed confessions, had affirmed the same: "... it is a denial of Christ when we confess another ground of salvation and satisfaction." Art. III, Schaff, I, 365.

mind towards God, it is enough, he need not question his eternal welfare. A cursed and desperate doctrine they conclude hence. Why, say they, may not this man be saved as well as the best? But if it be so, I ask such, What is the benefit and advantage of the Jew more than the Gentile? What is the benefit of Christ? Of the Church? Of faith? Of baptism? Of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper?⁸

Article Thirty-two marks the first appearance in the Irish Articles of the Lambeth Articles. As has been shown,⁹ this article is made up of three articles from that formulary.

No objection can be taken to the first phrase, a quotation from Scripture: No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him",¹⁰ and, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me".¹¹ The second phrase is a logical inference from this Scriptural statement. All men do not come to Christ; that is a fact of experience. Therefore, it must be, that "all men are not so drawn by the Father that they may come unto the Son." That is what Calvin says in endorsing Augustine's views. Commenting on John vi. 44, Calvin remarks:

This passage is judiciously explained by Augustine in the following words: "... Everyone that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me. Is not this saying, There is no one that hears and learns of the Father, and comes not unto me? For if every one that has heard and learned of the Father comes, certainly every one that comes not has neither heard nor learned of the Father; for if he had heard and learned, he would come. Very remote from carnal observation is

8 Works, XIII, 66-7.

9 Above, 129.

10 John vi. 44.

11 John vi. 37.

this school, in which men hear and learn of the Father to come to the Son.¹²

The last phrase of the article reads: "Neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto every man whereby he is enabled to come unto everlasting life."¹³ If men come to the Father by the Grace of Christ, and only by that grace, and if all men are not "so drawn by the Father", then it may be concluded, that a "sufficient measure of grace" has not been vouchsafed to every man whereby he may receive eternal life.

The article does not deny some measure of grace to everyone, but it does say, that everyone has not a sufficient measure". This accords with Calvin's teaching, that "nothing prevents God from illuminating some with a present perception of his grace, which afterwards vanishes away."¹⁴

This article is truer to Calvin than the corresponding Lambeth article, which says: "Saving grace is not given... to all men, by which they may be saved if they will." This language implies that some men cannot be saved even if they will, which is not in accord with Calvin. He says, that if men do will to be saved, it is because of the work of the Spirit causing them to will, and that willing itself is part of the beginning of salvation. His words are: "... the Divine benignity is free to all who seek it, without any exception; but since none begin to seek it,

12 Instit., III. xxiv. 1.

13 See above, 129.

14 Instit., III. ii. 11.

but those who have been inspired by heavenly grace, not even this diminutive portion ought to be taken from his praise."¹⁵

Article Thirty-three has no direct source that can be discovered. The article deals with the perseverance of the elect, claiming that all whom God has elected to eternal life are certain of their regeneration, being "inseparably united " unto Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost. This certainty proceeds from election, and does not rest upon human exertion.

The reason for this perseverance lies in the fact of the believer's being made a member of Christ's body, the body of which Christ himself is the Head. Such language corresponds to much in Calvin, who says: "... the head, in whom their heavenly Father has bound his elect to each other, and united them to himself by an indissoluble bond."¹⁶ And: "being united to their head, they never fail of salvation."¹⁷ He also says: "God regenerates forever the elect alone with incorruptible seed, so that the seed of life planted in their hearts never perishes."¹⁸ But he adds a warning, in answer to those who claim that such teaching favours a sinful course of life: "the faithful are taught to examine themselves... lest carnal security insinuate itself, instead of the assurance of faith."¹⁹

15 Instit., II. iii. 10.

16 Ibid., III. xxi. 7.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid., III. ii. 11.

19 Ibid.

2. Of Iustification and Faith.IRISHSOURCE

34. We are accounted righteous before God, onely for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Iesus Christ, applied by faith: and not for our owne workes or merits. And this righteousnes, which we so receiue of Gods mercie and Christs merits, imbraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full iustification.

We are accompted righteous before God, only for the merite of our Lord and sauour Jesus Christe, by faith, and not for our owne workes or deseruynges.²⁰ And this... righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.²¹

35. Although this iustification be free vnto vs, yet it commeth not so freely vnto vs, that there is no ransome paid therefore at all. God shewed his great mercie in deliuering vs from our former captiuitie,

And although this justification be free unto us, yet it cometh not so freely unto us, that there is no ransom paid therefore at all... His great mercy he showed unto us in delivering us from

20 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XI, Hardwick, 281.

21 Book of Homilies, Homily of Salvation, 25.

without requiring of any ransom to be paid, or amends to be made on our parts; which thing by vs had been vnpossible to bee done. And whereas all the world was not able of themselves to pay any part towards their ransome, it pleased our heavenly Father of his infinite mercie without any desert of ours, to prouide for vs the most precious merits of his owne Sonne, whereby our ransome might be fully payd, the lawe fulfilled, and his iustice fully satisfied. So that Christ is now the righteousnes of all them that truely beleue in him. Hee for them fulfilled the lawe in his life. That now in him, and by him euerie true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the lawe: forasmuch as that which our infirmitie

our former captivity, without requiring of any ransom to be paid, or amends to be made upon our parts, which thing by us had been impossible to be done.²² Whereas all the world was not able of theirselves to pay any part towards their ransom, it pleased our heavenly Father of his infinite mercy, without any our desert or deserving, to prepare for us the most precious jewels of Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied. So that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly do believe in him. He for them paid their ransom by his death. He for them fulfilled the law in his life. So that now in him, and by

was not able to effect, Christs iustice hath performed. And thus the iustice and mercie of God doe embrace each other: the grace of God not shutting out the iustice of God in the matter of our iustification; but onely shutting out the iustice of man (that is to say, the iustice of our owne workes) from being any cause of deseruing our iustification.

him, every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the law; forasmuch as that which their infirmity lacked, Christ's justice hath supplied.²³ And so the justice of God and his mercy did embrace together.²⁴ ... the grace of God doth not shut out the justice of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the justice of man, that is to say, the justice of our works, as to be merits of deserving our justification.²⁵

36. When we say that we are iustified by Faith onely, we doe not meane that the said iustifying faith is alone in man, without true Repentance, Hope, Charity, and the feare of God (for such a faith is dead, and cannot iustify)

... this sentence, that we be justified by faith only, is not so meant of them, that the said justifying faith is alone in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and the fear of God.²⁶

23 Homily of Salvation, 28.
 24 Ibid, 26.
 25 Ibid, 27.
 26 Ibid, 29.

neither do we meane, that this our act to beleue in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within vs, doth of it selfe iustifie vs, or deserue our iustification vnto vs, (for that were to account our selues to bee iustified by the vertue or dignitie of some thing that is within our selues:) but the true vnderstanding and meaning thereof is that although we heare Gods word and beleue it, although we haue Faith, Hope, Charitie, Repentance, and the feare of God within us, and add neuer so many good workes thereunto: yet wee must renounce the merit of all our said vertues, of Faith, Hope, Charitie, and all our other vertues, and good deeds, which we either haue done, shall do, or can doe, as

... that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, or deserue our justification unto us; (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves;) but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word, and believe it; although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and the fear of God within us, and do never so many works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, of faith, hope, charity, and all other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things

things that be farre too weake and vnperfect, and vnsufficient to deserue remission of our sinnes, and our iustification: and therefore we must trust onely in Gods mercie, and the merits of his most dearely beloued Sonne, our onely Redeemer, Sauour, and Iustifier Iesus Christ. Neuerthelesse, because Faith doth directly send vs to Christ for our iustification, and that by faith given us of God wee embrace the promise of Gods mercie, and the remission of our sinnes, (which thing none other of our vertues or workes properly doth:) therefore the Scripture vseth to say, the FAITH WITHOUT WORKES; and the auncient fathers of the Church to the same purpose, that ONE-
LY FAITH doth iustifie vs.

that be far too weak and insufficient, and unperfect, to deserve remission of our sins, and our justification; and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our high-priest and saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross.²⁷ Nevertheless, because faith doth directly send us to Christ for remission of our sins, and that, by faith given us of God, we embrace the promise of God's mercy, and of the remission of our sins, (which thing none other of our virtues or works properly doth,) therefore Scripture useth to say, that faith without works ... the old ancient fathers of the Church... have uttered our justification with this ... Only faith justifieth us.²⁸

27 Homily of Salvation, 31.
28 Ibid, 33.

37. By iustifying Faith wee vnderstand not onely the common beleefe of the Articles of Christian Religion, and a persuasion of the truth of Gods worde in generall: but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospell, to the comfort of our owne soules: whereby we lay hold on Christ, with all his benefits, hauing an earnest trust and confidence in God, that he will be mercifull vnto vs for his onely Sonnes sake. So that a true beleeuer may bee certaine, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiuenesse of his sinnes, and of his euerlasting salvation by Christ.

... the right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe that holy scripture, and all the... articles of our faith are true; but also to have a sure trust and confidence in God's merciful promises, to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ: whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments.²⁹ ... this sure trust and confidence in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins be forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God.³⁰ A man truly faithful, that is, such a 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.³¹

29 Homily of Salvation, 34.

30 Ibid.

31 Lambeth Articles, Art. VI, Schaff, III, 524.

38. A true lively iustifying faith, and the sanctifying spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanishes away in the regenerate, either finally or totally.

A true, living, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying (sanctifying), is not extinguished, falleth not away... in the elect, either finally or totally.³²

The doctrine of Justification by Faith was the touchstone of the Reformation; therefore, it assumed a distinct place in the confessions of that movement. In some, such as the Augsburg Confession³³ and the Thirty-nine Articles,³⁴ it is stated more succinctly than in the Irish Articles.

The former part of article Thirty-four is taken verbatim from the XXXIX, except for two minor changes; the first of these is the phrase, "applied by faith", for the former's "by faith"; the second is the substitution of the word "merits" for "deservings".

The latter part of the article in the XXXIX Articles, which the Irish does not incorporate, reads: "Wherefore, that we are iustified by fayth onely, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homilie of iustification."³⁵ The reason

32 Ibid, Art. V, 523-4.

33 Art. IV, Schaff, III, 10.

34 Art. XI, Hardwick, 281.

35 Hardwick, 281.

this was omitted is quite obvious; for, as seen in the several preceding pages, the expressions of the homily are reproduced in the Irish formulary almost verbatim, causing this section itself almost to take the form of a homily. Thus, since the teaching of the XXXIX Articles is that which is expressed in the Homily of Salvation, it follows that the Irish Articles, from articles Thirty-four to near the end of Thirty-seven, agree with the Articles of the Church of England.

The doctrine is concisely stated in the thirty-fourth article, while in the following articles in the section the doctrine is elaborated and explained.

The teaching of the Church of Rome on the subject of Justification, as summarised by Bishop Burnet, is, that

the remission of sins is to be considered as a thing previous to Justification, and distinct from it, and acknowledged to be freely given in Christ Jesus; and that in consequence of this there is such a grace infused, that thereupon the person becomes truly 'just', and is considered as such by God.³⁶

The Reformed teaching, and that of the Irish Articles, is, that Justification means being brought into favour with God, not on account of our own merits, but on account of the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to us; so that whereas we formerly stood under condemnation, we now are accepted as righteous by God. Thus, justification is distinguished from sanctification, which subject

will be treated in the following section in this chapter.

The difference between the Roman and the Reformed teaching is partly a matter of terminology. What the former calls Remission of sins, the latter calls Justification; and what the Romanists call Justification, the Reformers call Sanctification. Yet it must be admitted that the Reformers use language which is truer to Scripture; for it is said: "Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things..."³⁷, in which case Justification means acquittal. And also: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth;"³⁸ regarding which Calvin says: "It is most evident that the apostle is treating simply of accusation and absolution, and that his meaning wholly rests on the antithesis."³⁹

Ussher also recognised this difference in terminology, for he says:

... we have a righteousness without us, and a righteousness inherent in us; the righteousness without us, is forgiveness of sins, and pardon of them, which is a gracious act of God... then there is a righteousness within me, an inherent righteousness. And if a righteousness, then justification; for that is but a declaration of righteousness. And so that which the Fathers call justification, is taken generally for sanctification; that which we call justification, they call forgiveness of sins; ... the difference is only in the terms.⁴⁰

37 Acts xiii. 38-9.

38 Romans viii. 33.

39 Instit., III. xi. 6.

40 Sermon preached at Oxford, 1640, Works, XIII, 239.

It should be noted, that in the above quotation Ussher ascribes this difference to the Fathers of the Church; he has something other to say about the later teaching of the Church of Rome: "They utterly deny that there is any righteousness, but righteousness inherent. They say forgiveness of sins is nothing but sanctification. A new doctrine never heard of in the Church of God... till the spawn of the Jesuits devised it."⁴¹

The meaning of the Church of Rome of justification by faith is expressed in the Decrees of the Council of Trent in the following words: "we are... said to be 'justified by faith' because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation, and the root of all Justification; 'without which it is impossible to please God', and to come unto the fellowship of his sons."⁴² This is easily seen to be diametrically opposed to the Reformed teaching; so much so, that Ussher was forced to say: "they confound inherent righteousness which is begun, and shall be perfected in final grace with the other; so that the point is not between us and Rome, whether faith justifieth by works or no? but, whether it justifieth at all?"⁴³

Article Thirty-five deals with the basis for justification; and it is declared to be the merits of Jesus Christ, in "paying the ransom" for our sins. This is

41 Ibid, 259.

42 Sess. VI, Chap. VIII, Schaff, II, 97.

43 Sermon, Oxford, 1640, Works, XIII, 264.

the theory of Penal Substitution - the theory accepted by all the Reformers, and propounded in most of the confessions of their age. This was but natural, for it is clear New Testament doctrine, and especially Pauline. Calvin endorses it, saying, "... that righteousness which has been procured for us by the obedience and sacrificial death of Christ;"⁴⁴ and, "we are righteous through the expiation effected by Christ."⁴⁵

Despite a departure from the doctrine in succeeding centuries, it still has many ardent supporters. Professor Paterson says:

... it is still evident that there is no theory which is so intelligible... and that there is no religious message which has brought the same peace and solace to those who have realised the sinfulness of sin, and the menace of the retributive forces of the divine government, as the conception that the penalty due to sin was borne by the crucified Saviour, and that the guilty may be covered by the robe of His imputed righteousness.⁴⁶

Article Thirty-six is a precaution against the erroneous belief that "faith alone" is sufficient, which Ussher calls "a dead faith". True faith is accompanied by "true repentance, hope, charity, and the fear of God". The Council of Trent had said the same thing: "faith, unless hope and charity be added thereto, neither unites man perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of his body."⁴⁷ But the Irish article is careful to main-

44 Instit., III. xi. 5.

45 Ibid, III. xi. 9.

46 Rule of Faith, 286.

47 Sess. VI, Chap. VII, Schaff, II, 96.

tain that neither our act of believing in Christ, nor the faith that is within us, justifies us, for that "were to account ourselves to be justified by the virtue or dignity of some thing that is within ourselves."⁴⁸

The article teaches, that faith is given us of God, and because of this faith which has been given to us, "we embrace the promise of God's mercy, and the remission of our sins."⁴⁹ Ussher says elsewhere: "the word of God works faith in thee... It is not a flower that grows in thine own garden, but is planted by God."⁵⁰

The Irish Articles affirm, that a genuine faith is a faith that produces good works, or one that has been called a "lively" faith. It has been a misunderstanding of the real meaning of the term that has led to much of the controversy in the Church over the subject of justification by faith.

Article Thirty-seven defines justifying faith as, "not only the common belief of the Articles of the Christian Religion, and a persuasion of the truth of God's word in general: but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospel... whereby we lay hold on Christ."⁵¹ This seems, at first glance, to be partially in contradiction to Calvin, who says:

48 Above, 137.
 49 Ibid,
 50 Works, XIII, 168.
 51 Above, 139.

we shall have a complete definition of faith, if we say, that it is a steady and certain knowledge of the Divine benevolence towards us, which, being founded on the truth of the gratuitous promise in Christ, is both revealed to our minds, and confirmed to our hearts, by the Holy Spirit.⁵²

In this complete definition, there is nothing said of the belief of any articles of religion as a constituent of faith. However, that the language used in the first part of this article is meant to be taken in the intellectual sense, is to be doubted. The article was probably directed against those who believed that faith was a purely intellectual thing, a belief in a series of propositions about God. Ussher, along with his predecessors, saw that it was primarily "a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospel. to the comfort of our own souls."

The conviction of the truth of the articles of faith, and the "persuasion of the truth of God's word in general", comes as a result of the faith given us by God. Calvin gives expression to this in these words: "Faith... is a singular gift of God in two respects; both as the mind is enlightened to understand the truth of God, and as the heart is established in it."⁵³

In this sense, Faith obtained a new significance at the Reformation, which Bavinck expresses as follows:

If the Gospel is not a 'veritas' to which the 'gratia' is added later on, but is itself 'gratia' in its very origin, the revelation of God's gracious

52 Instit., III. ii. 7.

53 Ibid, III. ii. 33.

will, and at the same time the instrument for making this will effective in the heart of man, then faith can no longer remain a purely intellectual assent. It must become the confidence in the gracious will of God, produced by God himself in man's heart; a surrender of the whole man to the divine grace; a resting in the divine promise; a receiving of a part in God's favour; admission into communion with him; an absolute assurance of salvation.⁵⁴

He adds, comparing the Reformed doctrine with that of Rome: "As 'fides justificans salvifica' it differs not in degree, but in principle and essence from the 'fides historica'."⁵⁵

The last phrase of article Thirty-seven is taken from the Lambeth Articles, and states that a true believer may be assured of his salvation by Christ. This is what has been said above by Bavinck. The Church of Rome had denied this to be true; for the Council of Trent had declared, that "each one... may have fear and apprehension touching his own grace; seeing that no one can know with a certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God."⁵⁶

The language in this article is consistent with that of Calvin, who says:

... no man is truly a believer, unless he be firmly persuaded, that God is a propitious and benevolent Father to him, and promise himself every thing from his goodness; unless he depend on the promises of the Divine benevolence to him, and feel an undoubted expectation of salvation.⁵⁷

This firm assurance and unshaken conviction which Calvin and his followers possessed, was the result

54 Calvin and Common Grace, Art. in Armstrong: Calvin and the Reformation, 109.

55 Ibid.

56 Sess. VI, Chap. IX, Schaff, II, 99.

57 Instit., III. ii. 16.

of making "the foundation of faith to be the gratuitous promise; for on that faith properly rests."⁵⁸ And also, "... if we wish our faith not to tremble and waver, we must support it with the promise of salvation, which is ... offered us by the Lord, rather in consideration of our misery, than in respect of our worthiness."⁵⁹

Article Thirty-eight is taken almost verbatim from the Lambeth Articles, with one verbal difference, the substitution of the word "regenerate" for the earlier formulary's "elect". But it really does not change the meaning of the article, for article Thirty-three had stated, that "all God's elect... are truly regenerated",⁶⁰ which identifies the one word with the other. This article reiterates that which is taught in article Thirty-three, viz., the perseverance of true believers.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Instit., III. ii. 24.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Above, 129.

⁶¹ Ibid., 129, 133.

3. Of sanctification and good workes.IRISHSOURCE

39. All that are iustified,
are likewise sanctified: their
faith being alwaies accompa-
nied with true Repentance and
good Workes.

40. Repentance is a gift of
God, whereby a godly sorrow is
wrought in the heart of the
faithfull, for offending God
their mercifull Father by
their former transgressions,
together with a constant reso-
lution for the time to come
to cleaue unto God, and to
lead a new life.

<p>41. Albeit that good workes, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after iustification, cannot make satisfaction for our sinnes, and endure the</p>	<p>Albeit that good workes, which are the fruits of fayth, and folowe after iustifica- tion, can not put away our sinnes, and endure the</p>
--	--

seueritie or Gods iudgement:
yet are they pleasing to God
and accepted of him in Christ,
and doe spring from a true
and liuely faith, which by
them is to be discerned, as a
tree by the fruite.

seueritie of Gods iudgement:
yet are they pleasing and
acceptable to God in Christe,
and do spring out necessarily
of a true and liuely fayth,
in so much that by them, a
lyuely fayth may be as eu-
dently knowen, as a tree
discerned by the fruit.⁶²

42. The workes which God
would haue his people to walke
in, are such as he hath com-
maunded in his holy Scripture,
and not such workes as men
haue deuised out of their own
braine, of a blinde zeale, and
deuotion, without the warrant
of the word of God.

... what kind of good
works they be that God would
haue his people to walk in,
namely, such as he hath com-
maunded in his holy Scripture,
and not such works as men
have studied out of their own
brain, of a blind zeal and de-
uotion, without the word of
God.⁶³

43. The regenerate cannot ful-
fill the lawe of God perfectly
in this life. For in many
things we offend all: and if

we... yet offend in many
thinges, and if we say we

62 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XII, Hardwick, 281.

63 Book of Homilies, Homily of Good Works, 57.

we say, we haue no sinne, wee deceaue our selues, and the truth is not in vs.

haue no sinne, we deceaue our selues, and the trueth is not in vs.⁶⁴

44. Not euerie heynous sinne willingly committed after baptisme, is sinne against the holy Ghost, and vnpardonable. And therefore to such as fall into sinne after baptisme, place for repentance is not to be denied.

Not euery deadly sinne willingly committed after baptisme, is sinne agaynst the holy ghost, and vnpardonable. Wherefore, the graunt of repentaunce is not to be denied to such as fal into sinne after baptisme.⁶⁵

45. Voluntary workes, besides ouer and aboue Gods commandements, which they call workes of Superrogation, cannot be taught without arrogancie, and impietie. For by them men doe declare that they render vnto God as much as they are bound to doe, but that they doe more for his sake then of bounded duty is required.

Voluntarie workes besydes, ouer, and aboue Gods commaundementes, which they call workes of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancie and impietie. For by them men do declare that they do not onely render vnto God as muche as they are bounde to do, but that they do more for his sake then of bounded duetie is required.⁶⁶

64 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XV, Hardwick, 283, 285.

65 Ibid, Art. XVI, 285.

66 Ibid, Art. XIV, 283.

The first two articles in this section have no direct source, but the remaining five have been traced to former English documents, as shown above.

Articles Thirty-nine and Forty are clearly Calvinistic. The former states that all who are justified are likewise sanctified, meaning, of course, that in them the process of sanctification has been begun. Of this grace, Calvin says: "to this mercy (justification) he adds also another blessing; for he dwells in us by his Holy Spirit, by whose power our carnal desires are daily more and more mortified, and we are sanctified..."⁶⁷ He adds: "Christ therefore justifies no one whom he does not also sanctify."⁶⁸ And again: "we never dream either of a faith destitute of good works, or of a justification unattended by them."⁶⁹

The latter article (40) emphasises that repentance is a gratuitous favour of God, and it consists of two parts: first, a "godly sorrow", and secondly, a determination to lead a new life. This language is similar to that of Calvin, who says: "... repentance is a peculiar gift of God."⁷⁰

Repentance consists of: 1) Mortification, and 2) Vivification; the former of which is explained to be the sorrow of mind, and the terror of the Divine judgments.

67 Instit., III. xiv. 9.

68 Ibid., III. xvi. 1.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid., III. iii. 21.

"For when any one has been brought to a true knowledge of sin, he then begins truly to hate and abhor it; then he is heartily displeased with himself, confesses himself to be miserable and lost, and wishes that he were another man."⁷¹
 This first part of repentance has sometimes been called contrition. Of the second part, viz., vivification, Calvin says: "... it should signify an ardent desire and endeavour to live a holy and pious life, as though it were said, that a man dies to himself, that he may begin to live in God."⁷²

Other Reformed Confessions are in agreement as to the nature of repentance; e.g., the Second Helvetic says: "Now we do expressly say, that this repentance is the mere gift of God, and not the work of our own strength."⁷³

Article Forty-three denies the possibility of human perfection, stating: "The regenerate cannot fulfil the law of God perfectly in this life." With the exception of this sentence, the article is taken almost verbatim from the XXXIX, and is itself a quotation from Scripture.⁷⁴

The Irish Articles are careful to state, that although good works are pleasing to God, they do not of themselves warrant any merit, inasmuch as they spring out of faith. Another Calvinistic confession, the French, uses similar language: "... the good works which we do proceed

71 Ibid, III. 111. 3.

72 Ibid.

73 Art. XIV, Schaff, III, 859.

74 I John 1. 8.

from his Spirit, and cannot be accounted to us for justification."⁷⁵ As a tree is known by its fruit, so is a true faith known by the works which follow it. If no fruits are evident, it may be concluded that there is no lively faith; for, as Ussher says: "... saving faith is always a fruitful faith."⁷⁶

Article Forty-four is taken in substance from the XXXIX Articles, a notable change being the substitution of the word "heinous" for "deadly", following the language of article Twenty-seven.⁷⁷ The article was originally directed against the Anabaptists, who, at the time of the Reformation, asserted that "all hope of pardon is taken away from those, who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin."⁷⁸

A phrase from article Sixteen of the XXXIX, which has not been reproduced in the Irish Articles, reads: "After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given..."⁷⁹ Hardwick states, that at the Hampton Court Conference, Dr. Reynolds complained that the Thirty-nine Articles were, in certain places obscure; and that this particular passage was one instance, in which, although the meaning was sound, "yet he desired, that, because they may seem to be contrary to the doctrine of God's predesti-

75 Art. XXII, Schaff, III, 372.

76 Of Religion professed by Ancient Irish, Works, IV, 259.

77 See above, -102.

78 Hardwick, 95.

79 Ibid, 285.

nation and election in the seventeenth article, both these words might be explained with this addition: 'yet neither totally nor finally'.⁸⁰ As has been already seen, this latter phrase is found in the Lambeth Articles, and was incorporated into the Irish Articles.⁸¹

Article Forty-five deals with works of supererogation, the erroneous doctrine promulgated by the Church of Rome. The Irish is taken verbatim from the XXXIX, omitting the last clause of the latter, which reads: "Whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants."⁸² This "scholastic figment"⁸³ is so foolish, that a refutation of it is worth neither the time nor the effort.

80 Hardwick, 205-6.

81 Art. 38, above, 140. Professor Schaff says of the sixteenth Article of the XXXIX, that "it simply teaches the possibility of a temporal fall of the baptized and regenerated, but not a 'total' and 'final' fall of the elect." Creeds, I, 639.

82 Hardwick, 283.

83 Ibid, 101.

4. Of the service of God.IRISHSOURCE

46. Our dutie towards God is to beleue in him, to feare him, and to loue him with all our heart, with all our minde, and with all our soule, and with all our strength, to worship him, and to giue him thankes, to put our whole trust in him, to call vpon him, to honour his holy Name and his word, and to serue him truely all the dayes of our life.

My duty towards God is to believe in him, to fear him, and to love him with all my heart, with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength; to worship him, to give him thanks, to put my whole trust in him, to call upon him, to honour his holy name and his Word, and to serve him truly all the days of my life.⁸⁴

47. In all our necessities we ought to haue recourse vn- to God by prayer: assuring our selues, that whatsoever we aske of the Father, in the name of his Sonne (our onely mediator and intercessor)

... in time of necessity we should... crave help at his hands, with... prayer.⁸⁵
... assuring ourselves, that whatsoever we ask of God the Father, in the name of his son Christ, and according to

84 Anglican Catechism, Schaff, III, 519.

85 Book of Homilies, Homily of Prayer, 297.

Christ Iesus, and according to his will, he will vndoubtedly grant it.

48. Wee ought to prepare our hearts before wee pray, and vnderstand the things that wee aske when wee pray: that both our hearts and voyces may together sound in the eares of Gods Maiestie.

49. When almightie God smiteth vs with affliction, or some great calamitie hangeth ouer vs, or any other waighty cause so requireth; it is our dutie to humble ourselues in fasting, to bewaile our sinnes with a sorrowfull heart, and to addict our selues to earnest prayer, that it might please God to turne his wrath from vs, or supplie vs with such graces as wee greatly

his will, he will undoubtedly grant it.⁸⁶

... let us so prepare our hearts before we pray, and so understand the things that we ask when we pray, that both our hearts and voices may together sound in the ears of God's majesty.⁸⁷

... when they were admonished... by the preaching of the prophets, or... when they saw danger to hang over their heads... to appoint to themselves private fasts, at such times as they did either earnestly lament and bewail their sinful lives, or did addict themselves to more fervent prayer, that it might please God to turn his wrath from them...⁸⁸

86 Ibid, 300.

87 Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments, 338.

88 Homily of Fasting, 260.

stande in neede of.

50. Fasting is a with-holding of meat, drinke, and all naturall foode, with other outward delights, from the body, for the determined time of fasting. As for those abstinences which are appointed by publike order of our state, for eating of fish and forbearing of flesh at certaine times and daies appointed, they are no wayes ment to bee religious fastes, nor intended for the maintenance of any superstition in the choise of meates, but are grounded meere-ly vpon politicke considerations, for prouision of things tending to the better preservation of the Commonwealth.

Fasting... is a withhold- ing of meat, drink, and all natural food (... all delicious pleasures and delectations worldly)⁸⁹ from the body, for the determined time of fasting.⁹⁰ ... such abstinences as are appointed by public order and laws made by princes, ... fish only... forbear from flesh... for certain times and days appointed. Such laws... are not made to put holiness in one kind of meat... more than another... but are grounded merely upon policy... whereby the increase of victuals... may the better be spared and cherished, ... to the better sustenance of the poor.⁹¹

89 Ibid, 259. (parenthesis mine)

90 Ibid, 262.

91 Ibid, 267-8.

51. Wee must not fast with this persuasion of minde, that our fasting can bring vs to heauen, or ascribe holynesse to the outward worke wrought. For God alloweth not our fast for the worke sake (which of itselfe is a thing meerely indifferent), but chiefly respecteth the heart, how it is affected therein. It is therefore requisit that first before all things we cleanse our hearts from sinne, and then direct our fast to such ends as God will allow to bee good: that the flesh may thereby be chastised, the spirit may be more feruent in prayer, and that our fasting may bee a testimony of our humble submission to Gods maiestie, when wee acknowledge our sinnes vnto him, and are inwardly

To fast... with this persuasion of mind, that our fasting... can... bring us to heaven.⁹² ... ascribed holiness to the outward work wrought.⁹³ ... God alloweth not our fast for the work's sake (... which of itself is a thing merely indifferent),⁹⁴ but chiefly respecteth our heart... It is requisite that first, before all things, we cleanse our hearts from sin, and then to direct our fast to such an end as God will allow to be good... to chastise the flesh... that the spirit may be more... fervent in prayer... that our fast may be a testimony... of our humble submission to (God's) high majesty, when we... acknowledge our sins unto him, and are inwardly touched with

92 Ibid, 263,

93 Ibid, 262.

94 Ibid, 263. (parenthesis mine)

touched with sorrowfulnesse
of heart, bewailing the same
in the affliction of our
bodies.

52. All worship deuised by
mans phantasie, besides or
contrary to the Scriptures
(as wandering on Pilgramages,
setting vp of Candles, Sta-
tions, and Iubilies, Pharisa-
icall sects and fained relig-
ions, praying vpon Beades,
and such like superstition)
hath not onely no promise of
reward in Scripture, but con-
trariewise threatnings and
maledictions.

53. All manner of expressing
God the Father, the Sonne, and
the holy Ghost, in an outward
forme, is vtterly vnlawfull.
As also all other images de-

sorrowfulness of heart, be-
wailing the same in the af-
fliction of our bodies.⁹⁵

... all... worshipping of
God, deuised by man's fan-
tasies, besides or contrary
to the Scriptures, as wander-
ing on pilgrimages, setting
up of candles, praying upon
beads, and such like super-
stition; which kind of works
have no promise of reward in
Scripture, but contrarywise
threatenings and maledic-
tions.⁹⁶

... I do utterly disallow
the extolling of images,
relics, and feigned miracles,
and also all kind of express-
ing God invisible in the form

95 Ibid, 265-6.

96 Eleven Articles of 1559, Art. XI, Hardwick, 329.

uised or made by man to the use of Religion.

54. All religious worship ought to bee giuen to God alone; from whome all goodnesse, health, and grace ought to be both asked and looked for, as from the very author and giuer of the same, and from none other.

55. The name of God is to be vsed with all reuerence and holy respect: and therefore all vaine and rash swearing is vtterly to be condemned. Yet notwithstanding vpon lawfull occasions, an oath may be giuen, and taken, according to the word of God, IUSTICE, IUDGEMENT, AND TRUTH.

of an old man, or the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove.⁹⁷

Let us honour and worship for religion's sake none but (God)... trusting in him only, calling upon him, and praying to him only...⁹⁸

As we confesse that vayne and rashe swearing is forbidden Christian men by our lord Jesus Christe... So we iudge that Christian religion doth not prohibite, but that a man may sweare when the Magistrate requireth... so it be done accordyng to the prophetes teaching, in iustice, iudgement, and trueth.⁹⁹

97 Ibid.

98 Book of Homilies, Homily of Idolatry, 250.

99 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXIX, Hardwick, 317.

56. The first day of the the Lord's day... which
 weeke, which is the LORDS DAY, is the first day of the week,
 is wholly to be dedicated unto ... God's obedient people
 the seruice of God: and there- should use... holily, and
 fore we are bound therein to rest from their common and
 rest from our common and daily daily business, and also give
 buysinesse, and to bestow that themselves wholly to heavenly
 leasure vpon holy exercises, exercises of God's true
 both publike and priuate. religion and service.¹⁰⁰

This section, of the service of God, is one which is not usually found in a confession of faith. The only other confession that compares with it in this respect is the Second Helvetic, which was drawn up by Bullinger as his personal confession.¹⁰¹ As shown above, most of the articles (47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, and 56) have their source in the Book of Homilies of the Church of England. Two others (52, 53), while taken directly from the Eleven Articles of 1559, are also found in substance in the Book of Homilies.¹⁰² Article Forty-six is taken verbatim from the Anglican Catechism, changing only the number of the person from the singular to the plural. The remaining article (55) is the only one of the eleven in this section which is found in the Thirty-nine Articles.

100 Homily of Time and Place of Prayer, 316-7.

101 Arts. IV, V, XXIII, XXIV, Schaff, III, 836, 838, 897, 899.

102 Homily of Idolatry, 165 ff.

Strenuous objections have been made at various times against several articles in this section. Some writers have even accused Ussher of inserting his own private opinions into the Articles. For instance, Carte says:

...several particular fancies and notions of his own; such as the Sabbatarian doctrine of a Judaical rest on the Lord's day; ... abstinences from flesh upon certain days appointed by authority, declared not to be religious fasts, but to be grounded merely upon politick views and considerations...¹⁰³

Such a statement reveals a strong prejudice against the opposite party within the accuser's own Church, a prejudice held in face of an awareness of such teaching in his own Book of Homilies, which was recognised by the Thirty-nine Articles in these words: "The seconde booke of Homilies... doth conteyne a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessarie for these tymes, ... and therefore we iudge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be vnderstood of the people."¹⁰⁴

Ussher, following the Homily of Fasting, does declare, that such abstinences as are appointed by the State are not religious fasts; and in saying this, he distinguishes such commanded abstinences from those fasts which are truly religious fasts. He deals at length with the latter in articles Forty-nine, the first clause of Fifty, and Fifty-one. The section against which the above-

103 Life of Ormonde, 77. Heylin says the same, in his Life of Laud, 271; also Collier, of the former of these two points. History, VII, 384.

104 Art. XXXV, Hardwick, 311.

named writers object has been taken almost verbatim from the Book of Homilies, as shown above.¹⁰⁵ In the latter the subject is dealt with more explicitly than in article Fifty. For instance, a distinction is drawn between policies of princes and ecclesiastical policies; the former, not contrary to God's law, are to be obeyed out of reverence for the magistrate, who is God's minister; and not only for fear, but for "conscience sake". The section of the homily from which this article was taken was an emendation added to the original by Queen Elizabeth, and was occasioned by a bill brought in on 9 March 1563, which later became the Statute 5 Eliz. Cap. V. The bill reads:

Not for any superstition to be maintained in the choice of meats: be it enacted that whosoever shall by preaching, teaching, writing, or open speech, notify that the eating of fish and forbearing of flesh mentioned in this Statute is of any necessity for the saving of the soul of man, or that it is the service of God, or otherwise than as other politic laws are and be, shall be punished as spreaders of false news are or ought to be.¹⁰⁶

It is not difficult to vindicate Ussher from the aspersions cast upon him by Carte and Heylin, to the effect that "the Sabbatarian doctrine of a Judaical rest on the Lord's day" was also one of his own "particular fancies". If he did hold such an opinion, it was held in conformity with what the Church of England taught in her Book of Homilies, and thus, it would not be his own peculiar belief.

105 p. 158.

106 Tomlinson, The Prayer-Book, Articles, and Homilies, 249.

That Ussher was a Sabbatarian cannot be denied. But if that be true, it follows that the Book of Homilies also taught Sabbatarian doctrine.¹⁰⁷ Ussher was careful to retain the language used in the homily, perhaps from apprehension of criticism from adverse sources. Such carefulness, however, did little to prevent such criticism being later directed against him.

The Sabbatarian controversy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a furious one, and the literature is voluminous. Ussher, in his works, devotes relatively little attention to the question, but what he does say is relevant. Dr. Heylin had asserted, that previous to the formation of the Irish Articles, "the Lord's day had never attained such credit as to be thought an article of the faith."¹⁰⁸ Ussher replied, saying:

... he speaks very inconsiderately. He that would confound the Ten Commandments... with the articles of the faith, he had need be put to learn his catechism again: and he that would have every thing, which is put into the articles of religion... to be held for an article of the faith, should do well to tell us whether he hath as yet admitted... the two volumes of homilies into his creed; for... he shall find these received in the articles of religion agreed upon in the synod held at London, MDLXII.¹⁰⁹

Ussher adds: "By the verdict of the Church of England, I am sure the Lord's day had obtained such a

107 See above, 162.

108 History of the Sabbath, 259.

109 Part of a Letter of the Primate's not long after the publishing of Dr. Heylin's History of the Sabbath, Works, XII, 593-4.

pitch of credit, as nothing more could be left to the Church of Ireland in their articles, afterward to add unto it."¹¹⁰

The article says, that "the Lord's day is wholly to be dedicated unto the service of God." In this it agrees with its source, which says, that God's people should "give themselves wholly to heavenly exercises of God's true religion and service."

Another writer takes exception to Ussher's use of the word "wholly"; Leland says: "Without any condescension to the sentiments of King James, he declared... that the Lord's day was to be 'wholly' dedicated to the service of God."¹¹¹ As if the clergy's primary aim was to please men - even though those men be kings! Ussher says elsewhere:

I never yet doubted, but took it for granted; that as the setting of some whole day apart for God's solemn worship was 'juris divini naturalis', so that this solemn day should be one in seven, was 'juris divini positivi' recorded in the fourth commandment. And such a 'jus divinum positivium' here I mean, as baptism and the Lord's Supper are established by: which lieth not in the power of any man, or angel to change, or alter.¹¹²

Some justification for the presence of this article in the Irish formulary may be found in observing a statement by Trevelyan:

110 Ibid, 594.

111 History of Ireland, II, 459.

112 Part of a Letter to Mr. Ley of the Sabbath, Works, XII, 589.

At the period of James I's accession, the inhabitants of each parish, having satisfied the law by hearing the Common Prayer read on Sunday morning, streamed out from Church eager for the ale to flow and the rebecks to sound on the green, and spent the rest of the day and much of the night in roaring and dancing through the village in wanton revels.¹¹³

There is an expression used in this article, however, which imparts a legalistic tone to it. It is: "and therefore we are bound therein to rest...". Such a phrase is antagonistic to the spirit of the Gospel, which grants liberty to Christian men. As Calvin says, in reference to the Lord's day having put an end to the shadows of the law: "... the day itself puts us in mind of our Christian liberty."¹¹⁴

It appears as though Ussher failed to fully imbibe the spirit of Calvin as regards this subject, for Calvin removes all superstition and legalism from the observance of the day. His views are summarised in the following:

As the truth was delivered to the Jews under a figure, so it is given to us without any shadows; first, in order that during our whole life we should meditate on a perpetual rest from our own works, that the Lord may operate within us by his Spirit; secondly, that every man, whenever he has leisure, should diligently exercise himself in private in pious reflections on the works of God, and also that we should at the same time observe the legitimate order of the Church, appointed for the hearing of the word, for the administration of the sacraments, and for public prayer... Thus vanish all the dreams

113 England under the Stuarts, 70.

114 Commentary on Corinthians, II, 68.

of false prophets, who in past ages have infected the people with a Jewish notion, affirming that nothing but the ceremonial part of this commandment, which, according to them, is the appointment of the seventh day, has been abrogated, but that the moral part of it, that is, the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of a day.¹¹⁵

This language is distinctly different from that of Ussher, who affirmed that one day in seven was "juris divini positivi", which day cannot be changed by man.¹¹⁶

115 Instit., II. viii. 34.

116 See above, 166.

5. Of our duty towards our Neighbours.IRISH

63. Ovr duty towards our neighbours is, to loue them as our selues, and to do to all men as we would they should doe to us; to honour and obey our Superiours, to preserue the safety of mens persons, as also their chastitie, goods, and good names; to beare no malice nor hatred in our hearts; to keepe our bodies in temperance, sobernes, and chastitie; to be true and iust in all our doings; not to couet other mens goodes, but labour truely to get our owne liuing, and to doe our dutie in that estate of life vnto which it pleaseth God to call us.

SOURCE

My duty towards my neighbor is to love him as myself, and to do to all men as I would they should do unto me: to love, honor, and succor my father and mother: to honor and obey the King and his Ministers: to submit myself to all my governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters: to order myself lowly and reverently to all my betters: to hurt nobody by word nor deed: to be true and just in all my doings: to bear no malice nor hatred in my heart: to keep my hands from picking and stealing and my tongue from evil-speaking, lying, and slandering: to keep my body in temperance, soberness, and chastity: not to

covet nor desire other men's goods; but to learn and labor truly to get mine own living, and to do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me.¹¹⁷

64. For the preseuation of the chastitie of mens persons, wedlocke is commaunded vnto all men that stand in need thereof. Neither is there any prohibition by the word of God, but that the ministers of the Church may enter into the state of Matrimony: they being no where commaunded by Gods law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstaine from marriage. Therefore it is lawfull also for them, as well as for all other Christian men, to marrie at their owne discretion, as they shall iudge the same to serue

Byshops, Priestes, and Deacons, are not commaunded by Gods lawe eyther to vowe the estate of single lyfe, or to abstayne from mariage. Therefore it is lawfull also for them, as for all other Christian men, to mary at their owne discretion, as they shall iudge the same to serue better to godlynesse.¹¹⁸

117 Anglican Catechism, Schaff, III, 519-20.

118 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXII, Hardwick, 307.

better to godlines.

65. The riches and goodes of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same: as certayne Anabaptists falsely affirme. Notwithstanding euerie man ought of such things as hee possesseth, liberally to giue almes to the poore, according to his ability.

The ryches and goodes of Christians are not common, as touching the ryght, title, and possession of the same, as certayne Anabaptistes do falsely boast. Notwithstanding euerie man ought of suche thinges as he possesseth, liberally to geue almes to the poore, accordyng to his habilitie.¹¹⁹

66. Faith giuen, is to be kept, even with Hereticks and Infidells.

67. The Popish doctrine of Equiuocation & mentall Reseruation, is most vngodly, and tendeth plainely to the subuersion of all humaine society.

119 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXVIII, Hardwick, 317.

The first three articles in this section have direct sources; the first, article Sixty-three, is somewhat condensed from the corresponding section in the Catechism. Article Sixty-four deals with marriage, the first clause with the marriage in general, and the second clause with the marriage of the clergy. The former has no direct source, but the latter has its source in the XXXIX Articles, although there is a slight change in word order. A more important change is the substitution of the phrase "ministers of the Church" for the XXXIX's "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons", the three orders of the Episcopal ministry. This change was probably due to Ussher's lax views regarding Episcopacy. He held that the difference between the orders was in degree only, and not in kind. This article is originally found in the XLII Articles, and was "aimed at the mediaeval error which regarded the marriage of the clergy as absolutely sinful."¹²⁰

Article Sixty-five, likewise taken (almost verbatim) from the corresponding article of the XXXIX, inveighs against the erroneous teaching of the Anabaptists, who maintained the "notion of a community of goods".¹²¹ Two other earlier confessions reject this teaching, and use stronger language than the Irish Articles in doing so. The Formula

120 Hardwick, 105. Lindsay says, that one of the charges brought against Archbishop Cranmer, for which he was burned, was adultery; meaning, that he had married, being a priest, and had married the second time after being made an Archbishop. History of the Reformation, II, 378.

121 Hardwick, 106.

of Concord says of this Anabaptist tenet, that "it cannot be tolerated in daily life";¹²² and the French Confession: "We detest all those who would like... to establish community and confusion of property...".¹²³

Articles Sixty-six and Sixty-seven are unique; they are not found in any other confession. The former, that faith is to be kept "even with infidels and heretics" is suggested in the Book of Homilies, where two instances are cited in which God punished his people for "wittingly and willfully" breaking their promises, made under oath, with heathen peoples: the first being Joshua's league with the Gibeonites, which was broken by Saul; and the second, Zedekiah's promise of fidelity to the King of Chaldea, which he later broke by rebelling against King Nebuchadnezzar.¹²⁴

Article Sixty-seven refers to the Jesuit doctrine of equivocation and mental reservation. Such practices were condemned even by heathen moralists, and when they were being practiced by so-called Christians, they were to be doubly condemned. Ussher probably encountered this doctrine at first hand in his controversy with the Jesuit, Fitz-Symonds, so this article may have been formulated out of personal experience.¹²⁵

122 Art. XII, Schaff, III, 176-7.

123 Art. XL, Ibid, 382. However, Lindsay defends this group by saying: "All the Anabaptists inculcated the duty of charity and the claims of the poor on the richer members of the community; but that is a common Christian precept, and does not necessarily imply communistic theories or practices." History of the Reformation, II, 438.

124 Homily of Swearing, 76.

125 Works, I, 11-14.

6. Of God's eternall decree, and Predestination.IRISHSOURCE

11. God from all eternitie did by his vnchangeable counsell ordaine whatsoeuer in time should come to passe: yet so, as thereby no violence is offred to the wills of the reasonable creatures, and neither the libertie nor the contingencie of the second causes is taken away, but established rather.

12. By the same eternall counsell God hath predestinated some vnto life, and reprobated some vnto death: of both which there is a certaine number, knowen only to God, which can neither be increased nor diminished.

God from eternity hath predestinated certain men unto life; certain men he hath reprobated.¹²⁶ There is predetermined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminished.¹²⁷

126 Lambeth Articles, Art. I, Schaff, III, 523.

127 Ibid, Art. III, 523.

13. Predestination to life, is the euerlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were layed, he hath constantly decreed in his secret counsell to deliuer from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankinde, and to bring them by Christ vnto euerlasting saluation, as vessels made to honor.

Predestination to lyfe, is the euerlastyng purpose of God, wherby (before the foundations of the world were layd) he hath constantly decreed by his counsell secrete to vs, to deliuer from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christe out of mankynde, and to bryng them by Christe to euerlasting saluation, as vessels made to honor.¹²⁸

14. The cause mouing God to predestinate vnto life, is not the foreseeing of faith, or perseuerance, or good workes, or of anything which is in the person predestinated, but onely the good pleasure of God himselfe. For all things being ordained for the manifestation of his glory, and his glory being to appeare both in the

The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseuerance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the person predestinated, but only the good will and pleasure of God.¹²⁹ ... God... calleth those... without consideration of their works, to dis-

128 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XVII, Hardwick, 287.

129 Lambeth Articles, Art. II, Schaff, III, 523.

workes of his Mercy and of his Iustice: it seemed good to his heauenly wisdom to choose out a certaine number towardes whome he would extend his vnderued mercy, leauing the rest to be spectacles of his iustice.

15. Such as are predestinated vnto life, be called according vnto Gods purpose (his spirit working in due season) and through grace they obey the calling, they bee iustified freely, they bee made sonnes of God by adoption, they bee made like the image of his onely begotten Sonne Iesus Christ, they walke religiously in good workes, and at length, by God's mercy they attaine to euerlasting felicitie. But such as are not predestinated to saluation, shall finally be

play in them the riches of his mercy; leaving the rest in this same corruption and condemnation to show in them his justice.¹³⁰

Wherefore they which be indued with so excellent a benefite of God, be called according to Gods purpose by his spirite workyng in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be iustified freely: they be made sonnes of God by adoption: they be made lyke the image of his onely begotten sonne Iesus Christe: they walke religiously in good workes, and at length by Gods mercy, they attaine to euerlastyng felicitie.¹³¹ Those who are not predestinated to

130 French Confession, Art. XII, Schaff, III, 366-7.

131 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XVII, Hardwick, 287.

condemned for their sinnes.

salvation shall be necessarily damned for their sins.¹³²

16. The godlike consideration of Predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweete, pleasant, and vnspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feele in themselves the working of the spirit of Christ, mortifying the workes of the fleshe, and their earthly members, and drawing vp their mindes to high and heauenly things: as well because it doth greatly confirme and establish their faith of eternall saluation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth feruently kindle their loue towards God: and on the contrary side, for curious and carnall persons, lacking the spirit of Christ, to haue continually before

As the godly consyderation of predestination, and our election in Christe, is full of sweete, pleasaunt, and vnspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feele in them selues the working of the spirite of Christe, mortifying the workes of the fleshe, and their earthlye members, and drawing vp their mynde to hygh and heauenly thinges, as well because it doth greatly establyshe and confirm their fayth of eternal saluation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth feruently kindle their loue towards God: So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the spirite of Christe, to haue continually before their eyes the sentence of

132 Lambeth Articles, Art. IV, Schaff, III, 523.

their eies the sentence of
Gods predestination, is
very dangerous.

Gods predestination, is a
most daungerous downefall
...¹³³

17. Wee must receiue Gods
promises in such wise asthey
be generally set forth vnto
vs in holy Scripture; and in
our doings, that will of God
is to be followed, which we
haue expressly declared vnto
vs in the word of God

Furthermore, we must re-
ceaeue Gods promises in such
wyse, as they be generally
set foorth to vs in holy
scripture: and in our doynge,
that wyl of God is to be
folowed, which we haue ex-
preslye declared vnto vs in
the worde of God.¹³⁴

This section, of God's eternal decree, and pre-
destination, is composed of almost the entire seventeenth
article of the XXXIX Articles, and the first four of the
Lambeth Articles, with some phraseology in the latter part
of article Fourteen corresponding to that in the French
Confession.

The order of the section here has been changed,
for purposes of convenience, from its position as found in
the Articles, to the position in which the subject of pre-
destination is found in Calvin's "Institutes". It is found
in the latter in book Three, under the discussion of the

¹³³ Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XVII, Hardwick, 287, 289.
¹³⁴ Ibid, 289.

Holy Spirit and salvation. In the Irish Articles it is located near the beginning, in a section dealing with the Being of God, which is where St. Thomas Aquinas places it. Calvin's seems to be the better position, for predestination is of God's grace; and that it is of such, is witnessed to by Christian experience. Therefore, the subject should be dealt with in the discussion of that experience.¹³⁵

Article Eleven has no direct source. It is a statement of the eternal decree of God, by which everything which happens in the world has been ordained "from all eternity". Precaution, however, is taken in the second clause, for there it is affirmed, that the "wills of reasonable creatures" are in no wise violated, and that freedom and contingent causes are, not only not destroyed by this eternal decree, but rather "established". This is also declared by Ussher elsewhere, when he says: "We both believe and feel by experience that grace is so powerful, that yet we conceive it no way to be violent."¹³⁶

Other confessions which use similar language are all Reformed confessions; these are the French, the Belgic,¹³⁷ and the Scots¹³⁸ Confessions: e.g., the French speaks of "God... according to his immutable purpose which he has determined in Jesus Christ before the creation of the world."¹³⁹

135 Simpson, The Evangelical Church Catholic, 128-9.

136 Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit, Works, III, 516.

137 Art. XVI, Schaff, III, 401.

138 Art. VIII, Ibid, 444.

139 Art. XII, Ibid, 366.

Article Twelve, pertaining to the "double decree" of election and reprobation, is the article which brought the greatest reproach upon the Irish formulary. As shown, it is composed of articles One and Three of the Lambeth group, although the transition from the one to the other involved a slight change, which is found in the latter clause of article Twelve. Article Three of the Lambeth Articles says, that there is predetermined a certain number of those who are predestined unto life, which number is unchangeable; while the Irish article says, that there is a certain number of both those predestined unto life, and those reprobated unto death. The Lambeth article says nothing about the number of the reprobate being predetermined, although it may be inferred from the statement regarding the election unto life. Those who composed the article undoubtedly preferred not to express it explicitly.

This language is true to Calvin, who says: "... by an eternal and immutable counsel, God has once for all determined, both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction."¹⁴⁰ He also says, that "election itself could not exist without being opposed to reprobation."¹⁴¹ And also: "... whom God passes by, therefore, he reprobates."¹⁴²

140 Instit., III. xxi. 7.

141 Ibid, III. xxiii. 1.

142 Ibid.

That Ussher derived his teaching from the Lambeth Articles, or from Calvin himself, on this point of doctrine, however, is not to be concluded, although he did make use of the language of the Lambeth Articles in this particular article. Ussher found elsewhere the doctrine advanced by the Genevan Reformer and Whitaker and his brethren. He declares that the doctrine held by the learned men of Ireland, which they "observed out of the Scriptures and the writings of the most approved fathers was this", and he cites Gallus (c. 630 A.D.), "that God, by his immovable counsel, ordained some of his creatures to praise him, and to live blessedly from him, and in him, and by him... by his eternal predestination, his free calling, and his grace which was due to none."¹⁴³ And from Sedulius (c. 490 A.D.): "He hath mercy with great goodness, and hardeneth without any iniquity, so as neither he that is delivered can glory of his own merits, nor he that is condemned complain but of his own merits...".¹⁴⁴ He also quotes from Claudius Scotus (c. 815 A.D.), saying: "Thus did Sedulius and Claudius, two of our most famous divines, deliver the doctrine of free will and grace... no less agreeably to the faith which is at this day professed in the reformed churches, than to that which they... received from the more ancient doctors."¹⁴⁵

143 Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and British, Works, IV, 252.

144 Ibid.

145 Ibid, 257.

It may be said that the Thirty-nine Articles use more cautious language on the subject of predestination than do the Irish Articles. The former Articles "handle it with much wisdom and moderation, dwelling exclusively on the election of Saints, or predestination to life."¹⁴⁶ Professor Simpson says, that because the doctrine of reprobation does not stand on the basis of evangelical experience, it should not claim the same authority as that which does rest on experience.¹⁴⁷ Although it may be a logical deduction from the fact that all men are not saved, "it is a logic carried into a region where our categories of reasoning cannot be applied in the same way as they can be in the sphere of the finite and the contingent."¹⁴⁸ Thus, while deductions beyond experience may be made, "these deductions are of the nature of opinions, not of the nature of catholic dogma."¹⁴⁹ In other words, a public confession of faith is not the place for a declaration of the dogma of reprobation.

Article Thirteen is taken in toto from the XXXIX Articles, and deals with "predestination unto life". There have been attempts made by some scholars to prove the XXXIX Articles anti-Calvinistic,¹⁵⁰ but such attempts are futile. The language of article Thirteen is identical

146 Schaff, I, 633.

147 Evangelical Church Catholic, 129.

148 Ibid.

149 Ibid, 130.

150 See Hardwick, 371-3.

to that of article Seventeen of the XXXIX, and can be seen quite clearly in Calvin's writings; e.g., Calvin says: "... we were chosen in him from eternity, before the formation of the world, not on account of any merit of ours, but according to the purpose of the Divine will."¹⁵¹ Calvin bases his doctrine upon the language of the Apostle Paul, who said: "He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world...".¹⁵² According to this article, our election is "in Christ", which is what Calvin also maintains, although in the opinion of a recent writer, Calvin does not lay sufficient stress on it.¹⁵³ Calvin's words are as follows:

Paul's assertion, that we were 'chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world', certainly precludes any consideration of merit in us... Our heavenly Father, finding nothing worthy of his choice in all the posterity of Adam, turned his views towards his Christ, to choose members from his body....¹⁵⁴

The former part of article Fourteen is taken from the Lambeth Articles; and the latter part, if not taken directly from the French Confession, at least has its roots in a common source with that Continental confession. The former part deals with the efficient cause of predestination, which is declared to be none other than "the good pleasure of God", to the exclusion

151 Instit., III. xv. 5.

152 Eph. 1. 4.

153 J.K.S. Reid, Scottish Journal of Theology, June, 1948.

154 Instit., III. xxii. 1.

of foreknowledge, good works, or anything else in the person himself. This also is what Calvin says, again quoting Paul: "'He hath chosen us', he says, 'before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of his will...'"¹⁵⁵ And he adds:

If any inquiry be made after a superior cause, Paul replies, that God thus 'predestinated', and that it was 'according to the good pleasure of his will'. This overturns any means of election which men imagine in themselves; for all the benefits conferred by God for the spiritual life, he represents as flowing from this one source, that God elected whom he would, and, before they were born, laid up in reserve for them the grace with which he determined to favour them.¹⁵⁶

The latter part of article Fourteen affirms, that all things are ordained for the glory of God, whether it be those elected to life in order to reveal his mercy, or those left in a state of reprobation in order to reveal his justice. This is genuinely Calvinistic. Calvin declares: "... the great and only object of our election is, 'that we should be to the praise of Divine 'grace'."¹⁵⁷ And again: "We confess the guilt to be common, but we say, that some are relieved by Divine mercy. They say, let it relieve all. But we reply, Justice requires that he should likewise show himself to be a just judge in the infliction of punishment."¹⁵⁸

It appears, from this article, that the Irish

155 Instit., III. xxii. 1.
 156 Ibid, III. xxii. 2.
 157 Ibid, III. xxii. 3.
 158 Ibid, III. xxiii. 11.

Articles, with Calvin, tend towards Supralapsarianism. According to this doctrine, the eternal plan of God embraced in it from the first the fall of man, and the results of it. Sin, although God is not its author, is nevertheless foreordained by Him as the means by which the glory of his justice and mercy could alone be clearly shown.¹⁵⁹ This view is distinguished from Infra- or Sublapsarianism, which regards the Fall as an effected fact, as having been permitted by God; and the decree of election as having begun from the viewpoint of man as fallen, leaving the rest of mankind in their lapsed state.¹⁶⁰ Along with the teaching that election and reprobation are both for the purpose of the glory of God, however, Calvin declares, that man is also responsible for his own sin, which the Irish Articles fail to state. Calvin says: "The destruction they incur by predestination is consistent with the strictest justice. Besides, their perdition depends on the Divine predestination in such a manner, that the cause and matter of it are found in themselves."¹⁶¹

Article Fifteen is taken, for the most part, from the Thirty-nine Articles. The last clause finds its source in article Four of the Lambeth group. The article states the results stemming from predestination to life.

159 Hastie, Theology of the Reformed Church, 250.

160 Ibid, 250-1; Burnet, Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, 200-1.

161 Instit., III. xxiii. 8.

These are: calling, justification, adoption, good works, and final beatitude; they all rest on, and are evidences of, election. It was a false interpretation, or a misunderstanding, of Calvin which caused some to stigmatise his views on predestination as "false and erroneous", as was done in the Saxon Visitation Articles of 1592. Here it was said that Calvinism taught, "that the elected and regenerated cannot lose faith and the Holy Spirit, or be damned, though they commit great sins and crimes of every kind."¹⁶² From similar aspersions in his own day, Calvin defends his teaching by saying: "But how inconsistent is it to cease from the practice of virtue because election is sufficient to salvation, while the end proposed in election is our diligent performance of virtuous actions! Away, then, with such corrupt and sacrilegious perversions ... of election."¹⁶³ Professor Paterson gives expression to this fact in the following words:

... in the Calvinistic theory sufficient precaution was taken to guard against immoral consequences, since election involved election to sanctification as well as to faith in Christ, and where in place of holiness there was found essential wickedness, it was held to prove conclusively that the person concerned was not of the number of the elect.¹⁶⁴

Ussher, in formulating this article, followed the seventeenth article of the XXXIX Articles almost verbatim; and the language is true to Calvin, who says:

162 Schaff, III, 189.
 163 Instit., III. xxiii. 12.
 164 Rule of Faith, 310.

"In the elect, we consider calling as an evidence of election, and justification as another token of its manifestation, till they arrive in glory, which constitutes its completion."¹⁶⁵ He also says, that "the discriminating election of God, which is otherwise concealed within himself, he manifests only by his calling."¹⁶⁶ This is what the apostle Paul taught: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."¹⁶⁷

Ussher himself laid great stress upon effectual calling rather than upon election. In a sermon preached at Oxford in 1640, he says:

You hear much talk of God's eternal and everlasting election, and we are too apt to rest on this, that if we are elected to salvation we shall be saved, and if not, we shall be damned, troubling ourselves with God's work of predestination, whereas this works no change in the party elected, unless it come unto him in his own person. What is God's election to me? It is nothing to my comfort, unless I myself am effectually called. We are to look to this effectual calling. The other is but God's love to sever me from the corrupt mass of Adam's posterity. But what is my effectual calling? It is that, when God touches my heart, and translates me from the death of sin, to the life of grace. Before this effectual calling, even the elect Ephesians were 'without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world'.¹⁶⁸

165 Instit., III. xxi. 7.

166 Ibid, III. xxiv. 1.

167 Romans viii. 29, 30.

168 Works, XIII, 28.

Article Fifteen also teaches, with the Thirty-nine Articles, the final perseverance of the elect; this was affirmed previously in article Thirty-three, in the section, Of the communicating of the grace of Christ.¹⁶⁹ This perseverance rests upon election. Calvin attributes it, in one instance, to the intercession of Christ for his elect: "... they are beyond all danger of falling away, because the intercessions of the Son of God for their perseverance in piety have not been rejected."¹⁷⁰

The article closes with a quotation from the Lambeth Articles, and affirms, that "such as are not predestined to salvation, shall finally be condemned for their sins." Although this may be a valid inference from that which precedes, the XXXIX Articles show more wisdom than the Irish Articles in not affirming it.

Article Sixteen, also, is taken from article Seventeen of the XXXIX, and declares that the consideration of predestination is a comfort to godly persons; but for carnal persons to consider the doctrine, "is very dangerous".

The Irish Articles omit part of article Seventeen of the XXXIX. The Irish read: "... the sentence of God's predestination is very dangerous"; whereas the English read: "... the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust

169 See above, 129, 133.

170 Instit., III. xxiv. 6.

them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation."¹⁷¹

Article Sixteen affirms that this doctrine of predestination is conducive to piety of life. Calvin taught such, and we find him refuting those who claimed that the doctrine was subversive of all exhortations to piety. He quotes Augustine to express that which he himself believed:

... that because we know not who belongs, or does not belong, to the number of the predestinated, it becomes us affectionately to desire the salvation of all. The consequence will be, that whomsoever we meet we shall endeavor to make him a partaker of peace. But our peace shall rest upon the sons of peace. On our part, therefore, salutary and severe reproof, like a medicine, must be administered to all, that they may neither perish themselves nor destroy others.¹⁷²

The section on predestination closes with the affirmation, that we must seek for the will of God in the Scriptures, thereby inferring, that concerning the subject of predestination, we must not attempt to probe into the hidden recesses of the Divine counsel, for such an attempt leads men to despair. Calvin was aware of this danger, and to guard against it, he exhorted men to go no further than Scripture. He says:

For as those who, in order to gain an assurance of their election, examine into the eternal counsel of God without the word, plunge themselves into a fatal abyss, so they who investigate it in a regular and orderly manner, as it is contained in the word, derive from such inquiry the benefit of peculiar consolation.¹⁷³

171 Hardwick, 289.

172 Instit., III. xxiii. 14.

173 Ibid., III. xxiv. 4.

The Irish Articles, following the Thirty-nine, are silent on the subject of the extent of the atonement of Christ. The later Westminster Confession asserts this in the words: "Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called... but the elect only."¹⁷⁴ It appears, however, that Ussher himself held to the doctrine of a limited atonement, teaching that Christ's death put all men within the possibility of being saved, although none were actually saved but those who were effectually called. He says: "... our Saviour hath obtained at the hands of his father reconciliation, and forgiveness of sins, not for the reprobate, but elect only, and not for them neither, before they be truly regenerated, and implanted into himself."¹⁷⁵

174 III. vi., Schaff, III, 610.

175 Works, XII, 564.

7. Of the state of the soules of men, after they be departed out of this life: together with the general Resurrection, and the last Iudgement.

IRISHSOURCE

101. After this life is ended the soules of Gods children be presently receaued into Heauen, there to enjoy vnspeakable comforts; the soules of the wicked are cast into Hell, there to endure endlesse torments.

... the faithful, after bodily death, do go directly unto Christ...¹⁷⁶

... unbelievers are cast headlong into hell, from whence there is no return.¹⁷⁷

102. The doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning Limbus Patrum, Limbus Puerorum, Purgatorie, Prayer for the dead, Pardons, Adoration of Images and Relickes, and also Inuocation of Saints, is uainely inuented without all warrant of holy Scripture, yea and is contrary vnto the same.

The Romishe doctrine concerning purgatorie, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images, as of reliques, and also inuocation of Saintes, is a fonde thing, vainly inuented, and grounded vpon no warrantie of Scripture, but rather repugnaunt to the worde of God.¹⁷⁸

176 Second Helvetic Confession, XXVI, Schaff, III, 903.
 177 Ibid.
 178 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXII, Hardwick, 295.

103. At the end of this world the Lord Iesus shall come in the clouds with the glory of his Father; at which time, by the almightie power of God, the liuing shalbe changed and the dead shalbe raised; and all shall appeare both in body and soule before his iudgement seat, to receaue according to that which they haue done in their bodies, whether good or evill.

104. When the last iudgement is finished, Christ shall deliver vp the Kingdome to his Father, and God shalbe all in all.

... the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father...¹⁷⁹
 ... at the laste daie: for then... to all that bee dead their awne bodies, fleshe, and bone shalbe restored, that the whole man maie (according to his workes) haue other rewardes, or punishment, as he hath liued vertuouslie, or wickedlie.¹⁸⁰

... when he sall appeir againe in iudgement, and sall rander up the kingdome to God his Father, who then sall bee, and ever sall remaine all in all things God blessed for ever.¹⁸¹

179 Matthew xvi. 27.

180 Forty-two Articles, Art. XXXIX, Hardwick, 316, 318.

181 Scots Confession, XXV, Schaff, III, 478.

The articles in this section occur at the end of the Irish formulary, but they have been inserted in the present position to simplify the outline of the thesis.

The Irish Articles deal more at length with the subject of life after death and eschatology than the XXXIX Articles; article One-hundred and Two of the Irish Articles alone is found in those of the Church of England.

The language of the Second Helvetic Confession is similar to article One-hundred and One of the Irish, but it cannot be said definitely that Ussher drew his language from the Swiss formulary, for the Scots Confession also uses similar language,¹⁸² as does the Belgic.¹⁸³

Article One-hundred and Two is taken almost verbatim from the XXXIX Articles, but with a few additions; Limbus Patrum, Limbus Puerorum, and Prayer for the dead are declared, along with several other things, to be contrary to the Scripture.¹⁸⁴ The doctrine of prayer for the dead, as held by the Romanists, is intimately connected with the doctrine of purgatory. Ussher, in his writings, proves that a belief in purgatory was not held in the Church during the early centuries, and that the first intimation of it was by Gregory the First;¹⁸⁵ and as late as

182 Art. XXV, Schaff, III, 478.

183 Art. XXXVII, Ibid, 435.

184 It is of interest to note, that the practice of praying for the dead was censured in the copy of the Forty-two Articles as signed by the six royal chaplains in October, 1552, although the phrase disappeared in the authorised copy of that formulary. Hardwick, 103, note 3; 294, note 2.

185 Works, III, 189-90.

1146 A.D., the doctrine was held only as a private opinion by some, and not generally received by the whole Church.¹⁸⁶ Ussher admits that prayer for the dead was made in the ancient Church, but he denies that it had any relationship to the doctrine of purgatory.¹⁸⁷ He says, that the primary intention of such prayer used in the early Church was, that praise and thanksgiving were offered unto God for the blessed estate upon which the person deceased had now entered. Later, prayers of petition for forgiveness of sins were added. Although these were well meant, "yet in process of time, they proved an occasion of confirming men in divers errors; especially when they began once to be applied not only to the good, but to evil livers, also, unto whom by the first institution they never were intended."¹⁸⁸

Article One-hundred and Three affirms the Second Advent of our Lord, and a general resurrection and judgment. The article contains an implicit rejection of the millenarian doctrine. Ussher, in common with most scholars of his day, and with the Reformers, maintained that such doctrine was erroneous. Commenting on Revelation, chapter XX, he says: "... the first resurrection... is the resurrection of the soul from the death of sin and error in this world; ... the second is the resurrection of the body out of the dust of the earth, in the world to come."¹⁸⁹

186 Works, III, 192-3.

187 Ibid, 198-9.

188 Ibid, 208.

189 Ibid, 224. Cf. above, 22-3.

CHAPTER VIION THE EXTERNAL MEANS BY WHICH GOD CALLS US INTO COMMUNION WITH CHRIST, AND RETAINS US IN IT.1. Of the Church and Outward Ministry of the Gospel.IRISHSOURCE

68. There is but one Catholike Church (out of which there is no saluation) containing the uniuersall company of all the Saints that euer were, are, or shalbe, gathered together in one body, vnder one head Christ Iesus: part whereof is already in heaven TRIUMPHANT, part as yet MILITANT heere vpon earth. And because this Church consisteth of all those, and

... from the beginning there hes bene, and now is, and to the end of the world shall be, ane Kirk, that is to say, ane company and multitude of men chosen of God, who richtly worship and imbrace him be trew faith in Christ Iesus, quha is the onely head of the same Kirk, quhilk alswa is the bodie and spouse of Christ Iesus, quhilk Kirk is catholike, that is,

those alone, which are elected by God vnto saluation, & regenerated by the power of his spirit, the number of whome is knowen only vnto God himselfe: therefore it is called the CATHOLIKE or vniversall, and the INVISIBLE Church.

universal, because it conteinis the Elect of all ages, of all realmes, nations, and tongues ...: and therefore it is called the communioun... of Saints...: Out of the quhilk Kirk, there is nouthur lyfe, nor eternall felicitie... This Kirk is invisible, knawen onelie to God, quha alane knawis whome he hes chosen; and comprehends as weill... the Elect that be departed, commonlie called the KIRK TRIUMPHANT...¹

69. But particular and visible Churches (consisting of those who make profession of the faith of Christ, and liue vnder the outward meanes of saluation) be many in number: wherein the more or lesse sincerely according to Christs in-

The visible Church of Christe, is a congregation of faythfull men...² I do acknowledge also that church to be the spouse of Christ, wherein the word of God is truly taught, the sacraments orderly ministered according

1 Scots Confession, Art. XVI, Schaff, III, 458-9.

2 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XIX, Hardwick, 291.

stitution, and the word of God is taught, the Sacraments are administred, and the authority of the Keyes is vsed, the more or lesse pure are such Churches to bee accounted.

70. Although in the visible Church the euill bee euer mingled with the good, and sometimes the euill haue chiefe authoritie in the ministration of the word & Sacraments: yet, for as much as they doe not the same in their owne name, but in Christs, and minister by his commission and authority, we may vse their ministry both in hearing the word and in receauing the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christs ordinance taken away by their wickednesse: nor the grace of Gods gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly doe receaue the

to Christ's institution, and the authority of the keys duly used.³

Although in the visible Church the euyl be euer myngled with the good, and sometime the euyll haue cheefe auctoritie in the ministration of the worde and Sacramentes: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their owne name but in Christes, and do minister by his commission and auctoritie, we may vse their ministrie, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receauing of the Sacramentes. Neither is y effecte of Christes ordinaunce taken away by their wickednesse, nor the grace of Gods gyftes diminished from such as by

³ Eleven Articles of 1559, Art. III, Hardwick, 327.

Sacraments ministre vnto them; which are effectuall, because of Christs institution and promise, although they be ministred by euill men. Neuerthelesse it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of euill ministers, and that they be accused by those that haue knowledge of their offences, and finally being found guiltie by iust iudgement bee deposed.

fayth and ryghtly do receaue the Sacramentes ministered vnto them, which be effectuall, because of Christes institution and promise, although they be ministred by euill men. Neuerthelesse, it apperteyneth to the discipline of the Church, that enquirie be made of euyl ministers, and that they be accused by those that haue knowledge of their offences: and finally, beyng founde gyltie by iust iudgement, be deposed.⁴

71. It is not lawfull for any man to take vpon him the office of publike preaching or ministring the Sacraments in the Church, vnlesse hee bee first lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to iudge lawfully called and sent, which bee

It is not lawful for any man to take vpon hym the office of publique preachyng, or ministring the Sacramentes in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to iudge lawfully called and sent, whiche be

4 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXVI, Hardwick, 299, 301.

chosen and called to this worke by men who haue publike authoritie giuen them in the Church, to call and send ministers into the Lords vineyard.

72. To haue publike prayer in the Church, or to administer the Sacraments in a tongue not vnderstood of the people, is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custome of the Primitiue Church.

73. That person which by publike denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the vnitie of the Church, and excommunicate, ought to bee taken of the whole multitude of the faithfull, as a Heathen and Publican, vntill by Repentance he be openly

chosen and called to this worke by men who haue publique authoritie geuen vnto them in the congregation, to call and sende ministers into the Lordes vineyarde.⁵

It is a thing playnely repugnaunt to the worde of God, and the custome of the primitiue Churche, to haue publique prayer in the Churche, or to minister the Sacramentes in a tongue not vnderstanded of the people.⁶

That person whiche by open denuntiation of the Churche, is ryghtly cut of from the vnitie of the Churche, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faythfull as an Heathen and Publicane, vntill he be openly reconciled by penaunce,

5 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXIII, Hardwick, 295.

6 Ibid, Art. XXIV, 295, 297.

reconciled and receaued into the Church, by the iudgement of such as haue authoritie in that behalf.

74. God hath giuen power to his ministers, not simply to forgiue sinnes, (which prerogatiue he hath reserued onely to himselfe) but in his name to declare and pronounce vnto such as truely repent and vnfainedly beleue his holy Gospell, the absolution and forgiuenesse of sinnes. Neither is it Gods pleasure that his people should bee tied to make a particular confession of all their knowen sinnes vnto any mortall man: howsoeuer any person grieued in his conscience, vpon any speciall cause, may well resorte vnto any godly and

and receaued into the Church by a iudge that hath auctoritie thereto.⁷

When the whole Church confess themselves guilty... it is no mean or trivial consolation to have Christ's ambassador present, furnished with the mandate of reconciliation, by whom they may have their absolution pronounced.⁸ ... the loosing of sins depends entirely on faith and repentance.⁹ ... they who practice (confession) on account of their need of it, should neither be compelled by any precept... to enumerate all their sins.¹⁰ ... let every believer... if he feels such secret anguish or affliction from a sense of

7 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXIII, Hardwick, 307.

8 Instit., III. iv. 14.

9 Ibid, III. iv. 18.

10 Ibid, III. iv. 12.

learned Minister, to receive advice and comfort at his hands.

his sins... in order to alleviate his distress, ... use private confession with his pastor, and, to obtain consolation, ... privately implore his assistance, whose office it is... to comfort the people of God....¹¹

Article Sixty-eight is so close in language to the Scots Confession, that it is extremely probable that Ussher drew from that particular formulary. Although the same order is not found in both confessions, there are several points in common between the two: viz., there is one Catholic, or universal, Church; there is no salvation outside this Church; there is but one head of the Church, who is Jesus Christ; the part of the Church in heaven is designated the Church Triumphant; the Church consists of those alone who are the Elect; the Church is invisible, known to God alone. The only point of difference is, that the Irish Articles refer to the Church on earth as the Church Militant, whereas the Scots Confession makes no use of the expression, although there is an implicit distinction made between "the Kirk Triumphant" and the rest of the Church. It is quite probable that the Second Hel-

11 Instit., III. iv. 12.

vetic Confession was also consulted on this point, for that formulary expressly mentions both parts of the Church.¹²

The Irish Articles, in common with other Reformed confessions, such as the Belgic, Second Helvetic, and Scots, follow Calvin in his doctrine of the Church. It is to him, first of all, that the Reformed Church owes its conception of the Church as Catholic or universal, and invisible. He says: "The Church refers not only to the visible Church... but likewise to all the elect of God, including the dead as well as the living."¹³ He also says: "... we must leave to God alone the knowledge of his Church whose foundation is his secret election."¹⁴ This Church is Catholic because it is a body which has one head. Calvin says: "... unless we are united with all the other members under Christ our Head, we can have no hope of the future inheritance. Therefore the Church is called CATHOLIC, or universal."¹⁵ The new conception of the Church was necessitated by the fact, that hosts of believers were now outside the organised Roman community which regarded herself as the Catholic Church. That it was a sublime doctrine is seen by the following:

The idea of the Invisible Church was at once the most original, the most catholic, and the most Christian view of the Kingdom of God which the

12 Chap. XVII, Schaff, III, 869.

13 Instit., IV. i. 2.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid.

world had heard of since the days of the Apostles. It was the logical and special offspring of the Protestant principle of the Reformed Church when it disapproved the authoritative and exclusive visible unity of the mediaeval ecclesiasticism, and it at once gave room and verge enough for all the emancipated faith and life of the modern world.¹⁶

This article maintains, that out of this invisible, Catholic Church there can be no salvation, which is a valid conclusion; for only those who are of the Elect (which is equivalent to the regenerate) secure salvation; and inasmuch as the Catholic Church "consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God unto salvation", anyone outside this body of Christ has no part in its salvation. Strange to say, Calvin seems to affirm, that salvation is found in the visible Church. He says: "... our present design is to treat of the VISIBLE Church... that out of her bosom there can be no hope of remission of sins, or any salvation...".¹⁷ He says this preparatory to a remark, that "it is always fatally dangerous to be separated from the Church."¹⁸ But elsewhere he seems to lay more stress on the Invisible Church, for he says: "As it is necessary, therefore, to believe that Church which is invisible to us, and known to God alone, so this Church, which is visible to men, we are commanded to honour, and to maintain communion with it."¹⁹

16 Hastie, Theology of the Reformed Church, 61.

17 Instit., IV. i. 4.

18 Ibid.

19 Instit., IV. i. 7.

Article Sixty-nine treats of "particular and visible Churches", which it defines as those making an outward profession of their faith in Christ, and partaking of the means of grace. These Churches are not always, or never entirely, pure, but their purity is tested by certain criteria. These are declared to be: the pure preaching of the Word of God, the administration of the sacraments according to the institution of Christ, and the use of the authority of the keys.

Ussher used as his source for this article the third article of the Eleven Articles of 1559, instead of using article Nineteen of the XXXIX, as he might have done. The Thirty-nine Articles give but two criteria of a pure Church, viz., the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments, omitting any mention of the use of the keys.²⁰ In this it follows Calvin, who says: "But respecting the congregation... If they possess and honour the ministry of the word, and the administration of the sacraments, they are, without all doubt, entitled to be considered as a Church."²¹ Calvin, however, does take cognizance of the use of the keys, although instead of regarding them as a separate entity, he maintains that the remission of sins is obtained by the use of the Word and the sacraments. He says: "It is dispensed to us by the ministers and pastors of the Church, either in

20 Art. XIX, Hardwick, 291.

21 Instit., IV. 1. 9.

the preaching of the gospel, or in the administration of the sacraments; and... this is the principal exercise of the power of the keys..."²²

Article Seventy is taken verbatim from the XXXIX Articles. In the latter the article is found in the discussion of the sacraments, while in the Irish Articles it finds a place in the discussion of the Church. But since the article deals with the efficacy of the sacraments as not depending on the worthiness of the minister, either position is suitable. Ussher seems to have followed Calvin, for the latter, in his "Institutes", deals with this subject immediately subsequent to his discussion of the marks of a true Church.

The article affirms, that the sacraments remain efficacious in the Church even though they be administered by evil men. The reason is, that they do not administer them in their own name, but rather in the name of Christ. Their efficacy, however, is conditioned by the faith of the recipient. This article, while it does not look askance at vicious living on the part of the clergy, does recognise that the evil is always mixed with the good, and that perfect sanctity is unobtainable in this life. Although Calvin says the same,²³ it is not original with him, for the very words are used in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, by which the Donatists and "such like"

22 Instit., IV. 1. 22.

23 Ibid., IV. 1. 19.

were condemned, "who denied that it was lawful to use the ministry of evil men in the Church, and held that the ministry of evil men is useless and without effect."²⁴

The article closes with an appeal for the Church to exercise its right of discipline in the case of those ministers whose actions belie their calling.

Article Seventy-one is taken almost verbatim from the Thirty-nine Articles, the only difference being the substitution of the word "Church" for "congregation". It prohibits the assumption of the ministerial office by those who have not been "lawfully called". And a man is deemed "lawfully called and sent" who has been called by "men who have public authority given them in the Church". This authority, as in the corresponding article of the XXXIX, is not defined.

Article Seventy-two is likewise taken verbatim from the XXXIX, except that the order of the first and second clauses is reversed. The article strongly interdicts the use of any language other than the vernacular in public prayer and the administration of the sacraments.

Article Seventy-three also finds its source in the XXXIX Articles, but in the transition there have been a few important changes made. The first of these has been the substitution of the word "repentance" for the earlier formulary's "penance", probably because the latter

24 Art. VIII, Schaff, III, 12.

seemed to Ussher to carry a Romanist connotation. The second important change was in reference to the authority by which excommunicated members were to be restored to the fellowship of the Church. The English Articles assert, that this authority resides in a "judge"; the Irish Articles read: "the judgment of such as have authority". In the former, a bishop is implied; whereas in the latter, the reference is not necessarily to one person in the Church, who would be a bishop, but rather to more than one, probably a company of presbyters. That this interpretation is correct is highly probable in view of Ussher's own ideas in regard to episcopacy.

Ussher advocated episcopacy, but he refused to concede to bishops the power which they, in times after the early Church, came to possess. He quotes Calvin (one of the few times in his writings) to substantiate his argument for episcopacy. In regard to St. Paul's words to Titus, "for this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee", Calvin says: "... there was not then such an equality betwixt the ministers of the Church, but that there was some one who was president over the rest both in authority and in counsel."²⁵ And elsewhere Ussher speaks of the primitive bishops of the Church, "who so

25 Commentary on Titus 1. 5; quoted in Works, VII, 67.

willingly submitted themselves, not only to the archiepiscopal, but also to a patriarchal government, which Calvin professed he did: that in all this, they were far from having a thought, 'to devise another form of Church government, than that which God had prescribed in his word'."²⁶

In a short paper proposed by Ussher in 1641, but not published until 1657, a year after his death, he states, that in the Church at Ephesus, the bishop and the presbytery, or the community of the rest of the presbyters, or elders, governed the Church in harmony, the bishop being the chief president.²⁷ And then he brings an indictment upon his own Church by saying:

In our Church this kind of presbyterial government hath long been disused, yet seeing it still professeth that every pastor hath a right to rule the Church... and to administer the discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the doctrine and sacraments, and the restraint of the exercise of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in this realm; no man can doubt, but by another law of the land, this hindrance may be well removed.²⁸

Article Seventy-four, while it has manifestly no direct source, does bear a striking resemblance to the language of Calvin's "Institutes". The comparison is shown above. The article deals with the power of the keys, which power is declared to be declarative, and also with

26 Instit., IV. iv. 4; Works, VII, 69.

27 Works, XII, 531-2.

28 The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Ancient Church, Ibid, 533.

the subject of auricular confession. Because of the similarity of language, it is quite evident that Ussher follows Calvin in both these doctrines.

Ussher is strictly Reformed as regards the subject of absolution, as seen by his other writings. He maintains, that the power to forgive sins resides in God alone, but "we give unto his under-officers their due, when we 'account of them as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God'; not as Lords, that have power to dispose of spiritual graces as they please; but as servants..."²⁹ And again:

To forgive sins therefore being thus proper to God only, and to his Christ: his ministers must not be held to have this power communicated unto them, but in an improper sense; namely, because God forgiveth by them, and hath appointed them both to apply those means, by which he useth to forgive sins, and to give notice unto repentant sinners of that forgiveness.³⁰

29 Works, III, 126-7.
30 Ibid, 129.

2. Of the authoritie of the Church, generall Councells,
and Bishop of Rome.

IRISH

SOURCE

75. It is not lawfull for the Church to ordaine any thing that is contrary to Gods word: neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore although the Church bee a witnesse, and a keeper of holy writt: yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not inforce any thing to be beleued vpon necessitie of saluation.

... it is not lawfull for the Church to ordayne any thyng that is contrarie to Gods worde written, neyther may it so expounde one place of scripture, that it be repugnaunt to another. Wherefore, although the Churche be a witnesse and a keper of holy writ: yet, as it ought not to decree any thing agaynst the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be beleued for necessitie of saluation.³¹

76. Generall Councells may not be gathered together without the commaundement and will of Princes; and when they be

Generall Counsels may not be gathered together without the commaundement and wyll of princes. And when they be

31 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XX, Hardwick, 293.

gathered together (for as much as they be an assembly of men not alwaies gouerned with the spirit and word of God) they may erre, and sometimes haue erred, euen in things pertain-
ing to the rule of pietie.

Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to saluation, haue neither strength nor authoritie, vnlesse it may be shewed that they bee taken out of holy Scriptures.

77. Euery particular Church hath authority to institute, to change, and cleane to put away ceremonies and other Ecclesiasticall rites, as they be superfluous, or be abused; and to constitute other, making more to seemelynes, to order, or edification.

gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assemblie of men, wherof all be not gou-
erned with the spirite and word of God) they may erre, and sometyme haue erred, euen in thinges parteynyng vnto
God. Wherefore, thinges or-
dayned by them as necessary to saluation, haue neyther strength nor auctoritie, vnlesse it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.³²

... every such particular church hath authority to institute, to change, clean to put away ceremonies, and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous, or be abused, and to constitute other making more to seemliness, to order, or edification.³³

32 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXI, Hardwick, 293, 295.

33 Eleven Articles of 1559, Art. III, Ibid, 327.

78. As the Churches of IERUSALEM, ALEXANDRIA and ANTIOCH haue erred: so also the Church of ROME hath erred, not onely in those things which concerne matter of practise and point of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

79. The power which the Bishop of ROME now challengeth, to be Supreame head of the vniversall Church of Christ, and to be aboue all Emperours, Kings and Princes, is an usurped power, contrary to the Scriptures and word of God, and contrary to the example of the Primitiue Church: and therefore is for most iust causes taken away and abolished within the Kings Maiesties Realmes and Dominions.

As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioche haue erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their liuing and maner of ceremonies, but also in matters of fayth.³⁴

Touching the bishop of Rome... the power, which he now challengeth, that is, to be the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, and to be above all emperors, kings, and princes, is an usurped power, contrary to the scriptures and word of God, and contrary to the example of the primitive church, and therefore is for most just causes taken away and abolished in this realm.³⁵

34 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XIX, Hardwick, 291.

35 Eleven Articles of 1559, Art. VI, Ibid, 328.

80. The Bishop of Rome is so farre from being the supreme head of the vniuersall Church of Christ, that his workes and doctrine doe plainly discover him to bee THAT MAN OF SINNE, foretold in the holy Scriptures, WHOME THE LORD SHALL CONSUME WITH THE SPIRIT OF HIS MOUTH, AND ABOLISH WITH THE BRIGHTNES OF HIS COMMING. . . . then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.³⁶

Article Seventy-five reproduces article Twenty of the XXXIX Articles, except for the omission of the first clause, which reads: "The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith."³⁷ This clause was a stumbling block to Nonconformists,³⁸ and apparently Ussher was no exception. In omitting this affirmative clause, others preceded Ussher; the clause did not appear in the Latin manuscript of the XXXIX Articles, signed by Archbishop Parker and most of the bishops in 1563, or in the English manuscript signed by the bishops in Convocation in 1571. On the other hand,

36 II Thess. 11. 8.

37 Hardwick, 293.

38 Schaff, I, 649-50.

it did appear in an authorised edition of 1563, and in most subsequent editions.³⁹

Another change in the article was the use of the phrase, "God's word", for the XXXIX's "God's word written". This article limits the power of the Church to that which is warranted by Scripture, an express reference to the use of things indifferent, viz., surplices, vestments, and such like, the use of which caused so much trouble in the Church of England in later years.

Article Seventy-six, dealing with General Councils of the Church, is also taken from the XXXIX Articles, but again with a few changes. The Irish states, that an assembly may not always be governed with the Spirit, whereas the English says, that in an assembly, all of its members are not governed with the Spirit. The article maintains, that the norm by which the decisions of General Councils regarding matters of faith is to be measured, is the Holy Scriptures. It also asserts, that a General Council may err, inasmuch as the members of such are not perfect men. As Salmon says:

... belief in the infallibility of Councils can hardly be held by anyone who has studied the history of Councils, and who knows anything of their violence and party spirit, and of the bad arguments on the strength of which many of their infallible conclusions were arrived at.⁴⁰

This article also ascribes to the civil authority the right to call together a General Council, a power

39 Hardwick, 139-41.

40 Infallibility of the Church, 28.

which had been assumed by the Pope.⁴¹

Article Seventy-seven is found in the thirty-fourth article of the XXXIX, but the phraseology of the third of the Eleven Articles was used instead. The first part of article Thirty-four of the XXXIX was entirely omitted. It is given here:

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and mens' manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that other may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.⁴²

Article Seventy-eight is taken almost verbatim from the XXXIX Articles, except for a slight verbal change. The article is an assertion, that the Church of Rome is not infallible, that she may, and has, erred, even in matters of faith.

Article Seventy-nine is taken almost verbatim from the Eleven Articles, and affirms, that the power which the Bishop of Rome claimed to possess, was a power which did not rightfully belong to him, for such a claim could find support neither in Scripture nor in the early Church. That he was originally no greater than the other bishops of the Church is seen by the following: Calvin

41 Hardwick, 103.

42 Ibid, 309.

says, that "the Council of Carthage prohibited that any one should be called 'the prince of priests', or 'the first bishop', but only 'the bishop of the first see'."⁴³

And also: "... it is certain that as long as the Church retained its true and uncorrupted form, all those names of pride, which in succeeding times have been insolently usurped by the Roman see, were altogether unknown."⁴⁴

A Roman Catholic writer says the same, referring to the Council of Trent: "Les Eveques avoient espere d'y recouvre l'autorite Episcopale passee presque toute entiere entre les mains des papes; & il la leur a fait perdre tout a fait en les reduisant a une plus grande servitude."⁴⁵

Article Eighty applies a much-controverted text of Scripture to the Bishop of Rome, calling him Anti-Christ. In affirming this, it follows the Calvinistic Synod at Gappe, in Dauphiny, which had been held shortly before.⁴⁶ The Second Scots Confession (1580) also speaks of "the usurped authoritie of that Romane Antichrist",⁴⁷ and adds: "... monie ar stirred up be Sathan, and that Roman Antichrist."⁴⁸ That this was the common opinion held in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, can be seen by reference to the literature of that period.

43 Instit., IV. vii. 3.

44 Ibid.

45 Sarpi, Histoire du Concile de Trente, I, 5.

46 Collier, VII, 384.

47 Schaff, III, 481.

48 Ibid., 484.

3. Of the Sacraments of the New Testament.

<u>IRISH</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>
<p>85. The Sacraments ordained by Christ, be not onely badges or tokens of Christian mens profession: but rather certaine sure witnesses, and effectuall or <u>powerfull</u> signes of grace and Gods good will towards us, by which he doth worke inuisibly in vs, and not onely quicken but also strengthen and confirme our faith in him.</p>	<p>Sacramentes ordayned of Christe, be not onely badges or tokens of Christian mens profession: but rather they be certaine sure witnesses and effectuall signes of grace and Gods good wyll towards vs, by the which he doth worke inuisibly in vs, and doth not onely quicken, but also strengthen and confirme our fayth in hym.⁴⁹</p>
<p>86. There bee two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospell, that is to say, BAPTISME and the LORDS SUPPER.</p>	<p>There are two Sacramentes ordayned of Christe our Lorde in the Gospell, that is to say, Baptisme, and the Supper of the Lorde.⁵⁰</p>
<p>87. Those fiue <u>which by the Church of ROME are called</u></p>	<p>Those fyue, <u>commonly called</u> Sacramentes, that is to say,</p>

49 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXV, Hardwick, 297.

50 Ibid.

Sacraments, to witt, CONFIRMATION, PENANCE, ORDERS, MATRIMONY, and EXTREME UNCTION, are not to be accounted Sacraments of the Gospell: being such as haue partly growen from corrupt imitation of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet haue not like nature of Sacraments with BAPTISME and the LORDS SUPPER, for that they haue not any visible signe or ceremonie ordained of God, together with a promise of sauing grace annexed thereunto.

88. The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed vpon, or to be carried about; but that we should duely vse them. And in such onely as worthyly receaue the same, they haue a wholesome effect

Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme vnction, are not to be compted for Sacramentes of the Gospel, being such as haue growen partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the scriptures: but yet haue not lyke nature of Sacramentes with Baptisme and the Lordes Supper, for that they haue not any visible signe or ceremonie ordayned of God.⁵¹

The Sacramentes were not ordayned of Christ to be gased vpon, or to be caryed about: but that we should duely use them. And in such only as worthyly receaue the same, they haue a wholesome effect

51 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXV, Hardwick, 297.

and operation; but they that
receave them vnworthylie,
thereby draw iudgement vpon
themselues.

or operation: But they that
receave them vnworthily,
purchase to them selues dam-
nation, as S. Paul sayth.⁵²

On the subject of the Sacraments, the Irish Articles follow closely the Thirty-nine Articles; all, or part, of fourteen of the sixteen articles in this section have been taken almost verbatim from the English formulary.

The first part of the section, articles Eighty-five to Eighty-eight, deals with sacraments in general, and all four articles have their source in the XXXIX. Article Eighty-five pronounces against the Zwinglian conception of the sacraments, which regarded them as mere remembrances. The article teaches, that they are "signs of grace" by which God works in his people, and confirms their faith in him.

Article Eighty-six affirms, that there are but two sacraments which have been ordained of Christ, and the following article (87) rejects the five ecclesiastical rites which the Church of Rome calls sacraments. The reason these five are rejected is, that "they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God, together with a promise of saving grace annexed thereunto." This is more explicit than the corresponding English article, which

52 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXV, Hardwick, 297.

gives only the former of these two tests by which a sacrament is to be determined. Ussher's addition is a reflection of Calvin's statement, that "there can be no sacrament unaccompanied with a promise of salvation."⁵³ Inasmuch as there is no saving grace attached to the five additional "sacraments" of the Church of Rome, they cannot possibly be regarded as such.

In rejecting these five so-called sacraments, the Irish Articles follow the Reformed stream which originated in Calvin. He has devoted an entire chapter in his "Institutes" to a refutation of the Romanist doctrine regarding them.

Article Eighty-eight teaches, that the sacraments are to be "duly" used, that is, used as they were ordained by Christ, and not in the manner into which they had later degenerated, whereby they were regarded as things to be worshipped. The article further affirms, that only to such as receive the sacraments "worthily", is grace conferred; but such as receive them "unworthily", bring judgment upon themselves. This is in answer to the Romanist teaching of grace being conferred "ex opere operato", which had been declared the authoritative doctrine of the Church of Rome by the Council of Trent.⁵⁴

53 Instit., IV. xviii. 19.

54 Sess. VII, Schaff, II, 121.

4. Of Baptisme.IRISH

89. Baptisme is not onely an outward signe of our profession, and a note of difference, whereby Christians are discerned from such as are no Christians; but much more a Sacrament of our admission into the Church, sealing vnto vs our new birth (and consequently our Iustification, Adoption, and Sanctification) by the communion which we haue with Iesus Christ.

90. The Baptisme of Infants is to be retained in the Church, as agreeable to the

SOURCE

Baptisme is not only a signe of profession, and marke of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened: but is also a signe of regeneration or newe byrth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receaue baptisme rightly, are grafted into the Church: the promises of the forgeuenesse of sinne, and of our adoption to be the sonnes of God, by the holy ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: fayth is confyrmed: and grace increased by vertue or prayer vnto God.⁵⁵

The baptisme or young children, is in any wyse to be retayned in the Church, as most

55 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXVII, Hardwick, 301.

word of God.

agreeable with the institution
of Christe.⁵⁶

91. In the administration
of Baptisme, EXORCISME, OILE,
SALTE, SPITTLE, and supersti-
tious HALLOWING OF THE WATER,
are for iust causes abolished:
and without them the Sacrament
is fully and perfectly admin-
istred, to all intents and
purposes, agreeable to the in-
stitution of our Sauour
Christ.

And although in the admin-
istration of baptism there is
neither exorcism, oil, salt,
spittle, or hallowing of the
water now used, and for that
they were of late years abused
and esteemed necessary... they
be reasonably abolished, and
yet the sacrament full and
perfectly ministered to all
intents and purposes, agree-
able to the institution of
our Saviour Christ.⁵⁷

Article Eighty-nine, in its first clause, follows
the Thirty-nine Articles in proclaiming against the Zwing-
lian notion, that baptism was merely an external badge or
outward sign. In the second clause, however, the Irish de-
parts somewhat from the language of the corresponding
article of the XXXIX (28), which teaches the doctrine
of a "general" baptismal regeneration, calling baptism
"a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby as by an

56 Ibid.

57 Eleven Articles of 1559, Art. VIII, Hardwick, 328.

instrument, they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church." Thus, the Anglican Church, on the subject of baptism, is in closer agreement with the Lutheran than with the Calvinistic doctrine, for she retains the Catholic (Roman) doctrine of baptismal regeneration, while rejecting the "opus operatum" theory.⁵⁸

Ussher's language is more in keeping with that of Calvin, for he does not speak of baptism as an "instrument", as the English article does. The Irish article says, that baptism is a "sacrament of our admission into the Church", which Calvin likewise says: "Baptism is a sign of initiation, by which we are admitted into the society of the Church."⁵⁹ With Calvin, Ussher brings baptism into close connection with regeneration: "sealing unto us our new birth (and consequently our justification, adoption, and sanctification)"; but in this article he does not draw a sharp distinction between the outward visible sign and seal, and the inward invisible grace, as Calvin and the later Westminster Confession do. Calvin says, quoting Augustine, "that invisible sanctification may exist without the visible sign, and, on the contrary, that the visible sign may be used without real sanctification."⁶⁰

Article Ninety declares, that infant baptism is to be retained in the Church, for it is agreeable to

58 Schaff, I, 639.
 59 Instit., IV. xv. 1.
 60 Ibid, IV. xiv. 14.

the Word of God. The substitution of the word "infants" has been made for the English article's "young children". The article is directed against the teaching of the Anabaptists, that the baptism of infants was an erroneous practice. But on the other hand, it does not make infant baptism necessary for salvation, as the Church of Rome does.

Article Ninety-one is taken from the Eleven Articles; but whereas the latter states, that in regard to the later accretions used in the rite of baptism, they were abolished because "they were of late years abused and esteemed necessary", the Irish article says merely, that they are "for just causes abolished", the sacrament as instituted by our Saviour being properly administered without their use.

5. Of the Lords Supper.

<u>IRISH</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>
<p>92. The Lords supper is not onely a signe of the mutuall loue which Christians ought to beare one towards another, but much more <u>a Sacrament of our preseruatiō in the Church, sealing vnto us ovr spirituall nourishment and continuall growth in Christ.</u></p>	<p>The Supper of the Lord, is not only a signe of the loue that Christians ought to haue among themselues one to another: but rather it is <u>a Sacrament of our redemption by Christes death.</u>⁶¹</p>
<p>93. The change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Bloud of Christ, commonly called TRANSUBSTANTIATION, cannot be proued by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to plaine testimonies of the Scripture, ouerthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath giuen occasion <u>to most grosse Idolatry and manifold superstitions.</u></p>	<p>Transubstantiation (or the chaunge of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lorde, can not be proued by holye writ, but is repugnaunt to the playne wordes of scripture, ouerthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath geuen occasion <u>to many superstitions.</u>⁶²</p>

61 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXVIII, Hardwick, 301-3.

62 Ibid, 303.

94. In the outward part of the holy Communion, the Bodie and Bloud of Christ is in a most liuely manner REPRESENTED; being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signes and seales, that is to say, symbolically and relatiuely. But in the inward and spirit-uall part the same Body and Bloud is really and substan-tially PRESENTED vnto all those who haue grace to re-ceaue the Sonne of God, euen to all those that beleue in his name. And unto such as in this manner doe worthyly and with faith repaire vnto the Lords table the Bodie and Bloud of Christ is not onely signified and offered, but also truely exhibited and communicated.

Insomuch that to suche as ryghtlie, worthyly, and with fayth receaue the same the bread which we breake is a parttakyng of the body of Christe, and likewyse the cuppe of blessing, is a parttakyng of the blood of Christe.⁶³

63 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXVIII, Hardwick, 303.

95. The Bodie of Christ is giuen, taken, and eaten in the Lords Supper, onely after an heauenly and spirituall manner; and the meane whereby the Body of Christ is thus receaved and eaten is Faith.

The body of Christe is geuen, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heauenly and spirituall maner: And the meane whereby the body of Christe is receaved and eaten in the Supper, is fayth.⁶⁴

96. The wicked, and such as want a liuely faith, although they doe carnally and visibly (as Saint Augustine speaketh) presse with their teeth the Sacrament of the body and bloud of Christ, yet in no wise are they made partakers of Christ; but rather to their condemnation doe eat and drinke the signe or Sacrament of so great a thing.

The wicked, and suche as be voyde of a liuelye fayth, although they do carnally and visibly presse with their teeth (as Saint Augustine sayth) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: yet in no wyse are the partakers of Christe, but rather to their condemnation do eate and drinke the signe or Sacrament of so great a thing.⁶⁵

97. Both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, according to Christs institution and the practice of the auncient

... both the partes of the Lordes Sacrament, by Christes ordinance and commaundement, ought to be ministred to all

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid, Art. XXIX, 305.

Church, ought to be ministred vnto all Gods people; and it is plain sacriledge to rob them of the mysticall cup, for whom Christ hath shed his most precious bloud.

98. The Sacrament of the LORDS SUPPER was not by Christs ordinance reserued, carried about, lifted vp, or worshiped.

99. The sacrifice of the Masse, wherin the Priest is said to offer vp Christ for obtaining the remission of paine or guilt for the quicke and the dead, is neither agreeable to Christs ordinance nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolike; but contrarywise most ungodly

Christian men alike.⁶⁶ ... it is avouched by certain fathers of the Church to be a plain sacrilege, to rob them of the mystical cup, for whom Christ hath shed his most precious blood...⁶⁷

The Sacrament of the Lordes Supper was not by Christes ordinaunce reserued, caryed about, lyfted vp, or worshipped.⁶⁸

... the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priestes did offer Christe for the quicke and the dead, to haue remission of payne or gylt⁶⁹ ... is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine apostolic, but contrary-

66 Ibid, Art. XXX.

67 Eleven Articles, Art. X, Hardwick, 328.

68 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXVIII, Hardwick, 303.

69 Ibid, Art. XXXI, 307.

and most iniurious to that all-sufficient sacrifice of our Saviour Christ, offered once for euer vpon the Crosse, which is the onely propitiation and satisfaction for all our sinnes.

wise most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ, and his only sufficient sacrifice offered once for ever upon the alter of the cross.⁷⁰ ... the perfect ... propiciation, and satisfaction for all the sinnes of the whole worlde...⁷¹

100. Priuate Masse, that is, the receiuing of the EUCHARIST by the Priest alone, without a competent number of communicants, is contrary to the institution of Christ.

... private masses were never used amongst the fathers of the primitive church, I mean, public ministration and receiving of the sacrament by the priest alone, without a just number of communicants, according to Christ's saying, "Take ye and eat ye",...⁷²

The first clause of article Ninety-two follows the first clause of the corresponding article of the XXXIX in affirming, that the Lord's Supper is more than a bare sign of mutual Christian love. The second clause, however,

70 Eleven Articles, Art. IX, Hardwick, 328.

71 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXI, Ibid, 305.

72 Eleven Articles, Art. IX, Ibid, 328.

is changed, for, whereas the English defines it as a sacrament of our redemption by the death of Christ, the Irish speaks of it as "a sacrament of our preservation in the Church, sealing unto us our spiritual nourishment and continual growth in Christ." In an earlier article (89), baptism had been defined as "a sacrament of our admission into the Church". Thus, it is seen, that baptism and the Lord's Supper are inseparably connected with our relationship to the Church. It is quite likely that Ussher derived his language from Calvin, for the latter says:

... the signs are bread and wine, which represent to us the invisible nourishment which we receive from the body and blood of Christ. For as in baptism God regenerates us, incorporates us into the society of his Church, and makes us his children by adoption, so... he acts towards us the part of a provident father of a family, in constantly supplying us with food, to sustain and preserve us in that life to which he has begotten us by his word.⁷³

Article Ninety-three rejects the Romanist doctrine of transubstantiation, since it is "repugnant to plain testimonies of the Scripture". Besides giving occasion to superstitions, as the English article says, this article adds, that it has also occasioned "most gross idolatry".

Article Ninety-four deals with the manner in which the body and blood of Christ is received; and it is Calvin's doctrine which is taught. The Romanist theory of

73 Instit., IV. xvii. 1.

transubstantiation declared, that the "substance" of the bread and of the wine was changed into the "substance" of the body and blood of Christ, although the qualities, or accidents, remained the same - the change being effected by the priest in consecrating the elements.⁷⁴ The Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation was based on the theory of the ubiquity of the "glorified" body of Christ; and since the body was everywhere, it was naturally in the bread and wine also. The promise of God made this ordinary presence a Sacramental presence.⁷⁵ Thus, the Lutheran and Roman conceptions had much in common, although the former dispensed with the miraculous action of the priest. Calvin discarded both these theories, and inquired into the meaning of the words, "substance" and "presence". He said, that the substance of anything is its power, and its presence is the immediate application of its power. Following this line of thought, he reasoned, that the substance of the crucified body of Christ is its power, and the presence of the crucified body of Christ is the immediate application of its power. The assurance of the application of the power is the promise of God to the believing communicant.⁷⁶ Thus, Calvin shows, that the body of Christ is really present in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Article Ninety-four maintains, that outwardly, the body and blood of Christ is "represented", being no

74 Lindsay, History of the Reformation, II, 412.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid.

more present with the visible bread and wine than "things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals". But inwardly, the body and blood of Christ are "really and substantially presented", but only to those "who have grace to receive the Son of God... to all those that believe in his name". The last clause of the article affirms, that to those who "worthily and with faith" partake of the Lord's Supper, the body and blood is "truly exhibited and communicated". The language used in this article is found almost verbatim in Calvin. He says: "... the thing signified he exhibits and offers to all who come to that spiritual banquet; though it is advantageously enjoyed by believers alone."⁷⁷ And also: "... if, by the breaking of the bread, the Lord truly represents the participation of his body, it ought not to be doubted that he truly presents and communicates it."⁷⁸

The Irish Articles agree with the Thirty-nine in affirming, that the body of Christ is eaten "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner" (article 95), which is also said in the Lutheran Formula of Concord.⁷⁹ But the English and Irish add, that faith is the means by which it is eaten and received, which the Lutherans deny. Their words are: "... the body and blood of Christ are taken with the bread and wine, not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth...".⁸⁰ Calvin says:

77 Instit., IV. xvii. 10.

78 Ibid.

79 Schaff, III, 139.

80 Ibid.

"... there is no other eating than by faith, as it is impossible to imagine any other."⁸¹ Thus it is seen, that the Thirty-nine Articles also adhere to the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, although some have tried to force a Lutheran interpretation upon them.

Article Ninety-six reproduces verbatim article Twenty-nine of the XXXIX Articles. This twenty-ninth article had been suppressed for a time by Queen Elizabeth, for it was "expressed in terms which most Lutherans would have been loath to use",⁸² and Elizabeth, for political reasons, did not wish to offend them. The Lutherans maintain, that "the unworthy and unbelieving receive the true body and blood of Christ",⁸³ which is called "sacramental" eating, for they receive the body and blood of Christ without any influence of his Spirit.⁸⁴ This article refers to a quotation from St. Augustine, which Calvin gives at length, for he claims that those who use it to prove that the wicked receive the body and blood of Christ, pervert its meaning. Augustine says: "Therefore he who abides not in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, spiritually neither eats his flesh nor drinks his blood, though he may carnally and visibly press the sign of the body and blood with his teeth."⁸⁵ On this Calvin remarks:

81 Instit., IV. xvii. 5.

82 Lindsay, History of the Reformation, II, 414.

83 Formula of Concord, Schaff, III, 140.

84 Instit., IV. xvii. 34.

85 Ibid.

Here... we find the visible sign opposed to the spiritual eating; which contradicts that error, that the invisible body of Christ is really eaten sacramentally, though it be not eaten spiritually. We are informed also that nothing is granted to the profane and impure, beyond the visible reception of the sign.⁸⁶

Article Ninety-seven affirms, that both the bread and wine are to be administered in the Lord's Supper. The former clause is drawn from the XXXIX Articles, but the stronger language of the Eleven Articles is used in the latter clause. Whereas the Eleven Articles call the withholding of the cup from the laity "a plain sacrilege", the XXXIX Articles say merely, that it "is not to be denied". The Eleven Articles add, that for more than six hundred years after Christ, both parts of the sacraments were administered to the people. The Irish article does not reproduce this clause.

Article Ninety-eight declares, that the Lord's Supper is not to be worshipped; which is directed against the Romish doctrine. This practice is contrary to the original purpose of the sacrament, and is nowhere mentioned in Scripture. It is an error based on the assumption, that if the body of Christ is present, as the Romanists claim it is, then the soul and Divinity are also present, for they cannot be separated from the body - a view which is called "concomitance"; therefore, Christ is to be worshipped in the sacrament.⁸⁷

86 Instit., IV. xvii. 34.

87 Ibid, IV. xvii. 35.

Article Ninety-nine deals with the sacrifice of the Mass, and declares it to be "most ungodly and most injurious to that all-sufficient sacrifice of our Saviour Christ", using the language, in this clause, of the Eleven Articles. The Thirty-nine Articles had called them "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."⁸⁹

Article One-hundred declares private masses to be contrary to the institution of Christ, whereas its source, the Eleven Articles, says that they "were never used amongst the fathers of the primitive church."

6. Of the Ciuill Magistrate.IRISHSOURCE

57. The Kings Maiestie vnder God hath the Soueraigne and chiefe power, within his Realmes and Dominions, ouer all manner of persons, of what estate, either Ecclesiasticall or Ciuill, soeuer they bee; so as no other forraine power hath or ought to haue any superiority ouer them.

The Queenes Maiestie hath the cheefe power in this Realme of Englande, and other her dominions, vnto whom the cheefe gouernment of all estates of this Realme, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Ciuill, in all causes doth appartaine, and is not, nor ought to be subiect to any forraine iurisdiction.⁸⁹

58. Wee doe professe that the supreame gouernment of all estates within the said Realmes and Dominions, in all causes, as well Ecclesiasticall as Temporall, doth of right appartaine to the Kings highnes. Neither doe we giue vnto him hereby the administration of

Where we attribute to the Queenes Maiestie the cheefe gouernment, by whiche titles we vnderstande the mindes of some slaunderous folkes to be offended: we geue not to our princes the ministring either of God's word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the

89 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXVII, Hardwick, 313, 315.

the word and Sacraments, or
the power of the Keyes: but
 that prerogatiue onely, which
 we see to haue been alwaies
 giuen vnto all godly Princes
 in holy Scripture by God him-
 selfe; that is, that hee
 should containe all estates
 and degree committed to his
 charge by God, whether they
 be Ecclesiasticall or Ciuill,
 within their duty, and re-
 straine the stubborne and
 euill doers with the power
 of the Ciuill swoorde.

59. The Pope neither of him-
 selfe, nor by any authoritie
 of the Church or Sea of Rome,
 or by any other meanes with
 any other, hath any power or
 authoritie to depose the King,
 or dispose any of his King-
 domes or Dominions, or to au-
 thorise any other Prince to

Iniunctions also lately set
 forth by Elizabeth our Queene,
 plainlie testifie: But that
 only prerogatiue whiche we
 see to haue ben geuen alwaies
 to all godly Princes in holy
 Scriptures by God himselfe,
 that is, that they should
 rule all estates and degrees
 committed to their charge by
 God, whether they be Eccles-
 iasticall or Temporall, and
 restraine with the ciuill
 sworde the stubborne and
 euill doers.⁹⁰

The bishop of Rome hath no
 iurisdiction in this Realme
 of Englande.⁹¹... the Bishop
 of Rome, usurping as well
 against their natural lords
 the emperors, as against all
 other Christian kings and
 kingdoms, and their continual
 stirring of subjects unto

90 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXVII, Hardwick, 315.

91 Ibid.

inuade or annoy him or his Countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their alleageance and obedience to his Maiestie, or to giue licence or leaue to any of them to beare armes, raise tumult, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Royall person, state, or gouernment, or to any of his subjects within his Maiesties Dominions.

rebellions against their sovereign lords... were intolerable; and it may seem more than marvel, that any subjects would after such sort hold with unnatural foreign usurpers against their own sovereign lords, and natural country. Wherefore let all good subjects... avoid and flee... the pestilent suggestions of such foreign usurpers, and their adherents, and embrace all obedience to God, and their natural princes and sovereigns....⁹²

60. That Princes which be excommunicated or depriued by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoeuer, is impious doctrine.

61. The lawes of the Realme

The lawes of the Realme

may punish Christian men with death for heynous and grievous offences.

may punishe Christian men with death, for heynous and greeuous offences.⁹³

62. It is lawfull for Christian men, at the commandement of the Magistrate, to beare armes, and to serve in iust wars.

It is lawfull for Christian men, at the commaundement of the Magistrate, to weare weapons, and serue in the warres.⁹⁴

This section, of the Civil Magistrate, appears in the Irish Articles between the sections, of the Service of God, and, of our duty towards our Neighbours. Its position has here been changed, following the outline of the "Institutes", to a place posterior to the discussion of the Church and the Sacraments.

Most of the section has its source in the Thirty-nine Articles, although that formulary has not been followed verbatim, as seen above. Article Fifty-seven asserts the supremacy "under God" of the King. The phrase, "under God", has been added to make it explicit, although it is implied in the earlier formulary. The article is directed against those who still asserted the supremacy of the Pope, the term "foreign power" being a reference to that person.

93 Thirty-nine Articles, Art. XXXVII, Hardwick, 315.

94 Ibid.

Article Fifty-eight reaffirms what had been said in the previous article, adding, that this power which the King possesses pertains to him "of right", which is the "Divine Right" which James Ist had claimed. The article, however, makes an exception, that is, that the King has no right to administer the Word and Sacraments, or to exert the power of the Keys. The English article, as in the section of the Church, omits any mention of the Keys. The article teaches, that the King is God's minister, to whom God has committed both ecclesiastical and civil estates, and it is his duty to see that they stay within their bounds. The King has been given the power of the "civil sword" by God, by which he is to punish evil-doers. This is the doctrine advanced by Hooker, in his famous "Ecclesiastical Polity". That learned writer considers the Church and State to be two different functions of the one and the same society; thus the supremacy of the King over the Church.⁹⁵ Bishop Jewel had affirmed the same in his defence of the English Church: "... the care of both Tables is committed by God to a faithful Prince, that he may thereby understand, that not only the Civil, but the Ecclesiastical Polity belongs to him and to his office."⁹⁶ Ussher follows these two earlier writers in ascribing to the King supremacy in Church matters as well as State:

95 Fisher, The Reformation, 348.

96 Apology of the Church of England, 117-18.

... the power of the civil sword, the supreme managing whereof belongeth to the king alone, is not to be restrained unto temporal causes only; but is by God's ordinance to be extended likewise unto all spiritual or ecclesiastical things and causes: that, as the spiritual rulers of the Church do exercise their kind of government, in bringing men unto obedience, not of the duties of the first table alone, which concerneth piety and the religious service which man is bound to perform unto his Creator, but also of the second, which respecteth moral honesty, and the offices that man doth owe unto man, so the civil magistrate is to use his authority also in redressing the abuses committed against the first table, as well as against the second: that is to say, as well in punishing of an heretic, or an idolater, or a blasphemer, as of a thief, or a murderer, or a traitor...⁹⁷

Article Fifty-nine is much fuller than the corresponding article in the XXXIX, which affirms merely, that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." The language used in this article is similar to that used in the Homily against Wilful Rebellion, and was probably suggested to Ussher by reference to that work. The article affirms, that the Pope has no authority to interfere in any way with the civil magistracy^h "within his Majesty's dominions", a practice that had been in effect in England from the time of Henry IInd,⁹⁸ and which had reached its zenith during the reign of Elizabeth, who had been deposed by a Bull of Pius V, and her subjects released from their allegiance.⁹⁹ The Bull, however, did not mean much to the Queen, for she renounced all foreign jurisdiction, "as her crown was no way either

97 Works, II, 463-4.

98 Jewel, Apology of the Church of England, 138.

99 Fisher, The Reformation, 331.

subject to, or to be drawn under any Power whatever, saving under Christ the King of Kings."¹⁰⁰

Article Sixty states, that it is "impious doctrine" to teach that excommunicated princes may be murdered by their subjects, a doctrine disseminated by the Jesuits Suarez and Parsons, and which had formed a moral (or immoral!) basis for the Gunpowder Plot on the House of Parliament in England in 1605. The same doctrine reared its head in the Parliament of 1613 in Ireland, and William Talbot, chief legal advisor of the Opposition in that Parliament,¹⁰¹ was sent to the Tower for not condemning "with sufficient clearness" the Jesuit Suarez' opinions. "That murder was not lawful he had no doubt, but thought that deposition might be, and he said this in the King's presence."¹⁰² Barnewell, another leading Recusant in that Parliament, repudiated the doctrines as "most profane, impious, wicked, and detestable."¹⁰³

Articles Sixty-one and Sixty-two are both taken from the Thirty-nine Articles, the former asserting the validity of capital punishment, and the latter, the lawfulness of serving in "just" wars. This adjective is not found in the earlier formulary.

100 Strype, Annals, I, 141-2.

101 Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts, I, 120.

102 Ibid, 122.

103 Ibid.

CONCLUSION

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ARTICLES

CHAPTER VIIICONCLUSION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ARTICLES

It has been shown in chapter Three, that the Irish Articles possessed some amount of authority in their own country and Church for a period of only twenty to twenty-five years, and that after that time, they were superceded by the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. In another sense, however, it may be said, that the Irish Articles were accepted in later years, in a large degree, by the Church of Scotland, and by the Presbyterian Churches in the rest of Great Britain and in America. By this is meant, that the divines of the Westminster Assembly recognised the merits of Ussher's work, and made full use of the Irish Articles in the formation of their own doctrinal standard, which is known as the Westminster Confession of Faith.

The Westminster Assembly convened on 1 July 1643, having been called by Parliament for the purpose of effecting a more perfect reformation of the Church of England, and bringing it into closer agreement with the Church of Scotland and the Continental Reformed Churches.¹ The As-

1 Schaff, I, 730.

sembly was to include one-hundred and twenty-one divines, and all parties of the English Church were to be represented except the High-Church of Laud.² These were to be augmented by five clerical commissioners from Scotland.³ James Ussher was elected,⁴ but being a staunch Royalist, he refused to attend, for the king had made a proclamation prohibiting the meeting of the Assembly.⁵

The Assembly was directed by an order of Parliament (5 July 1643) to revise the first ten of the Thirty-nine Articles, in order "to free and vindicate the doctrine of them from all aspersions and false interpretations."⁶ This was followed by another order to deal likewise with the nine articles following. The revision had got as far as the fifteenth article when the work was suspended by an order of Parliament (12 Oct. 1643), requiring the Assembly to begin upon the work of Church government. And it was given up entirely when an order was given "to frame a Confession of Faith for the three kingdoms, according to the Solemn League and Covenant."⁷

2 Ibid, 731.

3 Ibid, 745.

4 Ibid, 733. He was again appointed a member of the Assembly in 1647 when he came to London, and was admitted as preacher at Lincoln's Inn. Mitchell, Intro., Minutes of Westminster Assembly, xxxii.

5 Schaff, I, 731. Ware says: "While the matter was under debate in the House, a question arose whether he (Ussher) should be admitted or not? Upon which Mr. Selden answered: that they had as good inquire, whether they had best admit Inigo Jones, the King's architect, to the Company of Mouse-Trap Makers." Works, I, 110.

6 Hardwick, 208.

7 Schaff, I, 755.

In this revision, which was designed to make the English Articles more explicitly Calvinistic, can be seen the influence of the Irish Articles. Four of the articles, viz., the second, sixth, ninth, and thirteenth, after revision, all bear the impress of Ussher's formulary. In some instances, the language of these revised articles is closer to the Irish Articles than is the language of the later Westminster Confession to those Articles. This is most noticeable in article Six of the revised group, which deals with Holy Scripture; and in a lesser degree in article Nine, which treats of original sin. The comparison is given below, the similarity in language between the English Articles as revised, and the Irish Articles, being underlined:

XXXIX Articles

II. ... who truly suffered.

VI. In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority

XXXIX Articles Re-
vised by Westmin-
ster Divines

II. who for our
sakes truly suf-
fered most griev-
ous torments in
his soul from God.

VI. By the name of
Holy Scripture we
understand all the
canonical Books of
the Old and New
Testament which follow:

Irish Articles

30. For our sakes
he endured most
grievous torments
immediately in his
soul.

2. By the name of
holy Scripture we
understand all the
Canonical Books of
the Old and New
Testament, viz.:

XXXIX ArticlesXXXIX RevisedIrish Articles

was never any doubt
in the church.

Of the Names and
Number of the Can-
onical Books.

Of the Old Testa-
ment.

Of the New Testa-
ment.

All which books, as
they are commonly
received, we do re-
ceive and acknow-
ledge them to be
given by the inspi-
ration of God; and
in that regard, to
be of most certain
credit, and highest
authority.

Of the Old Testa-
ment.

Of the New Testa-
ment.

All which we acknow-
ledge to be given by
the inspiration of
God, and in that re-
gard to be of most
certain credit and
highest authority.

IX. ... of every
man that naturally
is engendered of
the offspring of
Adam, whereby man
is very far gone
from original
righteousness.

And although there
is no condemnation
for them that be-
lieve and are bap-
tized...

XIII. Works done
before the grace of
Christ... are not
pleasant to God...

IX. ... of every man²³ that naturally is
propagated from
Adam; whereby man
is wholly deprived
of original right-
eousness.

And although there
is no condemnation
for them that are
regenerate, and do
believe...

XIII. Works done
before justifica-
tion by Christ...
are not pleasing
unto God...

23. ... of every per-
son that naturally
is engendered and
propagated from Adam:
whereby it cometh to
pass that man is de-
prived of original
righteousness,

24. And howsoever...
there be no condemna-
tion to such as are
regenerate and do
believe...

26. Works done be-
fore the grace of
Christ... are not
pleasing unto God...

XXXIX ArticlesXXXIX RevisedIrish Articles

... for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

... for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, they are sinful.

... for that they are not done in such sort as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they are sinful.

A Committee was appointed 20 August 1644, to prepare matter for a Confession of Faith, and consisted of the Scottish Commissioners and nine other clergymen,⁸ one of whom was Dr. Joshua Hoyle, the only Irish Divine of the Assembly.⁹ This Committee prepared the material, and reported in the 434th session (12 May 1645); whereupon another Committee, smaller than the first, was appointed, which consisted of members from the former Committee, Dr. Hoyle again being a member.¹⁰ On 7 July 1645, a report was made of the part of the Confession regarding the Holy Scriptures, and it was then debated.¹¹

While this debate, which lasted for several days, was being carried on in the Assembly, it was ordered (467th session, 11 July 1645), to divide the body of the Confession of Faith to the three sub-committees, which

8 Minutes, lxxxvi-vii.

9 Schaff, I, 743.

10 Ibid, 756; Minutes, 91. It will be remembered that Dr. Hoyle was one of the two members of the Lower House of Convocation in 1634 who alone voted against Strafford's Canon for introducing the Thirty-nine Articles into the Church of Ireland. See above, 58-9.

11 Minutes, 110.

were made up of members of the Committee previously appointed.¹² This was debated in the following session, and on the 16th of July (Sess. 470) it was ordered, that the first Committee prepare the Confession of Faith upon the following heads: God and the Holy Trinity; God's Decrees, Predestination, Election, etc.; the works of Creation and Providence; Man's Fall. The second Committee: Sin, and the punishment thereof; Free-will; the Covenant of Grace; Christ our Mediator. The third Committee: Effectual Vocation; Justification; Adoption; Sanctification.¹³ Professor Briggs shows that these heads reveal a transition from the Irish Articles to the Assembly's Confession.¹⁴ This transition is as follows:

<u>Irish Articles</u>	<u>Heads of Committee</u>	<u>Westminster Confession</u>
I. Of the Holy Scripture and the Three Creeds.	The Scriptures.	I. Of the Holy Scripture.
II. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.	God and the Holy Trinity.	II. Of God and of the Holy Trinity.
III. Of God's Eternal Decree and Predestination.	God's Decrees, Predestination, Election, etc..	III. Of God's Eternal Decree
IV. Of the Creation and Government of all Things.	The works of Creation and Providence.	IV. Of Creation. V. Of Providence.

12 Minutes, 112.

13 Ibid, 114.

14 Presbyterian Review, January, 1880.

<u>Irish Articles</u>	<u>Heads of Committee</u>	<u>Westminster Confession</u>
V. Of the Fall of Man, Original Sin, and the State of Man before Justification.	Man's Fall, Sin, and the Punishment thereof, Free Will.	VI. Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment thereof. IX. Of Free Will.
VI. Of Christ the Mediator of the Second Covenant.	The Covenant of Grace. Christ our Mediator.	VII. Of God's Covenant with Man. VIII. Of Christ the Mediator.
VII. Of the Communicating of the Grace of Christ.	Effectual Vocation.	X. Of Effectual Calling.
VIII. Of Justification and Faith.	Justification. Adoption.	XI. Of Justification. XII. Of Adoption.
IX. Of Sanctification and Good Works.	Sanctification.	XIII. Of Sanctification.

It has been pointed out by Professor Mitchell that the main source of the Westminster Confession was the Irish Articles. He says:

In these Articles... we have the main source of our Confession of Faith, and almost its exact prototype in its statement of all the more important and essential doctrines of Christianity. In the order and titles of many of its chapters, as well as in the language of whole sections or subdivisions of chapters, and in many single phrases... occurring throughout their Confession, the Westminster Divines appear to me to have followed very closely in the footsteps of Ussher and his Irish brethren.¹⁵

He also affirms, that the resemblance between the Irish Articles and the Westminster Confession is closer than can be explained by their both being founded

15 Intro., Minutes, xlvii, note 1.

on a common system. This is evident particularly in the position of the chapters on Holy Scripture and on Predestination. In other confessions the section on Scripture usually follows that on God, while all those which treat of Predestination, instead of placing it before the sections on creation and providence, deal with it later, more in accordance with its position in Calvin's "Institutes". Also, the headings of the chapters are too similar in language to deny that the later could have been formulated without reference to the earlier. This is evident in the use of the singular, "of Holy Scripture", and "of God's Eternal Decree", when the plural could have been used instead. Finally, the same qualifying adjectives are used in both Confessions in these two and other headings.¹⁶

The statements of the two formularies are given below in juxtaposition, and it becomes quite clear, that besides a close similarity in chapter headings, there is also a striking resemblance in language as well, being most evident in the sections touching Predestination and the Lord's Supper. In this comparison it is seen, that seventy-eight of the one-hundred and four articles in the Irish formulary are reproduced at least partially, and in a few instances, almost entirely, in the Westminster Confession. Likewise, eighty-eight of the one-

16 Intro., Minutes, xlviii, note.

hundred and seventy-two articles in the Westminster formulary, or more than half of the total number of articles, have their origin in the Articles of the Church of Ireland. The similarity in language and phraseology has been underlined:

Irish Articles

Westminster Confession

I Of the Holy Scripture
and the Three Creeds.

I Of the Holy Scripture.

2. By the name of holy Scripture we understand all the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, viz.:

II. Under the name of holy Scripture... are now contained all the Books of the Old and New Testament, which are these:

Of the Old Testament.

Of the Old Testament.

The Five Books of Moses.
Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
The First and Second of Samuel.
The First and Second of Kings.
The First and Second of Chronicles.
Ezra.
Nehemiah.
Esther.
Job.
Psalms.
Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes.
The Song of Solomon.
Isaiah.
Jeremiah, his Prophecy and Lamentation.
Ezekiel.
Daniel.
The Twelve lesser Prophets.

Genesis.	Isaiah.
Exodus.	Jeremiah.
Leviticus.	Lamentations.
Numbers.	Ezekiel.
Deuteronomy.	Daniel.
Joshua.	Hosea.
Judges.	Joel.
Ruth.	Amos.
I. Samuel.	Obadiah.
II. Samuel.	Jonah.
I. Kings.	Micah.
II. Kings.	Nahum.
I. Chronicles.	Habakkuk.
II. Chronicles.	Zephaniah.
Ezra.	Haggai.
Nehemiah.	Zechariah.
Esther.	Malachi.
Job.	
Psalms.	
Proverbs.	
Ecclesiastes.	
The Song of Songs.	

Of the New Testament.

The Gospels according to
 Matthew,
 Mark,
 Luke,
 John,
 The Acts of the Apostles.
 The Epistle of St. Paul to the
 Romans.
 II. Corinthians.
 Galatians.
 Ephesians.
 Philippians.
 Colossians.
 II. Thessalonians.
 II. Timothy.
 Titus.
 Philemon.
 Hebrews.
 The Epistle of St. James.
 St. Peter II.
 St. John III.
 St. Jude.
 The Revelation of St. John.

All which we acknowledge to be given by the inspiration of God, and in that regard to be of most certain credit and highest authority.

3. The other Books, commonly called APOCRYPHAL, did not proceed from such inspiration, and therefore are not of sufficient authority to establish any point of doctrine; but the Church doth read them as Books containing many worthy things for example of life and instruction of manners.

Of the New Testament.

The Gospels according to
 Matthew,
 Mark,
 Luke,
 John.
 The Acts of the Apostles.
 Paul's Epistles to the Romans.
 Corinthians I.
 Corinthians II.
 Galatians.
 Ephesians.
 Philippians.
 Colossians.
 Thessalonians I.
 Thessalonians II.
 To Timothy I.
 To Timothy II.
 To Titus.
 To Philemon.
 The Epistle to the Hebrews.
 The Epistle of James.
 The First and Second Epistles of Peter.
 The First, Second, and Third Epistles of John.
 The Epistle of Jude.
 The Revelation.¹⁷

All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life.

III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration... are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.

17 Comparing this list with that of the Irish Articles, it is seen that the Westminster Divines did not necessarily hold, that the authority of the books depended upon their traditional authorship: the first five books of the O.T. are not attributed to Moses; Solomon is not given as the author of the Song; Lamentations is not ascribed to Jeremiah; and Paul is not credited with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Irish Articles

6. The holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, and are able to instruct sufficiently in all points of faith that we are bound to believe, and all good duties that we are bound to practice.

5. Although there be some hard things in the Scripture ... yet all things necessary to be known unto everlasting salvation are clearly delivered therein; and nothing of that kind is spoken under dark mysteries in one place which is not in other places spoken more familiarly and plainly, to the capacity both of learned and unlearned.

4. The Scriptures ought to be translated out of the original tongues into all languages for the common use of all men: neither is any person to be discouraged from reading the Bible in such a language as he doth understand, but seriously exhorted to read the same with great humility and reverence, as a special means to bring him to the true knowledge of God and of his own duty.

Westminster Confession

VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture...

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

IX. ... when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture... it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

VIII. ... because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner...

Irish ArticlesII Of Faith in the Holy
Trinity.

8. There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there be three persons of one and the same substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

9. ... the person of the Father begetteth the person of the Son, by communicating his whole essence to the person begotten from eternity.

10. The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son...

III Of God's Eternal Decree
and Predestination.

11. God from all eternity did, by his unchangeable counsel, ordain whatsoever in time should come to pass; yet so as thereby no violence is offered to the wills of the

Westminster ConfessionII Of God, and of the Holy
Trinity.

I. There is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of his own immutable and most righteous will...

III. In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.

III Of God's Eternal Decree.

I. God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God

reasonable creatures, and neither the liberty nor the contingency of the second causes is taken away, but established rather.

12. By the same eternal counsel God hath predestinated some unto life, and reprobated some unto death: of both which there is a certain number, known only to God, which can neither be increased nor diminished.

13. Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed in his sacred counsel to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ unto everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor.

14. The cause moving God to predestinate unto life is not the foreseeing of faith, or perseverance, or good works, or of any thing which is in the person predestinated, but only the good pleasure of God himself. For all things being ordained for the manifestation of his glory, and his glory being to appear both in the works of his mercy and of his justice, it seemed good to his

the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.

III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished.

V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

VII. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his

Irish Articles

heavenly wisdom to choose out a certain number towards whom he would extend his undeserved mercy, leaving the rest to be spectacles of his justice.

15. Such as are predestinated unto life be called according unto God's purpose (his spirit working in due season), and through grace they obey the calling, they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity. But such as are not predestinated to salvation shall finally be condemned for their sins.

16. The godlike consideration of predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things: as well because it doth greatly confirm and establish their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God; and, on the contrary side, for curious and carnal persons lacking the spirit of Christ to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination is very dangerous.

Westminster Confession

sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice.

VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will. foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.

VIII. The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending the will of God revealed in his Word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God; and of humility, diligence and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the gospel.

Irish Articles

17. We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth unto 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.

IV Of the Creation and Government of all things.

18. In the beginning of time, when no creature had any being, God, by his word alone, in the space of six days, created all things, and afterwards, by his providence, doth continue, propagate, and order them according to his will.

21. Man being at the beginning created according to the image of God (which consisted especially in the wisdom of his mind and the true holiness of his free will), had the covenant of the law ingrafted in his heart, whereby God did promise unto him everlasting life upon condition that he

Westminster Confession

IV Of Creation.

V Of Providence.

IV, I. It pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create of nothing the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.

V, I. God, the great Creator of all things, doth uphold, direct, dispose, and govern all creatures, actions, and things, from the greatest even to the least, by his most wise and holy providence, according to his infallible foreknowledge and the free and immutable counsel of his own will...

IV, II. After God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after his own image, having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it; and yet under a

Irish Articles

performed entire and perfect obedience unto his Commandments, according to that measure of strength wherewith he was endued in his creation, and threatened death unto him if he did not perform the same.

V Of the Fall of Man, Original Sin, and the State of Man before Justification.

(including the English Article of Free Will)

23. Original sin standeth not in the imitation of Adam (as the Pelagians dream), but is the fault and corruption of the nature of every person that naturally is engendered and propagated from Adam: whereby it cometh to pass that man is deprived of original righteousness, and by nature is bent unto sin...

Westminster Confession

possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject unto change. Beside this law written in their hearts, they received a command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil...

VII (Of God's Covenant with Man), II. The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.

VI Of the Fall of Man, Of Sin, and of the Punishment thereof.

IX Of Free-will.

VI, II. By this sin (our first Parents) fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.

VI, III. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation.

VI, IV. ... this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil...

Irish Articles

24. This corruption of nature doth remain even in those that are regenerated, whereby the flesh always lusteth against the spirit, and cannot be made subject to the law of God. And howsoever, for Christ's sake, there be no condemnation to such as are regenerate and do believe, yet doth the Apostle acknowledge that in itself this concupiscence hath the nature of sin.

23. ... And therefore, in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.

25. The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he can not turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God. Wherefore, we have no power to do good works, pleasing and acceptable unto God, without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

26. Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit are not pleasing unto God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither

Westminster Confession

VI, V. This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin.

VI, VI. ... the sinner... is bound over to the wrath of God and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all the miseries spiritual, temporal, and eternal.

IX, III. Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.

IX, IV. When God converts a sinner, and translates him into the state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good...

XVI (Of Good Works), VII.

Works done by unregenerate men... because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith, nor are done in a right manner, according to the Word,

Irish Articles

do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School Authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather, for that they are not done in such sort as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they are sinful.

28. God is not the author of sin: howbeit, he doth not only permit, but also by his providence govern and order the same, guiding it in such sort by his infinite wisdom as it turneth to the manifestation of his own glory and to the good of his elect.

VI Of Christ, the Mediator of the Second Covenant.

29. The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the true and eternal God - of one substance with the Father - took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her

Westminster Confession

nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore sinful, and can not please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God...

V (Of Providence), IV. The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God so far manifest themselves in his providence that it extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing of them, in a manifold dispensation, to his own holy ends; yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature, and not from God; who, being most holy and righteous, neither is nor can be the author of sin.

VII Of God's Covenant with Man.

VIII Of Christ the Mediator.

VIII, II. The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature,

Irish Articles

substance, so that two whole and perfect natures - that is to say, the Godhead and manhood - were inseparably joined in one person, making one Christ very God and very man.

30. Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things - sin only excepted - from which he was clearly void, both in his life and in his nature. He came as a lamb without spot to take away the sins of the world, by the sacrifice of himself once made, and sin (as St. John saith) was not in him. He fulfilled the law for us perfectly: For our sakes he endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body. He was crucified, and died to reconcile his Father unto us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all our actual transgressions. He was buried, and descended into hell, and the third day rose from the dead, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature: wherewith he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father, until he return to judge all men at the last day.

Westminster Confession

with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin: being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance. So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man.

VIII, III. The Lord Jesus, in his human nature thus united to the divine, was sanctified ... to execute the office of a mediator and surety...

VIII, IV. This office the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake, which, that he might discharge, he was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfill it; endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body; was crucified, and died; was buried, and remained under the power of death, yet saw no corruption. On the third day he arose from the dead, with the same body in which he suffered; with which also he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father, making intercession; and shall return to judge men and angels at the end of the world.

VIII, V. The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which

Irish ArticlesWestminster Confession

he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.

VII Of the Communicating of the Grace of Christ.

31. They are to be condemned that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professteth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved.

32. ... Neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto every man whereby he is enabled to come unto everlasting life.

33. All God's elect are in their time inseparably united unto Christ by the effectual and vital influence of the Holy Ghost, derived from him as from the head unto every true member of his mystical body. And being thus made one with Christ, they are truly regenerated, and made partakers of him and all his benefits.

X Of Effectual Calling.

IV. ... much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is very pernicious, and to be detested.

IV. Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore can not be saved...

I. All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his Word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds, spiritually and

Irish ArticlesWestminster ConfessionVIII Of Justification and
Faith.

34. We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, applied by faith, and not for our own works or merits. And this righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.

36. ... neither do we mean that this, our act, to believe in Christ, or this, our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth of itself justify us... we must trust only in... the merits of... Jesus Christ...

35. ... whereas all the world was not able of themselves to pay any part towards their ransom, it pleased our heavenly Father of his infinite mercy ... to provide for us the most precious merits of his own Son, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied. So that Christ is now the

savingly, to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ...

XI Of Justification.XIV Of Saving Faith.

XI, I. Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith...

XI, III. Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf. Yet inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their

Irish Articles

righteousness of all them that truly believe in him. He, for them, paid their ransom by his death. He, for them, fulfilled the law in his life ... the grace of God not shutting out the justice of God in the matter of our justification, but only shutting out the justice of man (that is to say, the justice of our own works) from being any cause of deserving our justification.

36. When we say that we are justified by faith only, we do not mean that the said justifying faith is alone in man without true repentance, hope, charity, and the fear of God (for such a faith is dead, and can not justify)...

37. By justifying faith we understand not only the common belief of the articles of Christian Religion, and the persuasion of the truth of God's Word in general, but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the gospel to the comfort of our own souls, whereby we lay hold on Christ, with all his benefits; having an earnest trust and confidence in God, that he will be merciful unto us for his only Son's sake. So that a true believer may be certain, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiveness of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ.

Westminster Confession

stead, and both freely, not for any thing in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners.

XI, II. Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification; yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love.

XIV, II. By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein ... the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification.

XVIII (Of the Assurance of Grace and Salvation.), I. ... such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus... may in this life be certainly assured that they are in a state of grace...

XVIII, II. This certainty is ... an infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made...

Irish Articles

38. A true, lively, justifying faith and the sanctifying spirit of God is not extinguished nor vanished away in the regenerate, either finally or totally.

IX Of Sanctification and Good Works.

39. All that are justified are likewise sanctified, their faith being always accompanied with true repentance and good works.

40. Repentance is a gift of God, whereby a godly sorrow is wrought in the heart of the faithful for offending God, their merciful Father, by their former transgressions, together with a constant resolution for the time to come to cleave unto God and to lead a new life.

41. Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, can not make satisfaction for our sins and endure the surety of God's judgement; yet are they pleasing to God, and accepted of him in Christ, and

Westminster Confession

XVII (Of the Perseverance of the Saints), I. They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace...

XIII Of Sanctification.

XVI Of Good Works.

XIII, I. They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified...

XV (Of Repentance unto Life), I. Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace...

XV, II. By it a sinner, out of the sight and sense... of the filthiness and odiousness of his sins, as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for and hates his sins as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments.

XVI, II. These good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith...

XVI, VI. Yet notwithstanding, the persons of believers being

Irish Articles

do spring from a true and lively faith, which by them is to be discerned, as a tree by the fruit.

42. The works which God would have his people to walk in are such as he hath commanded in his holy Scripture, and not such works as men have devised out of their own brain, of a blind zeal and devotion, without the warrant of the Word of God.¹⁸

45. Voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, can not be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required.

XV Of the State of the Old and New Testament (including doctrine as to Moral and Ceremonial Law).

81. In the Old Testament the Commandments of the Law were more largely, and the promises of Christ more sparingly and darkly propounded, shadowed with a multitude of types and figures, and so much the more generally and obscurely de-

Westminster Confession

accepted through Christ, their good works also are accepted in him...

XVI, I. Good works are only such as God hath commanded in his holy Word, and not such as, without the warrant thereof, are devised by men out of blind zeal, or upon any pretense of good intention.

XVI, IV. They who in their obedience attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate and to do more than God requires, as that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.

XIX Of the Law of God.

III. Besides this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a Church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, his graces, actions,

18 This paragraph of the Irish Articles was adopted verbatim by the Westminster Divines in the 703rd session (10 September 1646), Minutes, 278; but it was afterwards changed to the form which is shown above (XVI, I), Intro., Minutes, xlviiii, note 1.

Irish Articles

livered as the manifesting of them was further off.

84. Although the Law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites be abolished, and the civil precepts thereof be not of necessity to be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is freed from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

X Of the Service of God (including teaching as to Oaths and the Lord's Day).

46. Our duty towards God is to believe in him, to fear him, and to love him with all our heart, with all our mind, and with all our soul, and with all our strength; to worship him, and to give him thanks; to put our whole trust in him, to call upon him, to honor his holy name and his Word, and to serve him truly all the days of our life.

47. In all our necessities we ought to have recourse unto God by prayer: assuring ourselves that whatsoever we ask of the Father, in the name of his Son (our only Mediator and Intercessor) Christ Jesus, and according to his will, he will undoubtedly grant it.

Westminster Confession

sufferings, and benefits; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.

IV. To them also, as a body politic, he gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of that people, not obliging any other, now, further than the general equity thereof may require.

V. The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof...

XXI Of Religious Worship,
and the Sabbath Day.

I. ... God... is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the might...

III. Prayer with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship, is by God required of all men; and that it may be accepted, it is to be made in the name of the Son, by the help of his Spirit, according to his will, with understanding, reverence,

Irish Articles

48. We ought to prepare our hearts before we pray, and understand the things that we ask when we pray...

52. All worship devised by man's phantasy besides or contrary to the Scriptures... hath not only no promise of reward in Scripture, but contrariwise threatenings and maledictions.

53. All manner of expressing God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in an outward form is utterly unlawful; as also all other images devised or made by man to the use of religion.

54. All religious worship ought to be given to God alone: from whom all goodness, health, and grace ought to be both asked and looked for... and from none other.

56. The first day of the week, which is the LORD'S DAY, is wholly to be dedicated unto the service of God; and therefore we are bound therein to rest from our common and daily business, and to bestow that leisure upon holy exercises, both public and private.

Westminster Confession

humility, fervency, faith, love, and perseverance; and if vocal, in a known tongue.

IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful...

I. ... the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited to his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.

II. Religious worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to him alone... nor in the mediation of any other but of Christ alone.

VII. ... the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's day... is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath.

VIII. This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men... do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts, about their worldly employments and recreations; but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.

Irish Articles

55. The name of God is to be used with all reverence and holy respect, and there, fore all vain and rash swearing is utterly to be condemned. Yet, notwithstanding, upon lawful occasions, an oath may be given and taken, according to the Word of God: Justice, Judgment, and Truth.

XI Of the Civil Magistrate.

58. We do profess that the supreme government of all estates within the said realms and dominions, in all cases, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, doth of right appertain to the King's highness. Neither do we give unto him hereby the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the Keys, but that prerogative only which we see to have been always given unto all godly princes in holy Scripture by God himself; that is, that he should contain all estates and degree committed to his charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, within their duty, and restrain the stubborn and evil-doers with the power of the civil sword.

Westminster ConfessionXXII Of Lawful Oaths and Vows.

II. The name of God only is that by which men ought to swear, and therein it is to be used with all holy fear and reverence; therefore to swear vainly or rashly by that glorious and dreadful name, or to swear at all by any other thing is sinful, and to be abhorred. Yet as, in matters of weight and moment, an oath is warranted by the Word of God, under the New Testament, as well as under the Old, so a lawful oath, being imposed by lawful authority, in such matters ought to be taken.

XXIII Of the Civil Magistrate.

III. The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven: yet he hath authority, and it is his duty to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed...

I. God... hath armed them with the power of the sword ... for the punishment of evil-doers.

Irish Articles

59. The Pope, neither of himself... hath any power or authority to depose the King, or dispose any of his kingdoms or dominions... or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his Majesty...

60. That princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever, is impious doctrine.

62. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to bear arms and to serve in just wars.

XII Of our Duty towards our Neighbours.

66. Faith given, is to be kept, even with heretics and infidels.

67. The Popish doctrine of Equivocation and Mental Reservation is ungodly, and tendeth plainly to the subversion of all human society.

65. The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same...

Westminster Confession

IV. ... much less hath the Pope any power or jurisdiction over (magistrates) in their dominions, or over any of their people; and least of all to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he shall judge them to be heretics, or upon any other pretense whatsoever.

II. ... Christians... may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasion.

XXII (Of Lawful Oaths and Vows)
IV. An oath is to be taken in the plain and common sense of the words, without equivocation or mental reservation. ... nor is it to be violated, although made to heretics or infidels.

XXVI (Of the Communion of Saints), III. Nor doth their communion... as saints, take away or infringe the title or propriety which each man hath in his goods and possessions.

Irish Articles

XIII Of the Church and Outward Ministry of the Gospel (including teaching as to Excommunication, absolution, etc.).

68. There is but one Catholic Church (out of which there is no salvation), containing the universal company of all the saints that ever were, are, or shall be, gathered together in one body, under one head, Christ Jesus... And because this Church consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God unto salvation, and regenerated by the power of his Spirit, the number of whom is known only unto God himself: therefore it is called the CATHOLIC or universal, and the INVISIBLE Church.

69. But particular and visible Churches (consisting of those that make profession of the faith of Christ, and live under the outward means of salvation) be many in number: wherein the more or less sincerely, according to Christ's institution, the Word of God is taught, the Sacraments are administered, and the authority of the Keys is used, the more or less pure are such Churches to be accounted.

74. God hath given power to his ministers, not simply to forgive sins (which preroga-

Westminster Confession

XXV Of the Church.

XXVI Of the Communion of Saints

XXX Of Church Censures.

XXV, I. The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof...

XXV, II. The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law) consists of all those, throughout the world, that profess the true religion, and of their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

XXV, IV. This catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible. And particular Churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

XXX, II. To these (Church) officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by

Irish Articles

tive he hath reserved only to himself), but in his name to declare and pronounce unto such as truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel the absolution and forgiveness of sins...

XIV Of the Authority of the Church, General Councils, And Bishop of Rome.

76. General councils... may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to the rule of piety. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be shown that they be taken out of holy Scriptures.

80. The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, that his works and doctrine do plainly discover him to be THAT MAN OF SIN, foretold in the holy Scriptures...

XVI Of the Sacraments of the New Testament.

85. The Sacraments ordained by Christ be not only badges

Westminster Confession

virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the Word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.

XXXI Of Synods and Councils.

IV. All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both.

XXV (Of the Church), VI.

There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense be head thereof; but is that Anti-christ, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God.

XXVII Of the Sacraments.

I. Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of

Irish Articles

or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witnesses and effectual or powerful signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by which he doth work invisibly in us, and not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

XIII (Of the Church and Outward Ministry of the Gospel), 70. ... Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which are effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men...

86. There be two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel: that is to say, BAPTISM and the LORD'S SUPPER.

XIII (Of the Church, etc.), 71. It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the Church, unless he be first lawfully called and sent to execute the same...

XVII Of Baptism.

89. Baptism is not only an outward sign of our profession, and a note of difference, whereby Christians are dis-

Westminster Confession

grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him...

II. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified...

III. The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.

IV. There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any but a minister of the Word lawfully ordained.

XXVIII Of Baptism.

I. Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the

Irish Articles

cerned from such as are no Christians; but much more a Sacrament of our admission into the Church, sealing unto us our new birth (and consequently our justification, adoption, and sanctification) by the communion which we have with Jesus Christ.

90. The Baptism of Infants is to be retained in the Church, as agreeable to the Word of God.

XVIII Of the Lord's Supper.

92. The Lord's Supper is not only a sign of the mutual love which Christians ought to bear one towards another, but much more a Sacrament of our preservation in the Church, sealing unto us our spiritual nourishment and continual growth in Christ.

93. The change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, commonly called TRANSUBSTANTIATION, can not be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to plain testimonies of the Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to most gross idolatry and manifold superstitions.

Westminster Confession

party baptised into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life...

IV. Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptised.

XXIX Of the Lord's Supper.

I. Our Lord Jesus... instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord's Supper... for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him... and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body.

VI. That doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common-sense and reason; overthroweth the nature of the sacrament; and hath

Irish Articles

94. In the outward part of the holy Communion, the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner REPRESENTED; being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals - that is to say, symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spiritual part the same body and blood is really and substantially PRESENTED unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in his name. And unto such as in this manner do worthily and with faith repair unto the Lord's table, the body and blood of Christ is not only signified and offered, but also truly exhibited and communicated.

95. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Lord's Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is thus received and eaten is Faith.

96. The wicked, and such as want a lively faith... press with their teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in nowise are they made partakers of Christ; but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

Westminster Confession

been, and is the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries.

V. The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly, and only, bread and wine, as they were before.

VII. Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses.

VIII. Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own damnation...

Irish Articles

97. Both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, according to Christ's institution and the practice of the ancient Church, ought to be ministered unto God's people...

98. The Sacrament of the LORD'S SUPPER was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

100. Private mass - that is, the receiving of the EUCHARIST by the priest alone, without a competent number of communicants - is contrary to the institution of Christ.

99. The sacrifice of the Mass, wherein the priest is said to offer up Christ for obtaining the remission of pain or guilt for the quick and the dead, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolic; but contrariwise most ungodly and most injurious to that all-sufficient sacrifice of our Saviour Christ, offered once forever upon the cross, which is the only propitiation and satisfaction for all our sins.

XIX Of the State of the Souls of Men after they be departed out of this Life, Together with the General

Westminster Confession

IV. Private masses, or receiving this sacrament by a priest, or any other, alone; as likewise the denial of the cup to the people; worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.

II. In this sacrament Christ is not offered up to his Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sins of the quick or dead, but only a commemoration of that one offering up of himself, by himself, upon the cross, once for all, and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same; so that the Popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the elect.

XXXII Of the State of Men after Death, and of the Resurrection of the Dead.
XXXIII Of the Last Judgment.

Irish ArticlesResurrection and the Last Judgment.

101. After this life is ended the souls of God's children be presently received into heaven, there to enjoy unspeakable comforts; the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, there to endure endless torments.

102. The doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning Limbus Patrum, Limbus Puerorum, Purgatory... is vainly invented without all warrant of holy Scripture, yea, and is contrary unto the same.

103. At the end of this world the Lord Jesus shall come in the clouds with the glory of his Father; at which time, by the almighty power of God, the living shall be changed and the dead shall be raised; and all shall appear both in body and soul before his judgment seat, to receive according to that which they have done in their bodies, whether good or evil.

Westminster Confession

XXXII, I. ... The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies: and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day...

XXXII, I. ... Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledges none.

XXXII, II. At the last day, such as are found alive shall not die, but be changed; and all the dead shall be raised up with the self-same bodies, and none other, although with different qualities, which shall be united again to their souls forever.

XXXIII, I. God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ... In which day ... all persons, that have lived upon earth, shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Armstrong, William Park
Calvin and the Reformation. Edited
by W. P. A. London, 1909.
- Bagwell, Richard
Ireland under the Stuarts. London,
1909. Vol. I.
- Bagwell, Richard
Ireland under the Tudors. 3 Vols.
London, 1885-90.
- Barth, Karl
The Doctrine of the Word of God.
Translated by G. T. Thomson.
Edinburgh, 1936.
- Bernard, Nicholas
The life and death of Dr. James
Ussher. London, 1656.
- Bernard, Nicholas
The Judgment of the Late Archbishop
of Armagh I. of the Extent of Christ's
death and satisfaction, etc. II. of
the Sabbath, and observations of the
Lord's Day. III. of the Ordination in
other reformed Churches. London, 1657.
- Bramhall, John
Works, with life of Author. 5 Vols.
(Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology).
Oxford, 1842-5.
- Bramhall, John
Works, with life by Bishop Vesey.
Dublin, 1677.
- Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum
An Exposition of the Thirty-nine
Articles of the Church of England.
Oxford, 1831.
- Burnet, Gilbert
The History of the Reformation of
The Church of England. 2 Vols.
London, 1841.
- Calvin, John
Commentary on the Epistles to Corinth-
ians. Translated by John Pringle.
Edinburgh, 1849. Vol. II.

- Calvin, John Institutes of the Christian Religion.
Translated by John Allen. 2 Vols.
Philadelphia, 1936.
- Calvin, John Tracts. Translated by Henry Beveridge.
Edinburgh, 1849. Vol. II.
- Cardwell, Edward A history of conferences and other
proceedings connected with the revision
of the Book of Common Prayer; from the
year 1558 to the year 1690. Oxford,
1841.
- Carew MSS., Calendar of
 Edited by Brewer and Bullen. London,
1873.
- Carr, J. A. The Life and Times of James Ussher,
Archbishop of Armagh. London, 1895.
- Carte, Thomas An history of the life of James, Duke
of Ormonde, from his birth in 1610, to
his death in 1688. 2 Vols. London, 1736.
- Collier, Jeremy An Ecclesiastical History of Great
Britain. London, 1852. Vols. VII, VIII.
- Cox, Richard History of Ireland. London, 1692.
- Cox, Robert The Whole Doctrine of Calvin on the
Sabbath. (pamphlet). Edinburgh, 1860.
- Cranmer, Thomas Miscellaneous Writings and Letters.
Edited by Parker Society. Cambridge,
1846.
- Denney, James The Death of Christ. London, 1902.
- Dictionary of National Biography
 Vol. IV. Edited by Stephen, Leslie.
London, 1885.
- Vol. VI. Edited by Stephen, Leslie.
London, 1886.
- Vol. LX. Edited by Lee, Sidney.
London, 1899.
- Elrington, Charles Richard
 Life of Archbishop Ussher. (Vol. I
of complete Works). Dublin, 1847.

- Fisher, George Park The Reformation. Revised edition.
London, 1906.
- Fuller, Thomas Church History of Britain from the
birth of Jesus Christ until the year
1648. (third edition). London, 1842.
Vol. III.
- Hall, Peter The harmony of Protestant Confessions.
London, 1842.
- Hardwick, Charles A History of the Articles of Religion,
to which is added a series of docu-
ments from 1536 to 1615. Cambridge,
1851.
- Hastie, William The Theology of the Reformed Church
in its fundamental principles. Edin-
burgh, 1904.
- Hetherington, W. M. History of the Westminster Assembly of
Divines. Edinburgh, 1878.
- Heylin, Peter Cyprianus Anglicus, or the History of
the life and death of William Laud.
London, 1668.
- Heylin, Peter The History of the Sabbath. London,
1636.
- Heylin, Peter Respondet Petrus; an answer of Peter
Heylin to Dr. Bernard's book entitled
"The Judgment of the late Primate of
Ireland". London, 1658.
- Homilies, First and Second Books of
of the Church of England. Oxford, 1822.
- Hooker, Richard Ecclesiastical Polity. London, 1676.
- Ireland, Calendar of State Papers relating to
Charles I and Commonwealth, 1633-47.
Edited by Mahaffey. London, 1901.
Vol. III.
- Ireland, MS. Book of Common Prayer for
Edited by Archibald John Stephens.
London, 1850. Vol. III.

- Jewel, John, Bishop of Sarum
The Apology of the Church of England.
London, 1685.
- Killen, W. D.
Ecclesiastical History of Ireland from
the Earliest Period to the Present Time.
2 Vols. London, 1875.
- Latimer, George
Remains of Bishop Latimer. Edited by
Parker Society. Cambridge, 1845.
- Laud, William
Works. (Library of Anglo-Catholic
Theology). Oxford, 1847-60. Vols. VI,
VII.
- Leland, Thomas
The history of Ireland from the in-
vasion of Henry II. 3 Vols. London,
1773. Vol. II.
- L'Estrange, Hamon
History of the Reign of Charles I.
London, 1655.
- Lindsay, Thomas M.
A History of the Reformation. Second
edition. 2 Vols. Edinburgh, 1908.
Vol. II.
- Mant, Richard
History of the Church of Ireland.
2 Vols. London, 1841.
- Maskell, William
A Second Letter on the present position
of the High Church Party in the Church
of England. (pamphlet). London, 1850.
- McCrie, Thomas
Life of Andrew Melville. 2 Vols.
Edinburgh, 1819.
- Mitchell, Alexander F.
The Westminster Confession of Faith.
(pamphlet). Edinburgh, 1867.
- Mitchell, Alexander F.
The Westminster Assembly. London, 1883.
- Mitchell, Alexander F., and Struthers, John
Minutes of the Westminster Assembly
(1644-49). Edinburgh, 1874.
- Moran, Patrick Francis
History of the Catholic Archbishops of
Dublin since the Reformation. Dublin,
1864.

- Moran, Patrick Francis
Specilegium Ossoriense; being a collection of original letters and papers illustrative of the History of the Irish Church from the Reformation to the year 1800. Dublin, 1874.
- Neal, Daniel
The History of the Puritans. (New edition in 3 Vols.) London, 1837, Vol. III.
- Parr, Richard
Life of James Ussher. London, 1686.
- Paterson, William P.
The Rule of Faith. London, 1932.
- Philips, Walter Alison
History of the Church of Ireland from the Earliest Time to the Present Day. Edited by W. A. P. 3 Vols. London, 1933.
- Quick, Oliver Chase
The Gospel of the New World. London, 1944.
- Rawdon Papers
consisting of letters on various subjects to and from Dr. John Bramhall. Edited by E. Berwick. London, 1819.
- Reid, James S.
The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. 3 Vols. Edinburgh, 1834. Vol. I.
- Salmon, George
The Infallibility of the Church. London, 1888.
- Sarpi, Father Paul
Histoire du Concile de Trente. Translated into French and edited by Pierre-Francois le Courayer. 3 Vol. London, 1751. Vol. I.
- Saunderson, Robert
Works. Oxford, 1854. Vol. V.
- Schaff, Philip
The Creeds of Christendom. 3 Vols.
Vol. I The History of the Creeds. London, 1878.

- Waterland, Daniel Works. Oxford, 1843. Vol. II.
- Wentworth, Thomas (Earl of Strafford)
Letters and Dispatches, 1611-39.
2 Vols. Published by William
Knowler. London, 1739.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss
The Historic Faith. London and Cam-
bridge, 1883.
- Wilkins, David
Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae.
4 Vols. London, 1737. Vol. IV.
- Zurich Letters
Edited by Parker Society. First Series,
Cambridge, 1842; Second Series, Cam-
bridge, 1845.

Periodicals:

Irish Ecclesiastical Journal. No. 118,
May, 1850; No. 119, June, 1850.

Presbyterian Review. January, 1880.

Scottish Journal of Theology. June,
1948.

Manuscripts: (Library of Trinity College, Dublin).

MS. copy of Strafford's printed letter
to Laud (16 Dec. 1634) (taken from orig-
inal at Wentworth, Woodhouse, Work-
shire, England).

MS. copy of document entitled: "Dean
Andrews; his deliberations about the
Canons of England and Ireland, exam-
ined."

MS. copy of Strafford's letter to Pro-
locutor of Lower House of Convocation,
10 December 1634.