

INTRODUCTION TO CHARNOCK'S WORKS.

I. HIS LIFE.

THE memorials of the life of Charnock are much scantier than those who have profited by his writings, or who are interested in the history of the time, could wish. We have some notices of him in the sermon preached at his funeral by his 'bosom friend' Mr Johnson; a vague general account of him in an epistle 'To the Reader,' prefixed by Mr Adams and Mr Veal, the editors, to his 'Discourse of Divine Providence,' published shortly after his death; a brief life of him by Calamy in his 'Account of the Ejected and Silenced;' his collegiate positions detailed by Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienses* and *Fasti*; and this is all the original matter that we have been able to discover regarding the author of the great work 'On the Attributes.' Mr Johnson says, 'he heard a narrative of his life would be drawn up by an able hand;' and Calamy mentions that *Memoirs of Mr Steph. Charnock* were written by Mr John Gunter, his 'chamber-fellow' at Oxford; but of these we have not been able to find any trace. We have made researches in London, in Cambridge, and in Dublin, without being rewarded by the discovery of many new facts, not given by the original authorities. All that we have aimed at in the following Memoir is to combine the scattered accounts of him, to allot the incidents the proper place in his life and in the general history of the times, and thus to furnish, if not a full, yet a faithful, picture of the man and his work.*

Stephen Charnock was born in the parish of Saint Catherine Cree (or Creechurch), London, in the year 1628. He was the son of Mr Richard Charnock, a solicitor, who was descended from an ancient Lancashire family, the Charnocks of Charnock. We have no account of his childish or boyish years, or of his training in the family. But we know what was the spirit that reigned around him among the great body of the middle classes

* The writer is under deep obligations to the Rev. Alexander B. Grosart, Kinross; the Rev. Dr Halley, New College, London; Joshua Wilson, Esq., Tunbridge Wells; and Charles Henry Cooper, Esq., author of the *Annals of Cambridge*, for directing him in his researches.

in the best parts of the metropolis. An awe sat upon their minds in consequence of the great national collisions which were impending or had commenced; public sports were discouraged, as agreeing not with 'public calamities,' and the Lord's day was observed with great strictness. The churches were crowded with earnest hearers, and 'religious exercises were set up in private families, as reading the Scriptures, family prayer, repeating sermons, and singing psalms, which were so universal in the city of London, that you might walk the streets on the evening of the Lord's day without seeing an idle person, or hearing anything but the voice of prayer or praise from churches or private houses.'*

In those times students entered college at a much earlier age than they now do, and had their university career over in sufficient time to enable them to enter when yet young on their several professional employments. Stephen was matriculated as a sizar at Cambridge July 8. 1642. Whether by the design of his father, or by the leadings of providential circumstances, we have no means of knowing, but young Charnock was sent to Emmanuel, the 'Puritan College,' so called, it is said, from a conversation between Queen Elizabeth and its founder, Sir Walter Mildmay. 'Sir Walter,' said the Queen, 'I hear you have erected a puritan foundation at Cambridge.' 'Madam,' said Sir Walter, 'far be it from me to countenance anything contrary to your Majesty's established laws; but I have set an acorn which, when it becomes an oak, God alone knows what will be the fruit thereof.' In 1641, it had 204 students attending, standing next to St John's and Trinity in respect of numbers;† and occupying a still higher place in respect of the eminence of its pupils. 'Sure I am,' says Fuller, 'it has overwhelmed all the university, more than a moiety of the present masters of colleges having been bred therein.'

Charnock entering in 1642, is proceeding B.A. in 1645-6, and commencing M.A. in 1649. We have no difficulty in apprehending the spirit which reigned in Cambridge when he began his college life. The Reformation struggle was over, and earnest men saw that the Reformed Church, with its worldly, often immoral and ill-educated, clergy, and its ignorant people, was yet very far from coming up to the pattern which Christ was supposed to have shewn to his apostles. Two manner of spirits had sprung up and were contending with each other. Each had an ideal, and was labouring to bring the church into accordance with it. The one looked to the written word, and was seeking to draw forth, systematize, and exhibit its truths; the other looked more to the church, and was striving to display its visible unity before the world, that men's looks and hearts might be attracted towards it. The one was internal, personal, puritan, anxious to keep up the connection between the church and its Head, and between the members of the church in and

* Neal's *History of the Puritans*, 1642.

† Cooper's *Annals of Cambridge*, 1641.

through Christ; the other was external, ecclesiastical, priestly, seeking to retain the connection of the Church of England with the church of the past and the church universal, and to organize it into a powerful body, which might put down all error and all schism, and mould the whole institutions and sentiments of the country.

Every public event of interest, and every collegiate influence, must have tended to press religious questions upon the attention of the student at the time when his character was being formed. The 'Thirty Years' War, which had begun in 1618, was dragging its weary length along, and was essentially a religious conflict which the continental nations were seeking to settle by arms and by policy. The colonies of Plymouth and Massachussets, Connecticut and Newhaven, had been founded in the far west, and Herbert had sung, in a sense of his own,

"Religion stands a tiptoe in our land,
Ready to pass to the American strand."

In 1641, the three kingdoms had been moved by the reports of the popish massacres in Ireland, in which it was said two hundred thousand protestants were put to death. In 1642, Charles had made his attempt to seize the 'five members,' and soon after the civil war began, and the king had rather the worst of it at the battle of Edge Hill. By the autumn it was ordained that the prelatic form of government should be abolished from and after November 5. 1643; and it was farther resolved that an assembly of divines should be called to settle the intended reformation, which assembly actually met at Westminster in July 1643, and continued its sittings for five years and a half.

In Cambridge, the feeling has risen to a white heat, and is ready to burst into a consuming flame. For years past there had been a contest between those who were for modelling the colleges after the ecclesiastical, and those who wished to fashion them after the puritan type. In a paper drawn up in the university in 1636, and endorsed by Laud as 'Certain disorders in Cambridge to be considered in my visitation,' there is a complaint that the order as to vestments is not attended to; that the undergraduates wear new-fashioned gowns of any colour whatsoever, and that their other garments are light and gay; that upon Fridays and all fasting days, the victualling houses prepare flesh for all scholars and others that will come and send to them, and that many prefer their own invented and unapproved prayers before all the liturgy of the church. When the report comes to Emmanuel, it says, 'Their Chappel is not consecrate. At surplice prayers they sing nothing but certain riming psalms of their own appointment, instead of Hymnes between the Lessons. And Lessons they read not after the order appointed in the Calendar, but after another continued course of their own,' &c. But by 1643 the complaint takes an entirely different turn; and an ordinance of both houses of parliament is made, directing

that in all churches and chapels, all altars and tables of stone shall be taken away and demolished; that all communion tables shall be removed from the east end of the churches; that all crucifixes, crosses, images, and pictures of any one or more persons of the Trinity, or of the Virgin Mary, and all other images and pictures of saints or superstitious inscriptions in churches or chapels shall be taken away or defaced.' One William Downing puts this order in execution, and at Queen's he beats down one hundred superstitious pictures; but when he comes to Emmanuel, 'there is nothing to be done.' These scenes must have fallen under the notice of the boy Charnock during the first year of his collegiate life. More startling sounds still must have reached the ears of the young student. Oliver Cromwell, who had been elected one of the burgesses of the town in 1640, has a close and intimate connection with the inhabitants; and in 1642 he is sending down arms to the county; the Parliament has committed the care of the town to him, the mayor, and three aldermen, who raise and exercise trained bands and volunteers; and he seizes a portion of the plate which the colleges are sending to the king. By the beginning of the following year, Cromwell has taken the magazine in the castle, the town is fortified, and a large body of armed men are in the place; the colleges are being beset and broken open, and guards thrust into them, sometimes at midnight, whilst the scholars are asleep in their beds, and multitudes of soldiers are quartered in them. By this time Holdsworth, the Master of Emmanuel, is in custody, and Dr Beale, Master of St John's, Dr Martin, President of Queen's College, and Dr Sterne, Master of Jesus, are sent up to parliament as prisoners.* In 1644, the royalists are ejected, and their places supplied by friends of the parliament.

At the time young Charnock entered, the sentiment of the members of the university was very much divided. Even in Emmanuel the opinion was not altogether puritan. The tutor from whom Charnock received his chief instruction was Mr W. Sancroft (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), who was attached to the royalist cause, and had joined in the congratulatory addresses to the king on his return from Scotland in 1641. Dr Holdsworth, who was Master of Emmanuel when Charnock entered, was appointed by the Lords, and approved by the Commons, as one of the divines to sit at Westminster; but he never attended, and in 1643 he was imprisoned, and in the following year ejected. The spirit of Emmanuel had been all along reforming and parliamentary, and after the ejections all the colleges became so. Dr Anthony Tuckney, who succeeded Holdsworth in the Mastership of Emmanuel, was an active member of the Westminster Assembly, and 'had a considerable hand,' says Calamy, 'in the preparation of the Confession and Catechisms.' Dr Arrowsmith, made Master of St

* These facts are gathered out of Cooper's *Annals of Cambridge*, vol. iii. 1642-4.

John's, and Dr Hill, appointed Master of Trinity, were of the same puritan spirit. Cudworth, Culverwel, and Whichcote, who had all been connected with Emmanuel, and held places in the university after the ejection, could scarcely be described as of the puritan type, but they were opposed to the policy which the king had been pursuing, and the ecclesiastical system which Laud intended to set up. In the university and the town, the popular preaching was decidedly evangelical and Calvinistic. In particular, Dr Samuel Hammond preached in St Giles 'with such pious zeal, liveliness, and Christian experience, that his ministry was attended by persons from all parts of the town and the most distant colleges; and it was crowned with the conversion of some scores (Mr Stancliff says some hundreds) of scholars. It was generally allowed that there was not a more successful minister in Cambridge since the time of Perkins.*'

This state of things, the conflicts of the time, the talk of the tutors and students, the earnest preaching in the churches, the spiritual struggles in many a bosom, and the necessity for understanding the questions at issue, and coming to a decision with its life consequences, all these must have tended to press religion on the personal attention of so earnest a youth as Charnock was. Without any living faith when he came to Cambridge, he was there led to search and pray; he was for a time in darkness, and beset with fears and temptations, but he got light and direction from above, and he devoted himself to God for life. He subsequently wrote out a paper explaining the way by which he was led, and declaring his dedication, but it perished in the great fire of London. Mr Johnson met him in 1644; and in the sermon which he delivered at his funeral, represents him 'as venerable and grave, like an aged person from his youth,' and gives the following account of his conversion and his Cambridge life:— 'The deed of gift, or rather copy of it, which shewed his title to heaven, I believe perished with his books in London's flames, and I have forgot the particular places of Scripture by which he was most wrought upon, and which were there inserted.' 'He would deeply search into and prove all things, and allow only what he found pure and excellent.' 'In this I had him in my heart at my first acquaintanceship with him in Cambridge thirty-six years since. I found him one that, Jonah-like, had turned to the Lord with all his heart, all his soul, and all his might, and none like him; which did more endear him to me. How had he hid the word of God in a fertile soil, "in a good and honest heart," which made him "flee youthful lusts," and antidoted him against the infection of youthful vanities. His study was his recreation; the law of God was his delight. Had he it not, think ye, engraven in his heart? He was as choice, circumspect, and prudent in his election of society, as of books, to converse with; all his delight being in such as excelled in the divine art of directing, furthering, and quickening him in the

* Calamy's 'Account of Ejected,' Art. Samuel Hammond.

way to heaven, the love of Christ and souls. Most choice he was of the ministers that he would hear; what he learned from books, converse, or sermons, that which affected and wrought most upon him he prayed over till he was delivered into the form of it, and had Christ, grace, and the Spirit formed in him. True, he had been in darkness, and then he said full of doubtings, fears, and grievously pestered with temptations. How oft have we found him (as if he had lately been with Paul caught up into the third heavens, and heard unspeakable words) magnifying and adoring the mercy, love, and goodness of God.'

We know from general sources what was the course of secular instruction imparted in the colleges at this time. Aristotle still ruled, though no longer with an undisputed sway, in the lessons of the tutors. There is an account left by a pupil, Sir Simonds D' Ewes, of the books prescribed by Dr Holdsworth in 1618-19, when he was a tutor in St John's, and probably there was not much difference in Emmanuel when he became master: 'We went over all Seton's Logic exactly, and part of Keckerman and Molinaeus. Of ethics or moral philosophy, he read to me Gelius and part of Pickolomineus; of physics, part of Magirus; and of history, part of Florus.' 'I spent the next month (April 1619) very laboriously in the perusal of Aristotle's physics, ethics, and politics; and I read logic out of several authors.'* But for an age or two there had been a strong reaction against Aristotle on the part of the more promising pupils. Bacon had left Trinity College in the previous century with a profound dissatisfaction with the scholastic studies, and already cogitating those grand views which he gave to the world in his *Novum Organum* (1620), as to the importance of looking to things instead of notions and words. Milton, in his College Exercises (1625 to 1632), had in his own grandiose style, and by help of mythological fable, given expression to his discontent with the narrow technical method followed, and to his breathings after some undefined improvement.† The predominant philosophic spirit in Cambridge prior to the Great Rebellion was Platonic rather than Aristotelian. This was exhibited by a number of learned and profound writers who rose about this time, and who continue to be known by the name of the 'Cambridge Moralists.' In Emmanuel College, before the ejection, there were Whichcote, author of *Moral and Religious Aphorisms*, and of *Letters to Tuckney* (1651); Nathanael Culverwel, author of the masterly work *Of the Light of Nature*‡ (1651); and Ralph Cudworth, who produced the great work on *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*,—all promoted to important offices in Cambridge under the Commonwealth. There were also in Cambridge Henry More, author of the *Enchiridion Metaphysicum*, and John

* Masson's *Life of Milton*, p. 229.

† *Familiar Letters* in Masson's *Milton*, p. 249.

‡ See the valuable edition by John Brown, D.D., with a critical essay by John Cairns, D.D.

Smith, author of the *Select Discourses*. All of those great men had caught, and were cherishing, a lofty Platonic spirit. While they implicitly received and devoutly revered the Bible as the inspired book of God, they entertained at the same time a high idea of the office of reason, and delighted in the contemplation of the eternal verities which they believed it to sanction, and sought to unite them with the living and practical truths of Christianity. Nor is it to be forgotten that John Howe, who entered Christ College in 1647, imbibed from Cudworth, More, and Smith his 'Platonic tincture,' which however was more thoroughly subordinated in him to the letter of Scripture. But in those times there was probably a still greater number of students whose college predilections would be those of Heywood: 'My time and thoughts were more employed in practical divinity, and experimental truths were more vital and vivifical to my soul. I preferred Perkins, Bolton, Preston, Sibbes, far above Aristotle, Plato, Magirus, and Wendeton, though I despise no laborious authors in these subservient studies.' *

Charnock was all his life a laborious student. We can infer what must have been his favourite reading, begun at college and continued to his death. While not ignorant of the physical science of his time, there is no reason to believe that he entered deeply into it. However, we are expressly told by Adams and Veal that he had arrived at a considerable knowledge of medicine, and that he was prevented from giving himself farther to it only by his dedication to a higher work. There are no traces of his having fallen under the bewitching spirit of Platonism, which so prevailed among the profounder students of Cambridge; but he characterises Plato as 'the divine philosopher,' he quotes More and Culverwel, and his own philosophy is of a wide and catholic character. It is quite clear from his systematic method, that he had received lessons from the Aristotelian logic, as modified by the schoolmen; but he never allowed it to bind and shackle him. He shews a considerable acquaintance with the ancient Greek philosophy, including the mystics of the Neoplatonist school. He is familiar with the writings of many of the fathers, and quotes from them in a way which shews that he understood them. He does not disdain to take instruction from Aquinas and the schoolmen when it serves his purpose. Among contemporary philosophic writers, he quotes from Gassendi and Voetius. His favourite uninspired writers were evidently the reformers, and those who defended and systematised their theology. Amyraut, and Suarez, and Daille were evidently favourites; and he was familiar with Turretine, Ames, Zanchius, Cocceius, Crellius, Cameron, Grotius, and many others; nay, he is not so bigoted as to overlook the high church Anglican divines of his own age. But we venture to say that, deeply read as he was in the works of uninspired men, he devoted more time to the study of the word

* Hunter's *Life of Oliver Heywood*, p. 46.

of God than to all other writings whatsoever. As to his linguistic accomplishments Mr Johnson, himself a scholar, says, 'I never knew any man who had attained near unto that skill which he had in both their originals [that is, of the Scriptures], except Mr Thomas Cawton;' and Mr Cawton, it seems, knew Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, French, Dutch, Italian, and Spanish.

Thus furnished by divine gift and acquired scholarship, he set out on the work to which he had devoted himself. 'Not long after he had received light himself,' says Johnson, 'when the Lord by his blessing on his endeavours had qualified him for it, such was his love, he gave forth light unto others, inviting them, and saying, "Come and see Jesus." In Southwark, where seven or eight, in that little time Providence continued him there, owed their conversion under God to his ministry; then in the university of Oxford and adjacent parts; after in Dublin, where it might be said of his as it was of the Lord's preaching in the land of Zebulon, "the people which sat in darkness saw a great light."'

On leaving college, he is represented by Adams and Veal as spending some time in a private family, but whether as a tutor or a chaplain does not appear. He seems to have commenced his ministry in Southwark, where he knew of seven or eight persons who owned him as the instrument of their conversion; and we may hope there were others profited, at a time when the mercantile and middle classes generally so crowded to the house of God, and the preaching of the word was so honoured. In 1649 or thereabouts, says Wood, he retired to Oxford, purposely to obtain a fellowship from the visitors appointed by the parliament when 'they ejected scholars by whole shoals;' and in 1650, he obtained a fellowship in New College. November 19. 1652, he is incorporated Master of Arts in Oxford, as he had stood in Cambridge. April 5. 1654 (not 1652, as Calamy says), he and Thomas Cracroft of Magdalene College are appointed Proctors of the university. Charnock, greatly respected for his gifts, his learning, and his piety, was frequently put upon 'public works.' In particular, he seems to have been often employed in preaching in Oxford and the adjacent parts. Here he had as his chamber-fellow, Mr John Gunter, who purposed to write, or did write, a life of him; and here he gained or renewed a friendship with Richard Adams, formerly, like himself, of Cambridge, and now of Brazennose, and Edward Veal of Christ's Church, and afterwards with him in Dublin, the two who joined, many years after, in publishing his posthumous works. Here he connected himself with 'a church gathered among the scholars by Dr Goodwin,' a society which had the honour to have enrolled among its members Thankful Owen, Francis Howel, Theophilus Gale, and John Howe,* who must no doubt have enjoyed much sweet fellowship together, and helped to edify one another. Oliver Cromwell,

* See Life of Goodwin, in folio edition of Works, Vol. V.; and Calamy's *Account of Ejected*, John Howe.

Lord Protector, was chancellor of the university, and Dr Owen, vice-chancellor; and an energetic attempt was made to produce and foster a high, though perhaps a somewhat narrow, scholarship, and to exercise a discipline of a moral and religious character, such as Christian fathers set up in their families. Notwithstanding all that has been said against it, it was by no means of an uncheerful character, and young men of virtue and piety delighted in it; but others, we fear, felt it irksome, because of the constant supervision, and the restraints meeting them on every hand, and the number of religious services imposed on them, and which could have been enjoyed only by converted persons. Lord Clarendon thinks that such a state of things might have been expected to extirpate all 'learning, religion, and loyalty,' and to be 'fruitful only in ignorance, profaneness, atheism, and rebellion;' but is obliged to admit that, 'by God's wonderful providence, that fruitful soil could not be made barren,' and that it yielded an harvest of extraordinary good knowledge in all parts of learning.' It could easily be shewn that the fruit was what might have been expected to spring from the labour bestowed and the seed sown. It is a matter of fact, as Neal remarks, that all the great philosophers and divines of the Church of England, who flourished in the reigns of Charles II. and William III., such as Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick, South, Cave, Sprat, Kidder, Whitby, Bull, Boyle, Newton, Locke, and others, were trained under teachers appointed by parliament and Cromwell.*

The scene of Charnock's labours and usefulness was now shifted. Cromwell had subdued Ireland to the Commonwealth, and he and others longed to have the protestants in that country supplied with a pure and fervent gospel ministry. Dr John Owen had been in Ireland a year and a half, overseeing the affairs of Dublin College and preaching the gospel. He dates a work from 'Dublin Castle, December 20. 1649,' and speaks of himself as 'burdened with manifold employments, with constant preaching to a numerous multitude of as thirsty people after the gospel as ever I conversed withal.' In the January following he returns to England, and has to preach before the Commons. Referring to Cromwell's victories, he says:—'How is it that Jesus Christ is, in Ireland, only as a lion staining all his garments with the blood of his enemies, and none to hold him forth as a lamb sprinkled with his own blood for his friends? Is it the sovereignty and interest of England that is alone to be thus transacted? For my part, I see no farther into the mystery of these things, but that I would heartily rejoice that innocent blood being expiated, the Irish might enjoy Ireland so long as the moon endureth, so that Jesus might possess the Irish.' 'I would there were, for the present, one gospel preacher for every walled town in the English possession in Ireland.' 'They are sensible of their wants, and cry out for supply. The tears and cries of the inha-

* *The History of the Puritans, 1647.*

bitants of Dublin are ever in my view.' In the course of the year, grants of land are made for the better support of Dublin University, and the Commissioners brought with them several Christian ministers. Among them was Samuel Winter, who afterwards became Provost of Trinity College, and who preached every Lord's day in Christ Church Cathedral before Deputy Fleetwood and the Commissioners, his services being reserved specially for the afternoons, when was the 'greatest auditory.' By 1654, Mr Veal, who had been in Oxford with Charnock, is a fellow of Dublin College, and some years after, is often exercising his ministry in and about the city of Dublin. Nor should we omit Mr John Murcot, who came from Lancashire in 1653, and preached with great fervour and acceptance to large numbers in Dublin and the south-west of Ireland, till the close of the following year, when he was cut off suddenly at the early age of twenty-nine, to the great grief of the Protestant inhabitants,—the Lord Deputy, and the Mayor, with a large body of citizens, following the body to the grave.*

Cromwell finding it necessary to restrain the republican Commissioners in Ireland, sent over his ablest son Henry to watch their proceedings, and to succeed them in the government. When he came to Ireland in August 1655, he brought with him some eminent ministers of religion, among whom was Samuel Mather, who, 'with Dr Harrison, Dr Winter, and Mr Charnock,' attended on Lord Harry Cromwell.† Mather was one of a famous nonconformist family, well known on both sides of the Atlantic. A native of England, he received his education in Harvard College, but returned to his native country, and having spent some time at Oxford and Cambridge, and in Scotland, he now came to Dublin, where he was appointed a fellow of the University, and chosen colleague to Dr Winter, and had to preach every Lord's day at the church of St Nicholas, besides taking his turn every five or six weeks before the Lord Deputy and Council. Dr Thomas Harrison was born at Kingston-upon-Hull, but, like Mather, was brought up in America, and had returned to England, where he was chosen to succeed Dr Goodwin in London; and now in Dublin he is chaplain to Henry Cromwell, with a salary of £300 a year, and preaches in St Werburgh's.

It was in such company that Stephen Charnock acted as one of the chaplains of the chief governor of Ireland, living with much respect in his family, we may suppose whether he resided at the Castle or in Phoenix Park, and enjoying a stipend of £200 a year, worth ten times the same nominal sum in the present day.‡ When in Dublin, he was also officially minister of St

* See *Several Works of Mr John Murcot*. It may be mentioned here that there is a valuable sketch of the state of religion in Dublin at that time, in a lecture, *Independency in Dublin in the Olden Time*, by William Urwick, D.D.

† Calamy's *Noncon. Mem.*, by Palmer, Art. Samuel Mather.

‡ See Extracts from 'The Civil Establishment of the Commonwealth for Ireland, for the year 1665,' in Appendix to vol. ii. of Reid's 'History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.'

Werburgh's, and lecturer at Christ Church. St Werburgh's Church, in its foundation going back to near the time of the Norman settlement, was in the time of Cromwell, and is still, close by the very walls of Dublin Castle; and the Lord-Depute must have attended there or at Christ Church, at one or both. In 1607, the famous Usher had been appointed to this church, and was succeeded by William Chappel, who had been John Milton's tutor at Cambridge, and who, according to Symmonds, was the reputed author of 'The Whole Duty of Man.' 'The church is described in 1630 as "in good repair and decency," worth sixty pounds per annum, there being two hundred and thirty-nine householders in the parish, all Protestants, with the exception of twenty-eight Roman Catholics. "St Warburr's," says a writer in 1635, "is a kind of cathedral, wherein preacheth the judicious Mr Hoile about ten in the morning and three in the afternoon,—a most zealous preacher, and general scholar in all manner of learning, a mere cynic." Mr Hoyle, the friend of Usher, and "the tutor and chamber-fellow" of Sir James Ware, was elected professor of divinity in, and fellow of, Trinity College, Dublin; he sat in the Assembly of Divines, witnessed against Laud, and in 1648 was appointed Master of University College, Oxford.* In this famous church, where the gospel had been proclaimed with such purity and power by Usher and by Hoyle, Charnock officiated, down, we may suppose, to the Restoration.

But his most conspicuous field of usefulness seems to have been on the afternoons of the Lord's day, when the great audiences of the citizens of Dublin assembled, and to them he *lectured*—that is, delivered an elaborate discourse, discussing fully the subject treated of—we may suppose either at St Werburgh's or Christ Church. Calamy says, 'he exercised his ministry on the Lord's day afternoons to the admiration of the most judicious Christians, having persons of the greatest distinction in the city of Dublin for his auditors, and being applauded by such as were of very different sentiments from himself. Many commended his learning and abilities who had no regard for his piety.' God was now giving his servant, who had been so thoroughly prepared for his work by a long course of training, a wide sphere to labour in. In future years, when he was partially silenced, he must have looked to his Dublin opportunities with feelings of lively interest. Though a counsellor, and a wise counsellor, to Henry Cromwell, and at times employed on public duty, in which his good sense, his moderation, and his truly catholic spirit gained him universal confidence, yet preaching was his peculiar gift, and to this he devoted all his talents. His preaching powers had now reached their full maturity. At a later period his memory somewhat failed him, and he had to read in a disadvantageous way with a glass. But at this time he used no notes, and he poured forth the riches of his original endowments and of his acquired treasures to the great delight of

* *The History of the City of Dublin* by J. T. Gilbert, vol. i. p. 29.

his audience. His solid judgment, his weighty thoughts, his extensive learning, and his cultivated imagination, were all engaged in the work of recommending the gospel of Jesus Christ to the principal inhabitants of the capital of Ireland. Most careful in husbanding time, on which he ever set great value, spending most of it in his study, in reading and writing, meditation and prayer, accustomed to muse on profound topics in his restless hours in the night, and when walking in the streets during the day, constantly jotting down (as many of the puritans did) the thoughts that occurred to him on these occasions, and employing them as materials for his projected discourses,* he made it appear on the Lord's day how well he had been employed. We know what the discourses which he preached were from those given to the world after his death, and which were printed from his manuscripts as he left them. Characterised as those of most of the preachers of the time were by method, Charnock's were specially eminent for solidity of thought, for clear enunciation of important truth, for orderly evolution of all the parts of a complicated subject, for strength and conclusiveness of argument, coming forth with a great flow of expression, recommended by noble sentiment and enlivened by brilliant fancy,—with the weight he ever had the lustre of the metal.† Except in the discourses of Usher, there never had been before, and it is doubtful whether there ever has been since, such able and weighty evangelical preaching in the metropolis of Ireland; and we do not wonder that the thinking and the 'judicious' should have waited eagerly on his ministry, specially on his 'lectures,' seeking not so much excitement as instruction, presented in a clear and pleasant manner. Doing much good during the brief period allowed him, we are convinced that he helped to raise up a body of intelligent Christian men and women among the English settlers, who within the Established Church, or beyond it as Presbyterians or Independents, handed down the truth to the generations following, and that the lively protestant religion of Dublin in the present day owes not a little to the seed which was then scattered, and which in due time, spite of many blights, grew into a forest.

But his days of usefulness in Ireland speedily came to a close.‡ When Oliver Cromwell died, he left no one who could wield his sceptre. Henry was certainly fittest of his kindred for the work of government; but he had one disqualification (for such it is in our crooked world), he was too upright and

* Adams and Veal mention these habits.

† Cotton Mather, in his *History of New England*, speaking of Nathanael Mather, who succeeded his brother Samuel as pastor in Dublin, says:—'It was commonly remarked that Mr Charnock's invention, Dr Harrison's expression, and Mr Mather's logic, would have made the perfectest preacher in the world.'

‡ His editors make Charnock B.D. Wood conceives that he was made so by Dublin University. Mr Armstrong and Dr Seaton Reid make him a fellow of Trinity College. There is no register of this in the college books; but the records both of Trinity College and of Dublin Castle are very defective as to the Commonwealth period.

honourable to descend to the base means necessary to keep the various conflicting parties in subjection. His soul was expressed in one of his letters: 'I will rather submit to any sufferings with a good name, than be the greatest man on earth without it.'* He had to complain during his whole rule in Ireland of the selfishness of the English settlers, of the extravagancies of the sectaries, and of the jealousy of the army of the Commonwealth. He seems, however, to have been efficiently supported in his wise and impartial rule by such men as Winter† and Charnock. Nearly all parties in Ireland, Church of England, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics, were opposed to the Commonwealth and his father's rule; but all respected and loved Henry Cromwell. He got his brother Richard proclaimed in Ireland; but the incapable parliament, out of jealousy, summoned him to England, and the royalists, at the Restoration, expelled him, without his offering any resistance.

Charnock had now to sink for a time into obscurity, with rare and limited opportunities compared with those which he had enjoyed for four or five years in the court of the lord deputy, and in St Werburgh's and Christ Church Cathedral. It was necessary to shew that he could not only act, but suffer, for Christ's name. Adams and Veal say, that 'about the year 1660, being discharged from the public exercise of his ministry, he returned back into England, and in and about London spent the greatest part of fifteen years, without any call to his old work in a settled way.' Wood and Calamy make statements to the same effect, and we must believe the account to be correct. But there is some reason to think, that though for the most part in London, he had not altogether abandoned Dublin for some time after 1660. At the close of the year 1661 (Dec. 31), he signs a certificate in favour of his friend Mr Veal, dated at Dublin.‡ It is stated that he and Mr Veal ministered in Dublin after the Restoration; and it is certain that at that time the meetings of nonconformists were winked at in Ireland, and that the Presbyterian and Independent ministers there took and were allowed an amount of liberty denied to their brethren in England and Scotland. It is stated that both Charnock and Veal preached in a Presbyterian church in Wood Street (afterwards Strand Street), which continued for many years to have a flourishing congregation, with such pastors as the Rev. Samuel Marsden, one of the ejected fellows of Dublin College, the Rev.

* Letter in *Thurloe Papers*.

† There is a work, *Life and Death of Winter*, 1677; also *Sermons* by him against the Anabaptists, preached before the lord deputy.

‡ The certificate is given by Calamy, in *Continuation*, p. 83. It is 'Dated at Dublin, Dec. 31. 1661,' and is signed 'Steph. Charnock, formerly Minister at Warbouroughs, and late Lecturer at Christ Church, Dublin; Edward Baines, late Minister of St John's Parish, Dublin; Nath. Hoyle, late Minister at Donobrock, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; Robert Chambres, late Minister of St Patrick's Church, Dublin; Samuel Coxe, late Minister at Katherine's, Dublin; William Leclaw, late Minister of Dunborn; Josiah Marsden, late Fellow of the above said Trin. College, Dublin.'

Dr Daniel Williams, who founded the Dissenters' Library in Red Cross Street, London; Dr Gilbert Rule, afterwards principal of the university of Edinburgh; and the Rev. Joseph Boyse, an able defender of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of Protestant nonconformists. On the supposition that this is correct, we find Charnock's ministry in Ireland after the Restoration followed by a train of important consequences, reaching forward into coming ages.*

This is the proper place for referring to and examining a scandalous story about Charnock given by Bishop Parker in the '*History of his own Times.*' He tells us that, Jan. 6. 1662-3, one Philip Alden voluntarily discovered to Vernon, one of the king's officers, a conspiracy to subvert the government in all the three kingdoms. This Alden had been an old rebel, and one who dealt in proscriptions and forfeited estates; but Vernon had so much obliged him by begging his life of the lord lieutenant, that he promised to discover the designs of the rebels. The principal leaders being chosen in March, determined on May 11. to open the war with the siege of Dublin: but many forces were in readiness, and they were dispersed. Lackey, a Presbyterian teacher, was hanged; but it is said he had seven accomplices, among whom was Charnock. 'This Charnock had been chaplain of Henry Cromwell, advanced to that dignity by John Owen. He was sent by the conspirators as their ambassador to London, and promised them great assistance, as Gibbs, Carr, and others had done in Scotland and Holland. But the conspiracy being now discovered, he fled again into England, and changed his name from Charnock to Clarke. He was a man of great authority among the fanatics, and for a long time was at the head of a great assembly, and did not die till twenty years after, *anno* 1683, and his corpse was carried through the city with the pomp of almost a royal funeral.†' This statement lays itself open to obvious criticism. First, Bishop Parker, so inconsistent in his life and so hasty in his charges, is by no means a safe authority in any question of fact. Next, the original informer is described as an old rebel, and a dealer in proscriptions and forfeited estates, and by no means to be trusted in the charges which he brings. Then our author makes Charnock live till 1683, whereas we have documentary evidence that he died in 1680. These considerations might seem sufficient to justify us in dismissing the statement as a fabrication, or an entire mistake.

But we know from better authorities that there was a general discontent, in the spring of 1663, among the protestants of Ireland, indeed among the nonconformists all over the three kingdoms, and that there was a conspiracy formed to seize Dublin

* See *Sermon, &c.*, at the ordination of Rev. James Martineau, with an appendix containing a Summary History of the Presbyterian Churches in the City, by the Rev. James Armstrong, 1829.

† The statement of the Latin edition is '*neque enim ante vicennium obiit anno, 1683 cujus exequias pone regali funeris pompâ per urbem extulerant.*'

Castle. In Ireland, the dissatisfaction was very keen among the English settlers, because they thought their interests neglected; among the soldiers of the Commonwealth, who were now stripped of their importance; but especially among zealous protestants, who were bitterly disappointed, because they saw the work of reformation thrown back. The leader seems to have been the notorious Blood, who involved in it his brother-in-law, the Rev. W. Lecky, formerly a fellow of Trinity College, who seems to have become maddened in the course of the trial. Leland says that 'some lawyers, several Presbyterian ministers, Blood, who was afterwards so distinguished in London, some members of the Irish Commons, and several republican officers, embarked in this design.' 'On the eve of the day appointed for seizing the Castle of Dublin and publishing their declaration, about five-and-twenty conspirators were seized, and a reward published for the apprehension of those who escaped.'* It appears, farther, that some intimation had been sent to London which raised the suspicion of the Government there against Charnock, for there is issued, '1663, June 19., warrant to Joel Hardy to apprehend Stephen Charnock,' and, 'June 20., an examination of Rob. Littlebury. Knows Mr Charnock, who visits at his house, and told him he had an overture to go beyond seas. Has had no letter from Ireland for him these six weeks;' and under the same year, 'Note of address of Robt. Littlebury at the Unicorn, Little Britain, London, with note not to miss him.' The country is evidently in a very moved state, in consequence of the ejection of the two thousand ministers, and the refusal to allow the non-conformists to meet for the worship of God. Thus William Kingsley to Secretary Bennet, June 20. 1663:—'There are daily great conventicles in these parts; on Whitsunday, 300 persons met at Hobday's house, Waltham parish, &c.' The news from Carlisle give indications of an understanding among the discontented. Thus Sir Phil. Musgrave reports to Williamson, June 22., Carlisle:—'There is much talk of the more than ordinary meeting of the sectaries, and the passing of soldiers between Ireland and Scotland before the public discovery of the horrid plot.'† The conclusion which we draw from these trustworthy statements is, that there was deep discontent over all the three kingdoms, among those who had been labouring to purify the church, and who were now claiming liberty of worship; that there was a correspondence carried on among the aggrieved; that there was a disposition among some to resist the Government, the anticipation and precursor of the covenanting struggle in Scotland, and the revolution of 1688; and that there was an ill-contrived conspiracy in Dublin, which was detected and put down. But there is no evidence whatever to shew that Charnock was identified in any way with the projected rising in Dublin. His name does not appear in the proclamation from Dublin Castle, 23d May

* *History of Ireland*, vol. iii. p. 434.

† *Calendar State Papers*, edited by Mrs Green, vol. iii.

1663. That the government should have proceeded against him, is no presumption of his guilt, though it may have been quite sufficient to lead Bishop Parker to propagate the story. We know that 'the generality of the ministers of the north (Ulster) were at this time either banished, imprisoned, or driven into corners, upon occasion of a plot of which they knew nothing,* these Presbyterians having in fact stood throughout by the family of Stuart, and given evidence of loyalty in very trying times. We can readily believe that Charnock should deeply sympathise with the grievances of his old friends in Dublin; but his sober judgment, his peaceable disposition, his retiring and studious habits, all make it very unlikely that he should have taken any active part in so ill-conceived and foolish a conspiracy.†

From whatever cause, Charnock disappears very much from public view for twelve or fifteen years. We must be satisfied with such a general statement as that of Wood, who says that, returning to England about 1660, 'in and about London he did spend the greater part of fifteen years without any call to his own work, whereby he took advantage to go now and then either into France or Holland.' In France he would see a lordly church, enjoying full privileges under Louis XIV., and meet with many protestants deprived of political and military power, but having a precarious liberty under the Edict of Nantes not yet revoked. In Holland were already gathering those refugees who in due time were to bring over with them William of Orange to rescue England from oppression. Calamy represents him as 'following his studies without any stated preaching.' Yes, it was now a necessity of his nature to study. Adams and Veal say, 'Even when providence denied him opportunities, he was still laying in more stock, and preparing for work against he might be called to it.' During these years when he was in some measure out of sight, he was probably revolving those thoughts which were afterwards embodied in his great work on

* Adair MSS., quoted in Reid's *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 284.

† In reference to Parker's charge, Bliss, the editor, in Notes to Wood's *Athenæ*, says:—'Quære—if Stephen Charnock? Grey. Probably it was the same, the bishop having mistaken the time of his death.' Mr T. Y. Gilbert, the famous antiquarian, writes us:—'Among the names of those committed on account of the alleged conspiracy, is that of "Eduard Baines, a fanatic preacher, formerly Harry Cromwell's chaplain." Could Bishop Parker have confounded the two men? Baines was rector of St John's Church, close to Werburgh's, during the Commonwealth, and subsequently founded the Cooke Street congregation in Dublin.' It is proper to explain, as to this alleged 'fanatic preacher and the congregation in Cooke Street (first Wine Tavern Street), that Mr Baines was 'a clergyman of learning and good sense, of rational piety and zeal for the truth, and of great integrity and simplicity of spirit;' and that in the congregation there were many persons of rank and fortune, particularly Sir John Clotworthy, afterwards Lord Massareene, Lady Chichester, afterwards Countess of Donegal, and Lady Cole of the Enniskillen family. Dr Harrison became co-pastor with Mr Baines in this congregation, and John Howe often officiated there when Lord Massareene, to whom Howe was chaplain, happened to reside in the capital. In all this we have another example of the continuance of the puritan influence in Dublin. See Armstrong's 'History of the Presbyterian Churches,' in Appendix to *Sermon*.

the 'Attributes.' Now, as at all times, he lived much in his library, which, say Adams and Veal, was his 'workshop,' furnished, 'though not with a numerous, yet a curious, collection of books;' and we can conceive that one so dependent on his reading, and who had it in view to prepare deep theological works, must have felt it to be a great trial when his books were burnt in the great fire of London.

About 1675, he seems to be in a position to receive a call to minister to a fixed congregation. It appears that a portion of the congregation were anxious to secure him as joint pastor with Dr Thomas Jacomb, and successor to Dr Lazarus Seaman, who died Sept. 9. 1675. John Howe, however, was settled in this office,* and Charnock was appointed joint pastor to the Rev. Thomas Watson in Crosby Hall. The congregation worshipping there had been collected soon after the Restoration by Mr Watson, formerly rector of the parish of St Stephen's, Walbrook, whose little work, *Heaven taken by Storm*, was the means, under God, of Colonel Gardiner's conversion. Upon the indulgence in 1674 he licensed the hall in Crosby House, on the east side of Bishopsgate Street, which had been built in the fifteenth century by Sir John Crosby, had at a later date been the residence of Richard Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III., and was now the property of Sir John Langham, who patronised the non-conformists, and devoted its very beautiful Gothic hall to the preaching of the word. Charnock was settled there in 1675, and officiated there to the time of his death, and there a numerous and wealthy congregation, presbyterian or independent, continued to worship for some ages.† Charnock could not be described at this part of his life as specially a popular preacher. On account of his memory failing, he had to read his sermons; and on account of his weak eyesight he had to read them with a glass, and his delivery was without the flow and impressiveness which it had in his younger years. Besides, his compositions were too full of matter, and were far too elaborate to be relished by the unthinking multitude, who complained of his discourses as being "but morality or metaphysics," their only fault being that they were too thoughtful. Adams and Veal say, 'Yet it may withal be said that if he were sometimes deep, he was never abstruse; he handled the great mysteries of the gospel with much clearness and perspicuity, so that in his preaching, if he were above most, it was only because most were below it.' Those who were educated up to him, as many of the middle classes were in that age, when the word of God and theological treatises were so studied, and when the public events of the times compelled men to think on profound topics, waited upon his ministry with great eagerness, and drank in greedily the

* Roger's *Life of Howe*, p. 144.

† Wilson's *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches*, vol. i. pp. 331, *et seq.*, where is a history of Crosby Hall and an account of its ministers. Crosby Hall is now a merchant's wareroom, but retains traces of its beauty in its timber roof and splendid bow window.

instruction which he communicated from sabbath to sabbath. Mr Johnson tells us that 'many able ministers loved to sit at his feet, for they received by one sermon of his those instructions which they could not get by many books or sermons of others.'

We can readily picture him at this time from the scattered notices left of him. We have two portraits of him; one a painting in Williams' Library, the other a plate in the folio edition of his works. Both exhibit him with marked and bony features, and a deep expressive eye. The painting makes him appear more heavy looking and sunken, as if he often retreated into himself to commune with his own thoughts. The plate is more lively, as if he could be drawn out by those who understood and reciprocated him. Adams and Veal say he 'was somewhat reserved when he was not very well acquainted, otherwise very affable and communicative where he understood and liked his company.' We now extract from his funeral sermon. Those who did not know him cast upon him 'foul and false aspersions' 'as if he was melancholy, reserved, unsociable to all, while his acquaintances will give a character of him diametrically opposite. How cheerful, free, loving, sweet-dispositioned was he in all companies where he could take delight; he was their love, their delight.' By this time 'our Timothy was somewhat obscured by manifold infirmities, a crazy body, weak eyes, one dark, the other dim, a hand that would shake, sometimes an infirm stomach, an aching head, a fugitive memory, which, after it had failed him sometimes, he would never trust again, but *verbatim* penned and read all his notes, whereas till of late years he never looked within them.' From such a temperament we might expect a little 'passion or choler,' which is acknowledged by his friend, but which, he assures us, 'through grace he turned into the right channel.' 'He was careful to watch over his heart and against spiritual pride.' Five days each week, and twelve hours each day, he spent in his study, 'I will not say, as some, to make one sermon; I know he had other work there.' When some one told him if he studied too much it would cost him his life, he replied, 'Why, it cost Christ his life to redeem and save me.' When he went out from his books and meditations, it was to visit and relieve his patients, he having had all along a taste for medicine, and having given much time to the study of it. His bodily infirmities, his trials and spiritual conflicts, gave him a peculiar fitness for guiding the anxious and comforting the afflicted. 'He had bowels of compassion for sinners to snatch them out of the flames, and for saints to direct them unto the love of Christ.' 'I need not speak unto you of his preaching; how oft went he to children of light walking in darkness, to cheer and revive them with cordials wherewith the Lord had usually refreshed him.' 'Your teacher was,' said the preacher in the face of the congregation, 'though not a perfect man, a perfect minister, thoroughly accomplished by the Spirit and the word of truth.'

The ambition of able and thinking ministers in those times

was to draw out a system of theology. Watson, his colleague, has left us a '*Body of Divinity*,' which long continued to train the common people in the puritan theology, and may still be found, as we can testify, in the cottages of the Scottish peasantry. Charnock 'intended to have given forth a complete body of divinity' to the congregation which met in Crosby Hall, the result, we doubt not, of long reading and much thought. He began with treating of the being, and went on to the attributes of God; but 'his sun set before he had gone over half of his transcendent excellencies and perfections. The last subject he treated on and finished was the patience of God. He was looking what to say next of the mercy, grace, and goodness of God, which he is gone to see and admire, for he found that which he most looked and longed for, the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life, in heaven whence he shines now. Indeed, all the while he was upon the attributes of God, he moved with that extraordinary strength and celerity, 'twas an argument of his near approach unto his centre and everlasting rest; and if it be true, as some say, that the soul doth *prominere in morte*, his words were too true predictions, and from his soul when he said, that concerning divine patience would be his last sermon.' 'It was his longing desire, and his hopes were, that he should shortly be in that sinless state where there is the acme, the perfection of grace and holiness.'

He died July 27. 1680, at the comparatively early age of fifty-two, in the house of Richard Tymms, a glazier in the parish of Whitechapel. On July 30th, his body was conveyed to Crosby Hall, and thence accompanied by great numbers of his brethren to St Michael's Church, in Cornhill, where* his bosom friend Mr Johnson, gained at Emmanuel, adhering to him at New College, preached his funeral sermon from Mat. xiii. 43, 'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.†' His remains were buried 'over Mr Sykes, under the steeple' of St Michael's, where the worshippers have ever since passed over them in going in to the church.

He published himself nothing but a sermon 'On the Sinfulness and cure of Evil Thoughts,' Gen. vi. 5, which appeared in the supplement to the Morning Exercises at Cripplegate; and it is an indication of his disposition to keep his name from public

* We might have doubted whether a nonconformist minister could have been permitted to preach the funeral sermon of a nonconformist minister in a parish church, but the statement is made by Wood. The entry in the register of St Michael's is, 'July 30. was buried Stephen Charnock, minister, under the steeple.'

† 'ΕΚΑΑΜΥΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΩΝ. On the shining of the righteous, a sermon preached partly on the Death of that Reverend and Excellent Divine, Mr Stephen Charnock, and in part at the funeral of a godly friend, by John Johnson, M.A.' 1680. In explanation, he states that the body of the discourse had been prepared on the occasion of the death of another friend; but, as being called suddenly to preach at Mr Charnock's funeral, he had used the same sermon, but accommodated to the different person. The discourse is somewhat rambling. We have embodied most of what relates to Charnock in this memoir. We have used the copy in the Williams' Library.

view, that in the title there is nothing more than the initials S. C., whereas in every other sermon in the collection there appears the name of the preacher. His posthumous works were given to the world by Mr Richard Adams and Mr Edward Veal, both Oxford friends, the latter also a Dublin friend, the one then a nonconformist minister in Southwark, and the other in Wapping. They first published 'A Discourse on Divine Providence,' 1680, and announce that 'this comes out first as a prodromus to several works designed to be made public as soon as they can be with conveniency transcribed,' declaring that 'the piece now published is a specimen of the strain and spirit of this holy man, this being his familiar and ordinary way of preaching.' The same year there appeared 'A Sermon on Reconciliation to God in Christ.' His discourses 'On the Existence and Attributes of God,' appeared in a large folio in 1681-82, and were followed by another folio in 1683, containing discourses on regeneration, reconciliation, the Lord's supper, and other important subjects. A second edition of his works, in two volumes folio, appeared in 1684, and a third in 1702. In 1699, were published with 'An Advertisement to the Reader,' by Edward Veal, two discourses, one on *Man's Enmity to God*, the other on *Mercy for the Chief of Sinners*.

His great work is that on the 'Attributes.' Prior to his time the subject had been treated of near the opening of systems of theology, but never in the particular and minute way in which it is done in Charnock's discourses. There had been two works on the special topic published in the English tongue in the early part of the century. The one was *A Treatise containing the Original of Unbelief, Misbelief, or Mispersuasion concerning the Veritie, Unitie, and Attributes of the Deity*, by Thomas Jackson, Doctor in Divinity, Vicar of St Nicholas Church, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 1625. The work is a philosophico-religious one, treating profoundly, if not clearly, of the origin of ideas as discussed by Plato and Aristotle, and of belief in God; but not unfolding, as Charnock does, the nature of the several attributes. A work more nearly resembling that of our author, and very probably suggesting it, was written by Dr Preston, one of the ablest of the Cambridge divines, and who had been master of Emmanuel some years before Charnock's time, and left a great name behind him. It is *Life Eternal, or a Treatise of the Knowledge of the Divine Essence and Attributes*, by the late John Preston. It reached a fourth edition in 1634. In the eighteen sermons of which the work is composed, the author first proves the existence and unity of God, and then dwells on eight of his perfections.* The whole is

* These are (1.) that God is perfect; (2.) that he is without all causes, having his being and beginning from himself; (3.) that he is eternal; (4.) that he is simple and spiritual; (5.) immutable; (6.) infinito (beyond all we can conceive), including goodness; (7.) omnipresent; (8.) omnipotent. The arrangement is very imperfect.

under 400 pages, of by no means close printing. The analysis and distribution of the attributes are by no means the same with those followed by Charnock, whose method is much more logical and judicious, while his illustration is much more full and ample. Charnock's work is at this day the most elaborate that has appeared on the subject.

Some in our day object to the separation of the divine attributes, such as we have in Charnock's work, and in systems of theology, that it is a division of the divine unity; that it is fitted to leave the impression that the perfections are so many different entities; and that it exhibits the divine being in dry and abstract forms, which do not engage and win the affections of the heart. Now, it should be admitted at once, that a theological treatise on the attributes, or on any other subject, cannot serve every good purpose. No treatise of divinity can accomplish the high ends secured by the Word of God, with its vivid narratives, its typical events and ordinances, its instructive parables, and its attractive exhibition of God as living, acting, and loving—all suited to the heart and imagination of man as well as his understanding. A theological system when compared with the word of God, is at best like a *hortus siccus*, when compared with the growing plants in nature, or a skeleton in reference to the living frame, clothed with flesh and skin. The most useful and effective preaching must follow the Word of God as a model rather than bodies of divinity, and present God and his love in the concrete and not in the abstract form. Still, systematic theology has important purposes to secure, not only in testing and guarding purity of doctrine in a church, but in combining the scattered truths of God's Word, so that we may clearly apprehend them: in exhibiting the unity of the faith; and in facing the misapprehensions, mistakes, and errors which may arise. In particular, great good may be effected by a full display, and a reflective contemplation of the divine character; and in order to this, there must be some order, plan, and division, and the more logical these are the better for every purpose, speculative or practical. Care must be taken always, in drawing such a portraiture, to shew that the attributes are not distinct parts of the divine essence, but simply different aspects of the one God, viewed separately because of the infirmity of our minds, and the narrowness of our vision, which prevent us from taking in the whole object at once, and constrain us to survey it part after part. As it is not the abstract quality, but the concrete being that calls forth feeling and affection, we must ever contemplate his perfections, as combined in the unity of his living person. It is to be said, in behalf of Charnock, that he never leaves the impression that the attributes are separate existences; they are simply different manifestations presented to us, and views taken by us of the one God, who is at once Great and Good, Holy and Gracious.

II. THE PURITAN PREACHING AND THE PURITAN LECTURE.

‘Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these? for thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this,’ Eccles. vii. 10. There are some ever telling us that the theology of former times is much superior to that of our day. Some prefer the theology of the so-called fathers of the church, some that of the middle ages, some that of the Reformation, some that of the puritans. Now we believe that it may be good for us to look to the way in which great and good men have conceived, expressed, and enforced the truth in divers ages, were it only to widen the narrowness of our views, and recall attention to catholic verities which particular ages or sects have allowed to sink out of sight. Let us by all means rise from time to time above the contracted valleys in which we dwell, and ascend a height whence we may observe the whole broad and diversified territory which God has given us as an inheritance, and the relation of the varied parts which branch out from Christ as the centre, as do the hills and valleys of our country from some great mountain, the axis of its range. There is, we should acknowledge, an attractive simplicity in the expositions of divine truth by the early fathers; and we are under deep obligations to the divines of the fourth century for establishing on Scripture evidence the doctrine of the Trinity. Those who look into it with a desire to discover what is good, will find not a few excellencies even in the mediæval divinity, notwithstanding the restraints laid on it by crutches and bandages. It is not to be forgotten that Thomas à Kempis lived in what are called the dark ages; and that we owe to a philosophic divine of that time, not certainly the doctrine of the atonement, which had been in the revealed religion of God since Adam and Abel offered lambs in sacrifice, but a very masterly and comprehensive exposition of that cardinal truth. Free grace, which had been so limited and hindered in the priestly and ecclesiastical ages, breathes from every page of the Reformers as fragrance does from the flower. The puritan preaching is unsurpassed for clear enunciation of divine truth, accompanied with close, searching, and fervent appeal, which now shakes the whole soul, as the earthquake did the prison at Philippi, and anon relieves it by the command and promise, ‘Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.’

But we should put implicit trust in no human, or hereditary, or traditional theology, in no theology except what comes direct from the Bible, interpreted according to the letter, but received after the spirit. How often does it happen that you will know what sect a man belongs to by the favourite passages which he quotes in his sermons, and in his very prayers, shewing how apt we are to take our very Scriptures from the traditions of our churches. We act as if the well were shut up from us, and as if we were obliged to

go to the streams, which may have caught earthliness in their course, and which at the best cannot be so fresh as the fountain. That is the theology best suited to the age which is put forth by living men of the age, drinking of the living word for themselves by the power of the living Spirit.

The peculiarities of the puritan preaching arose from the circumstances in which they were placed, combined always with their deep piety. Most of them were highly educated men, trained in classics, logics, and ethics at the old universities. In their colleges, and in the Established Church, they had acquired habits of careful study and preparation for the pulpit, which they retained all their lives, whether they remained in or removed from the communion of the Church of England. Meanwhile, in the prosecution of their high aims, they were thrown into the midst of most exciting scenes, which moved society from its base to its summit. They had to make up their minds on most momentous questions, and to come to a public decision, and take their side,—it may be at an immense sacrifice of worldly wealth and status. With a great love for the national Church, and a desire to keep the unity of the faith, they declined, in obedience to what they believed to be the commands of God in his word, to conform to practices which the government, political and ecclesiastical, was imposing on them. In taking their part in the movements of these times, they had to mingle with men of all classes, to write papers of defence and explanation, and at times of controversy, and to transact a multifarious business, with bearings on statesmen on the one hand, and the mass of the people on the other. Out of this state of things arose a style of exposition different from that of the retired scholar on the one hand, and from that of the man of bustle on the other; equally removed from the manner of the independent churchman and of the ever stirring dissenter. The discourses are by men of thought and erudition, who must draw their support from the great body of the people, and address in one and the same sermon both men and women belonging to all ranks and classes. We see those characteristics in every treatise of Owen and Baxter, and they come out in the discourses of Charnock.

The works of Charnock, and of the puritans generally, labour under two alleged imperfections. With the exception of Howe's 'Living Temple,' and one or two other treatises, they are without that subdued and quiet reflection which gives such a charm to books which have come out of retired parsonages or the cloisters of colleges. In most of the writings of the puritans, there is a movement, and in many of them a restlessness, which shew that they were composed for hearers or readers who were no doubt to be instructed, but whose attention required also to be kept alive. Their profound discussions and their erudite disquisitions, having reference commonly to expected, indeed immediate action, are ever mixed with practical lessons and applications which interrupt the argument, and at times give a

strain and bias to the interpretation of a passage. In this respect their discourses, written with the picture of a mixed auditory before them, are very different from the essays or dissertations, philosophic or critical, of certain of the Anglican or German divines, who, themselves mere scholars or thinkers, write only for the learned; but possess an interest to them such as cannot attach to spoken addresses in which the popular and the scientific are mixed in every page.

Because of this attempted combination, the puritans labour under another alleged disadvantage. Most of their writings contain too much thought, too much erudition, and above all too many logical distinctions, to admit of their being appreciated by vulgar readers. With the living voice and the earnest manner to set them off, the sermons may have been listened to with profound interest by large mixed audiences; but in the yellow pages of the old volume they scare those who do not wish to be troubled with active or earnest thought. In this respect they are inferior—some would rather say immeasurably superior—to the popular works produced in our day by evangelical writers both within and beyond the established churches of England and Scotland. They are not characterised by that entire absence, in some cases studious abnegation, of reflective thought and convincing argument, which is a characteristic of some of our modern preachers, who cast away their manhood and pule like infants; nor do they indulge in those stories and anecdotes by which some of our most successful ministers of the word attract and profit large audiences in our times. The puritans had learning, and they gave the results of it to their congregations. They thought profoundly themselves, and they wished to stimulate and gratify thought in their hearers and readers.

The consequence of all this is, that there is a class who reckon themselves above, and there is a class certainly below, the puritan. There are contemplatists who are disturbed by their feverishness, and scholars who complain of the intrusion of unasked practical lessons. But if these persons would only exercise a little of that patience on which they set so high a value, they would find imbedded in the rich conglomerate of the puritans profound reflections and wise maxims, which could have come only from deep thinkers and scholars, who spent long hours in their studies reading, meditating, and, we may add, praying over the deepest questions which the mind of man can ponder. It is also true that there are men and women of all ranks and conditions who are below the puritans, such as the devourers of novels in our circulating libraries, our men of pleasure and of mere business and agriculture, who have never been led to entertain a thought above their amusements, or their shops and their warehouses, their crops and their cattle; and such are the masses in our great cities, and in our scattered rural districts too, who have been allowed to spring up in utter ignorance, but who would not have been left in such utter degradation if the puritans had been

allowed to carry out their system of inspection, catechising, and careful Bible instruction. We allow that persons so untrained to thinking would speedily fall asleep if made to read a puritan treatise, with its deep thoughts and its logical distinctions. The puritan preachers no doubt required a prepared audience; but they had succeeded so far in training intelligent audiences in their own day, and they had a discipline which, if they had been allowed to carry it out, might have prepared the great body of the people for listening to the systematic exposition of the divine word. Nor is it to be forgotten that there are passages in the writings of the best puritans more fitted than any composed by uninspired men to awaken the unthinking and arouse the careless, and compel them to think of the things which belong to their everlasting peace. These passages continue to be regularly quoted to this day, and often constitute the very best parts of the articles in our popular religious literature. Charnock's discourses, in particular, have been a mine in which many have dug, and found there gold wherewithal to enrich themselves, without exhausting the numberless veins. The preachers who have caught the spirit of the puritans, but have avoided their technicality and mannerism, have commonly been the most successful in rousing the sunken and the dead from their apathy, and in stirring them to anxiety and prayer.

Some of the critical commentaries furnished by the puritans, such as those of Owen, are among the ablest, and altogether the best, that have ever been published. It is all true that modern German industry has dug up and collected materials unknown in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the more recent contests with the rationalists and infidels, while producing it may be much immediate mischief, have in the end led to a larger and more minute acquaintance with ancient thought and history, and with eastern languages and customs. But the puritans have been left behind merely by the onward march of knowledge; and the time may come when even the most advanced German critics may in this sense become antiquated. It is true that the puritans, keeping before them a living audience, ever mingled practical reflections and applications with their most erudite criticism, in a way which is now avoided by learned commentators. But over against this we have to place the counterbalancing circumstance, that the Scriptures were written for practical purposes, and will ever be better interpreted by practical men, who have felt the truth themselves, and who have had enlarged and familiar intercourse with men, women, and children in the actual world, than by the mere book scholar, who is ever tempted to attribute motives to historical actors such as real human beings were never swayed by, and to discard passages because they contain improbabilities such as one who mingles with mankind is meeting with every day. We have sometimes thought, in comparing the puritan with the modern German criticism, that

the one of these circumstances is quite fitted to outweigh the other; of course, the one should be used to counteract the other, and a perfect commentary should seek to embrace both advantages.

The multiplied divisions, and ramified subdivisions, employed in their discourses, furnish matter of very common complaint against them. The habit arose from the training in a narrow scholastic logic in the universities, and is to be found in the ethical, the juridical, the legal, and the parliamentary quite as much as in the theological writings of the age, and in the high Anglican as well as in the puritan theology. We are not prepared to vindicate the peculiar manner of the times. The excess in one direction led in the immediately succeeding age to an excess in the other direction. The new method, or want of method, was introduced from France, and came in with a very light and superficial literature. It was espoused by such writers as Lord Shaftesbury in his '*Characteristics of Men, and Manners, and Times*;' and appeared in a very graceful dress in the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*. Shaftesbury tells us that the miscellaneous manner was in the highest esteem in his day, that the old plan of dividing into firsts and seconds had grown out of fashion, and that 'the elegant court divine exhorts in miscellany, and is ashamed to bring his twos and threes before a fashionable assembly.' 'Ragouts and fricassees are the reigning dishes; so authors, in order to become fashionable, have run into the more savoury way of learned ragout and medley.' In adopting the style of the times, the preachers no doubt supposed that they could thereby recommend religion to the world, especially to the gay and fashionable classes, who had been repelled by the old manner, and might be won, it was alleged, by the new. The comment of the clerical satirist Witherspoon, in his '*Characteristics*,' is very pertinent. After stating the allegation that the old system had driven most of the fashionable gentry from the churches, he says: 'Now the only way to regain them to the church, is to accommodate the worship as much as may be to their taste;' and then remarks silyly, 'I confess there has sometimes been an ugly objection thrown up against this part of my argument, viz., that this desertion of public worship by those in high life seems in fact to be contemporary with, and to increase in a pretty exact proportion to, the attempts that have been made, and are made, to suit it to their taste.' Not that we have any right to condemn the preachers of the eighteenth century because they did not choose to follow the formalism of the seventeenth. A much graver charge can be brought against them; that of sinking out of sight, or diluting, some of the convincing and saving truths of Christianity. The minister of God's Word, if he is not to make himself ridiculous, must wear the dress and accommodate himself to the innocent manners of his age; but he is never to forget that he is a minister of the word, prepared to declare the whole

counsel of God, and he is not to imagine that he can deliver himself from the offence of the cross. The polite, the gay, and the refined admired the preaching of the eighteenth century, but never thought of allowing themselves to fall under the power of the religion recommended. The puritan preachers are still read and have power, 'being dead they yet speak unto us;' but who remembers the names of the admired pulpit orators of last century? Who, except the lovers of *belles lettres*, ever think of looking into the polished sermons of Hugh Blair and his school?

It may be allowed that the puritan preachers, like all the didactic writers of their time, carried their subdivisions too far. They sought by abstraction to bring out into distinct view all the attributes of the concrete object; and by mental analysis to distribute a complex subject into its parts. As correct thinkers, their judgment would have been offended if a single one of the parts which go to make up the whole had been left out. But comprehensive minds now see that it is beyond the capacity of man to find out all the elements of any one existing object 'in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth.' In the subject, for example, discussed by Charnock, the nature of God, no one should profess, (certainly Charnock does not) to be able to discover or to unfold all the perfections of Jehovah; and it would be simple pretension to make the propositions we utter assume the appearance of completeness of knowledge and explanation. The mind feels burdened when a speaker or writer would lay the whole weight of a comprehensive subject upon it. Charles II. was offering a just criticism on the whole preaching of the age when he charged Isaac Barrow with being an unjust preacher, inasmuch as he left nothing for any other man to say. All people weary of an enumeration which would count all gifts bestowed in minute coins; independent thinkers feel offended when any one would dogmatically settle everything for them; and enlarged minds would rather have a wide margin left for them to write on, and prefer suggestive to exhaustive writers.

But on the other hand, definition and division are important logical instruments; and when they are kept in their proper place as means, they serve important purposes. The puritan preachers all aimed at vastly more than mere tickling, rousing, and interesting their hearers; they aimed at instructing them. For this purpose it was needful first of all to give their hearers clear notions; and how could that be done except by the speakers themselves acquiring distinct and adequate ideas, and then uttering a clear expression of them? They were quite aware that speculative notions and linked ratiocinations were not fitted to raise feeling, and that there could be no religion without affection; and hence they ever mingled appeals to the conscience, and addresses to the feelings, and even pictures for the fancy; with their methodical arrangements and reasoning processes.

But they knew at the same time that mere feeling, unsustained by the understanding, would die out like an unfed flame, and hence they ever sought to convey clear apprehensions, and to convince the judgment. Then they wished their audience to retain what they heard in their memories for future rumination. But the memory, at least of the intelligent, proceeds in its reminiscences by correlation; it cannot bring up the unconnected, the dismembered; it needs hooks on which to hang the thoughts, compartments in which to arrange them, that we may know where to find them, and to be able to bring them out for use when we need them. All skilful teachers of youth know that if their pupils would make progress they must employ method, and have division and enumeration in the lessons on which they examine. And it is certain that the puritans aimed at nothing less than thoroughly *teaching* their flocks; and many of their hearers, male and female, took notes of the sermons and afterwards expanded them. Such a process would be quite impossible in regard to much of the preaching of our times, satisfying itself with a loose general view of a subject, which may produce a transient impression for good, but which does not give a distinct apprehension at the time, and which could not possibly be recalled afterwards, much less expressed, by any but the original speaker. Depend upon it, two centuries hence these writers will be far less read than the puritans are at this present time.

An objection has frequently been taken to the too graphic illustrations and quaintnesses of the puritans. An excuse can easily be pled for it by those who may not be prepared to recommend it for general adoption. It was the habit of the time, and was adopted in all departments of literature, poetical and prose, and by the adherents of the Anglican establishment as well as the nonconformists. The puritan preachers felt as if they were necessitated to employ some such means of keeping alive the attention of hearers to the weighty instruction they were in the habit of imparting to their large mixed audiences. It is a curious circumstance that the present age has come back to the same practice under a somewhat different form, and with less excuse for it in the solidity of its thinking; and it cannot with any consistency object to the fashion of the good old puritans as long as it calls for and favours so many *sensation* means of summoning the attention, not only in novels, but in every species of writing, including our religious literature, which is advertised by catch titles and read for the sake of excitement. It is to be said in behalf of the puritans, that though there may be at times an overstrained ingenuity in their illustrations, yet these always bear directly and pointedly upon the doctrinal truth which they are expounding, and the practical lessons which they enforce. The puritans ever sought to enlighten the intellect; but their aim was also to gain the heart, and in order to both one and the other, to awaken the conscience—in the addresses to which

they have not been surpassed, perhaps not equalled, by any class of teachers in ancient or in modern times.

The best puritan preaching ever tended to take the form of what they called the 'lecture.' We often meet with this phrase in reading the history of the times. There were lectures delivered weekly in certain churches in London, and in some of the principal towns throughout the three kingdoms; Laud, we know, endeavoured to put down the puritan lecture. Charnock describes himself as officially lecturer at Christ Church, where the lecture was delivered at three o'clock on the afternoons of the Lord's day. We are not to suppose that the puritans always preached in this elaborate style, but the ablest of them did so when they could get fit audience; and the sermons which they thought worthy of publication were commonly of this elaborately-expository type. In particular, Charnock always discourses to us as if he were lecturing in a college chapel at Oxford, or in Christ Church, Dublin.

While it is not desirable that all preaching, or even ordinary preaching, should be of this stamp, it would surely be for the benefit of the church of Christ to have a few lecturers or doctors, fitted for such work, in all our great cities; or to secure the same end by systematic lectures delivered by a judicious combination of competent men, not merely on attractive and popular, but on profound theological, subjects. To accomplish the purpose in our day, it is not needful that this elaborate exposition should proceed in the manner of the puritans; in particular, it should avoid the minute dissection of texts in which they so delighted, but in which the living truth was apt to be killed in the process. In order to be profitable, the lectures must be addressed to the age, by men who sympathise with the age; and it is only thus that they can accomplish in this century, what the puritan lecture effected two hundred years ago. Ever founded on the word of God, they should endeavour to bring out its broad and simple meaning, rather than exercise their ingenuity in drawing out significations which were never seen by the writers of the Scriptures. Thus may the church of God expect to raise up a body of intelligent people, to maintain and defend the truth in our day, by better weapons than were employed even by the soldiers of Cromwell in the seventeenth century.

III. PHILOSOPHICAL PRINCIPLES INVOLVED IN THE PURITAN THEOLOGY.

The author of this Introduction feels that, on being asked to write about the divine who discussed the profound subject of the 'Attributes of God,' it will be expected of him, from the character

of his favourite studies, that he should say something of the philosophy of the puritans, or rather of the philosophic principles involved in the puritan theology. For in truth the puritans were not, really nor professedly, philosophers, but theologians and preachers. Not that their religious views discouraged the study of philosophy. It could be shewn that some of the greatest thinkers that England has produced, owed not a little to puritan influence. Francis Bacon had certainly none of the self-sacrificing spirit of the puritans, but he owed much to a puritan mother. The puritans generally were too much engrossed with practical questions, to write calm philosophic treatises. But it is not to be forgotten that Culverwel and Cudworth, about the most learned and profound thinkers of their age, took the reforming side in Cambridge; and Howe, who wrote his 'Living Temple' (at least the first part of it) in his calm retirement in the family of Lord Massarene at Antrim, was altogether a puritan. Locke (like Milton) did not keep by the deep religious faith of those among whom he was brought up, but he cherished their reverence for the Bible and liberty of thought.

The phrase 'puritan divines' is understood to apply to those who sought to construct a biblical theology. But Christian theology, which is a co-ordination of the scattered truths of God's word, cannot be constructed without philosophic principles, more or fewer, being involved explicitly, or more frequently implicitly. If we try to connect truths which in the Bible are left unconnected; if we generalise what in the Scriptures is particular; if we infer from what is revealed; if we argue from the analogy of the faith, or from any other principle; above all, if we would arrange the truth into a system, we must, whether we avow it or not, whether we know it or not, proceed on some principle of reason. We often find that those who affect to be the most determined to avoid all scholastic forms, are all the while, in their statements and reasonings, proceeding on principles which are really metaphysical, the metaphysics being very confused and ill-founded. It would be very curious and very instructive withal, to have a full and clear enunciation of the philosophic principles involved in the theologies of all different ages and creeds. It is only by having such a statement spread out articulately, that we can find what is human and what is divine in systems of divinity. In this article we are to endeavour to bring out to view the philosophy implied in the construction of the puritan theology.

Bible theologians, as such, should always avoid identifying their systems with, or founding them upon, any peculiar metaphysical system. But let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean to affirm that no attempt should be made to wed religion and philosophy. We hold that all philosophy should be thought out in a religious spirit, and that much good may be effected by philosophic works on religious topics, such as those of Pascal, and Culverwel, and Cudworth in the seventeenth century. But in all such cases the philosophy and the Scriptural theology should

be kept separate, not, it may be, in separate chapters, but first in the mind of the writer, and second in the composition of his work ; so separate, that the reader may discern the difference, and that the certainties of God may not be confounded by the dullest apprehension with the speculations of men.

The puritans professed to be students of the Bible, and not philosophers, and to avoid all mere speculative questions. And we are prepared to affirm that neither before nor since, has there been a body of profound divines assuming fewer doubtful metaphysical principles. But the very puritans did proceed, in the construction of their systems, on certain logical or metaphysical maxims. We allow that, like all dogmatic theologians, they carried their method of technical formulæ too far ; that they did at times squeeze a text, written in an eastern language, to suit it to a western article ; and that they professed to reach a completeness of system such as is altogether beyond the limited capacities of man, in dealing with the boundless truths of God's Word. But we maintain that in their theology they ground on no peculiar philosophy ; that the maxims involved in their construction and inferences are found in the very nature of the human mind, and of the reason with which man is endowed, are such as man must ever take with him, if he is not to abnegate his rational nature, are such as have had a place allotted them in all profound philosophies, whether in ancient, in mediæval, or in modern times ; in short, the puritans proceed on the principles of a catholic philosophy, which is the expression of the laws of man's intellectual constitution.

It may be allowed indeed that they employed at times the forms and expressions of authors, and of systems that were favourites with them. In particular, they used the distinctions and the phrases of Aristotle, of Augustine, and of the scholastic logicians. But then it is to be remembered that Aristotle and Augustine were about the most comprehensive thinkers that ever lived ; and it is a fact that the schoolmen, all narrow and technical as they were in their spirit, were the main instruments of giving definiteness to the expressions used in the western world in our modern literature,—in fact, in our very speeches, sermons, and common conversation. The puritans in their learned treatises had to employ the phraseology of the learning of their times, just as they had to use the language of their country. The inspired writers themselves had their nationalities and their individualities—the speech of the disciples still ‘ bewrayeth ’ them. They had to speak of the sun rising, and the earth standing, according to the ideas of their time ; and in regard to man's nature they had to use the phrases, ‘ reins,’ ‘ bowels,’ ‘ heart,’ and employ the distinction of ‘ body,’ ‘ soul,’ and ‘ spirit,’ because they were accepted in their times. The puritans must use the language they found ready for them, and the distinctions understood by their readers ; but just as the writers of Scripture did not mean authoritatively to sanction any theories of the world or of the mind, so the puritans did not intend to adopt any peculiar philoso-

phic system, Platonic or Aristotelian, Greek or Latin, ancient or modern, but to proceed on the universal principles of reason.

In establishing the divine existence, Charnock had to make references to the material universe, as furnishing evidence of order, design, and beneficence. In doing so, he has to make his statements according to the views of the time. The Copernican theory of the universe had been adopted for some ages by men of science, but had not yet been brought down to the common belief of the people. Bacon had rejected it, and Milton in his great poem forms his pictures on the idea of the earth being reckoned the stable centre, with the stars moving round it in cycles and epicycles. When Charnock was in Dublin, the Royal Society was formed in Oxford; and while Charnock was meditating his discourses on the Attributes, Newton was cogitating the law of universal gravitation. But the preacher feels that it was not for him to go in advance of the popular apprehension. He usually supposes, as all men in fact still do, that the sun moves round the earth, but he states in a note, 'whether it be the sun or the earth that moves, it is all one,' that is for his purpose, which is to shew that 'the things in the world declare the existence of a God in their production, harmony, preservation, and answering their several ends.' 'Every plant, every atom, as well as every star, at the first meeting, whispers this in our ears, "I have a Creator, I am witness to a Deity." Who ever saw statues or pictures, but presently thinks of a statuary and limner?' 'The spider, as if it understood the art of weaving, fits its web both for its own habitation, and a net to catch its prey. The bee builds its cell, which serves for chambers to reside in, and a repository for its provision.' 'The whole model of the body is grounded upon reason. Every member hath its exact proportion, distinct office, regular motion.' 'The mouth takes in the meat, the teeth grind it for the stomach, the stomach prepares it.' 'Every member hath a signature and mark of God, and of his wisdom.* It is the office of natural theology to unfold the order and the adaptation which everywhere fall under our notice in the works of God, but in doing so it should never profess to expound the ultimate constitution of things: 'No man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end.' In order to the conclusiveness of the argument for the divine existence, it is not necessary that we should know the final composition and laws of the substances in which the order and design are exhibited. We may see at once that there are plan and purpose in the dispositions of an army in march, though we know not meanwhile whence it has come or whither it is going. In like manner we are sure that there are skill and contrivance in the movements of the hosts of nature, though we cannot tell their ultimate properties. Charnock lived in an age of transition in physical science, and some of his representations are antiquated; but his arguments are still conclusive, and his illustrations need only to be expressed in a new form to become apposite. We should not forget that we, too, live in an age of transition, and

* *Attributes*, Dis. I.

when the grand discoveries of our day in regard to the conservation of energy and the correlation of all the physical forces, and in regard to the unity of all organic forms, are wrought out to their full consequences, we suspect that the most advanced works in our century, that the *Natural Theology* of Paley, and the *Bridgewater* and *Burnet Treatises*, will be found as antiquated in the twentieth century as the works of the seventeenth century are to us.

But the divines of the seventeenth century had to deal much more with mental philosophy than with physical science. It may serve some good ends to exhibit the exact historical position in respect of philosophy of the puritans, and more especially of Charnock. The puritan divines generally were well acquainted with the philosophy of Aristotle, with his logic, his psyche, his ethics, and metaphysics. They were also conversant with the theology of Augustine, of the middle ages, and of the reformers. The exclusive reverence for the scholastic system had passed away among advanced thinkers, but the scholastic training still lingered in the colleges, and the new and experiential method had not yet been expounded. Charnock was born four years before Locke, and the 'Discourses on the Attributes' appeared ten years before the 'Essay on the Human Understanding,' the work which founded modern English philosophy. Charnock died fifty-nine years before David Hume published the sceptical work on *Human Nature*, which compelled thinkers to review all old philosophic principles, even those involved in theology; eighty years before Thomas Reid began the work of reconstruction on observational principles; and a century before Emmanuel Kant made his attack on rational theology, and appealed to man's moral nature as furnishing the only argument for the divine existence. This was no doubt one reason why the puritan theology was not appreciated except by earnest Christians in the eighteenth century; it did not speak to those who had been trained in the new philosophy. But we have now arrived at a time in which neither the philosophy of Locke, nor that of Kant, can be allowed to reign supremely. We are at a sufficient distance to regard them, not as suns in our sky, but as stars, with Plato and Aristotle and Augustine, and many others, their equals in light and splendour. In particular, those who most admire Locke and his fresh observational spirit, now see his great defects in deriving all our ideas from sensation and reflection, and setting aside the constitutional principles of the mind. The superficial theology which grounded itself on the philosophy of Locke has died an unlamented death, and no one wishes to see it raised from the grave to which it has been consigned. We shall certainly never return to the phraseology employed by the puritans, nor bind ourselves to follow them in their favourite distinctions. Let us copy them only in this, that in our arguments we proceed on the principles which, in some modification or other, have appeared in all deep philosophies, and have done so because they are in the very structure of our minds, and in the nature of human reason, as reflecting the divine reason.

I. Let us glance at the PURITAN PSYCHOLOGY.

The Faculties of the Mind.—These come out only incidentally. The following is Charnock's summary, 'The essential faculties of the rational soul—the mind, the repository of principles, the faculty whereby we should judge of things honest or dishonest; the understanding, the discursive faculty, and the reducer of those principles into practical dictates; that part whereby we reason and collect one thing from another, framing conclusions from the principles in the mind; the heart, *i. e.*, the will, conscience, affections, which were to apply those principles, draw out those reasonings upon the stage of the life.'* Though not a perfect, this is not a bad, distribution of the mental powers. The account of our intellectual capacities is certainly superior to that given by Locke, who denied innate ideas, and allowed an inadequate place to intuition. Charnock mentions first 'the mind, the repository of principles.' What is this but Plato's λόγος and Aristotle's νοῦς described by both, each, however, with a different explanation, as τόπος εἰδῶν (see Aris. *Psyche*, iii. c. 4 s. 4)? What but Locke's *intuition*—not properly unfolded by him? What but Reid's *principles of common sense*, Kant's *forms*, and Sir William Hamilton's *regulative faculty*? Then in regard to the other, or motive, department of the mind, we may mark how English thinkers had not yet come to the miserably defective psychology of the last century and beginning of this, in which man's powers are represented as consisting simply in the understanding and feelings. Man's heart is spoken of as having three essential elements, the will, the conscience, and the affections, each with a province, each serving a purpose, and all to be dedicated to God. There was no such narrow and confused controversy such as that which has been started in our day as to whether religion be an affair of the head or of the heart. In their 'repository of principles,' as distinguished from the discursive faculty and reasoning, they had all that is good and true in the modern Germano-Coleridgean distinction between the reason and the understanding; and they had it in a better form; and they never proposed, as some in our day have done, to make reason the sole discerner and judge of religion. With the puritan, religion was an affair of the whole man, including head and heart, and the heart having not only emotive sensibility and attachment, but a conscience to discern good and evil, and a will to choose.

Knowledge.—As opposing themselves to scepticism, both in natural and revealed religion, they held that man could reach knowledge, positive and correct. They represented some knowledge as being intuitive, and other knowledge as obtained by a process, both the one and the other being real. They held that man could rise to a true knowledge of God, to some knowledge by means of his works within and without us, but to a still closer and more satisfactory knowledge by the revelation he has given in his Word, very specially by the manifestation he has made of himself

* Sermon on *The Knowledge of God*, p. vi.

in the face of his Son. The divines of that century did not countenance the doctrine advocated by Archbishop King and Bishop Peter Brown in the beginning of the next, and revived in our day, as to man being incapacitated by his very nature from knowing God as he is, a doctrine supposed to be favourable to religion, but which may quite as readily serve the purposes of a philosophy which affirms that man can know nothing, and terminate in scepticism. Charnock declares, as to this knowledge, first, that it is not *immediate* or intuitive, such as we have of a man when we see him face to face, but through 'his excellent works of creation, providence, redemption, and the revelation of invisible mysteries in the Word.' He says, secondly, it is not *comprehensive*. 'To know comprehensively is to contain, and the thing contained must be less than that which contains, and therefore, if a creature could comprehend the essence of God, he would be greater than God.' He says that we cannot comprehend the nature of the creatures that are near us, and that not even in heaven shall God be comprehensively known. But still we are represented as knowing God. We know God as we know the sea; we behold the vastness of its waters, but we cannot measure the depths and abysses of it. Yet we may be said truly to see it, as we may touch a mountain with our hands, but not grasp it in our arms.'

Knowledge and faith.—The puritans do not enter into any minute inquiries as to the natural exercises of knowledge and faith. The precise nature and relation of knowledge and faith as psychological acts cannot be said to be yet settled by the professors of mental science. We here come to a *desideratum*, which we venture to think might be supplied by inductive investigation. There is a constant reference in the present day to knowledge and faith as different, and each with a province, but we are furnished with no definition of terms, or explanation of the precise difference of the exercises. The puritans confined themselves, as the schoolmen of the age of Anselm and Abelard did, to their own province, the relation of the two as religious acts. Their views, especially those of Charnock, are clear and distinctly announced, and they seem to us to be sound and judicious. Charnock declares unequivocally that knowledge is necessary in order to faith: 'It is impossible an act can be without an object; nothing is grace but as it is conversant about God, or hath a respect to God. There can be no act about an unknown object.' 'Faith cannot be without the knowledge of God and Christ.' 'Knowledge is antecedent to faith in the order of nature. *I know whom I have believed*, 2 Tim. i. 12. *That ye may know and believe that I am he*, Is. xliii. 10.' The divines of that century have not started the question whether faith belongs to the understanding or the feelings. Their view seems to us to be sounder both psychologically and theologically. 'This grace (faith), therefore, is set in a double seat by divines, in the understanding and will: *it is properly a consent of the will, which cannot be without an assent in the mind.*' 'Faith is in the understanding in regard of disposition, but in the will in regard of the

fiducial apprehension; for faith is not one simple virtue, but compounded of two, knowledge and trust.*

The conscience.—In respect of the place they give to the conscience, the puritans have passed far beyond Aristotle, whom they so far follow in their psychology. Aristotle, in his *Ethics*, does allot to 'right reason' (ὀρθὴ λογικὴ καὶ ὡς ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὁρίσσειεν, see *Ethics* ii. c. 6, § 15), a function in the determination of virtue; but he does not mention the conscience. The puritans, founding on the passage in Paul (Rom. ii. 15), make constant references to the conscience; no preachers before their time, and few since, have made such direct and powerful appeals to this mental faculty. 'Conscience,' says Charnock, 'is natural to man, and an active faculty.' They attempt no psychological analysis of the power; they do not inquire whether it is an exercise of the reason on the one hand, or a sense, sentiment, or feeling on the other. This was a question started in the next age by Samuel Clarke on the one side, and Shaftesbury and Francis Hutcheson on the other. Charnock, we have seen, makes the heart embrace 'the conscience, will, affections.' In the 'mind, the repository of principles,' he places the faculty 'whereby we should judge of things honest or dishonest;' and the office of conscience seems to be that of following this up by 'accusing, or else excusing.' He argues resolutely that the conscience testifieth in behalf of the existence of God. 'Man witnesseth to God in the operations and reflections of conscience.' 'There is a law in the minds of men which is a rule of good and evil. There is a notion of good and evil in the consciences of men, which is evident by those laws which are common to all countries.' 'Man, in the first instant of the use of reason, finds natural principles within himself; directing and choosing them, he finds a distinction between good and evil; how could this be if there were not some rule to him to try and distinguish good and evil.' 'Common reason supposeth that there is some hand which hath fixed this distinction in man; how could it else be universally impressed? No law can be without a lawgiver.' 'As there is a rule in us, there must be a judge.' 'From this a man may rationally be instructed that there is a God; for he may thus argue: I find myself naturally obliged to do this thing and avoid that, I have therefore a superior that doth oblige me.'† Has Emmanuel Kant, with his 'practical reason' and 'categorical imperative,' said anything more direct and convincing than this?

The affections and the will. These two were never resolved into each other by the puritans. They asserted that all knowledge should lead on to affection, and that all genuine faith does produce

* The above extracts from the sermon on *The Knowledge of God*.

† *Attributes*, Disc. I. The puritans generally appealed to first principles, intellectual and moral. Thus Baxter says, *Reasons of the Christian Religion*, P. 1, 'And if I could not answer a sceptic, who denied the certainty of my judgment by sensation and reflexive intuition (how near to Locke), yet nature would not suffer me to doubt.' 'By my actions I know that I am; and that I am a sentient, intelligent, thinking, willing, and operative being.' 'It is true that there is in the nature of man's soul a certain aptitude to understand certain truths as soon as they are revealed; that is, as soon as the very *natura rerum* is observed. And it is true that

affection. But they ever insisted that above the affections there is a more important power, the power of will. It is thus that Charnock puts the relation of these attributes:—‘The choice of the will in all true knowledge treads upon the heel of the act of understanding, and men naturally desire the knowledge of that which is true, in order to the enjoyment of that which is good in it. The end of all the acts of the understanding is to cause a motion in the will and affections suitable to the apprehension.’ ‘Knowledge is but as a cloud that intercepts the beams of the sun, and doth not advantage the earth, unless melted into drops, and falling down into the bosom of it. Let the knowledge of the word of the truth drop down in a kindly shower upon your hearts, let it be a knowledge of the word heated with love.’*

II. PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLES.—We have seen that among the mental attributes he places ‘the repository of principles.’ The puritan divines do not attempt to expound the nature of these principles, and the accounts given by metaphysicians since that time, as well as prior

this disposition is brought to actual knowledge as soon as the mind comes to actual consideration of the things. But it is not true that there is any actual knowledge of any principles born in man.’ It is wrong to ‘make it consist in certain axioms (as some say) born in us, or written in our hearts from our birth (as others say), dispositively there.’ These distinctions do not exhaust the subject, but they contain important truth; and if Locke had attended to them, he would have been saved from extravagant statements. Owen, in his *Dissertation on Divine Justice*, appeals, in proving the existence of justice, (1.) to the ‘common opinion’ and innate conceptions of all; (2.) to the consciences of all mankind; (3.) to the public consent of all nations.

* Sermons on *Knowledge of God and Regeneration*. David Clarkson, in his account of the ‘New Creature,’ speaks of the following mental acts as involved in the religious exercises of the soul:—I. THE MIND OR UNDERSTANDING. And under this (1.) apprehensions, view, or notion; (2.) judgment and assent arising from apprehensions; (3.) valuations proceeding from the estimative power of the mind; (4.) designs or contrivances of ends; (5.) inventions, whereby finds means towards ends; (6.) reasonings, or discursive power; (7.) thoughts, or cogitations; (8.) consultations, the advising power which philosophers call *Βουλευτική*, which shews by what means the good end may be secured. II. THE WILL, under which we have (1.) new inclinations,—Aristotle calls the act *Βούλησις*, and the schoolmen, *simplex volitio*, in it the mind has a new object; (2.) new intentions, aiming at something new, intending God and aiming at him; (3.) fruitions, in which the mind rests and is contented; (4.) new elections in choice of means for promoting ends, Aristotle’s *προαίρεσις τῶν πρὸς τὸ τέλος*; (5.) new consents, in particular the soul consenting to enter into covenant with God; (6.) new applications, whereby the will applies the faculties to prosecute what it has pitched on; (7.) new purposes, determinations, resolves, these being fixed and permanent. This analysis, taken with modifications from Aristotle and the scholastic divines, is too minute, but it shews how expanded a view the puritans took of the higher attributes of the mind as engaged in spiritual acts. In his sermon ‘Of Faith,’ he says—Faith implies (1.) knowledge; (2.) assent; (3.) dependence or procumbence. ‘To rely upon Christ alone for salvation is saving faith.’ See *Sermons and Discourses on Several Divine Subjects*, by the late Reverend and learned David Clarkson, B.D., and sometime Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, 1696. In these sermons, the scholastic phrases, *objective*, *subjective*, *effective*, *formaliter*, *interpretive*, *habitualiter*, cast up in all profound discussion. The account of the mental faculties is the most extended we have seen in the puritan writings. That of Charnock is more succinct and judicious. But all the puritans proceed substantially on the same views. The view of faith is the same with that of Charnock, and it could easily be shewn that it is that held by the puritan divines generally.

to it, have been sufficiently confused. So far as Charnock incidentally sketches their nature, his views are both just and profound. He speaks of them as *connatural*,* a phrase the praise of which has been ascribed to Shaftesbury; but Culverwel, with whose writings Shaftesbury was well acquainted, uses *connate*, and Whichcote (see *Aphorisms*) uses *connatural*; and *connate* and *connatural* were probably familiar phrases among the Platonic thinkers in Emmanuel College. Charnock is fond of characterising these principles as 'common reason,' 'nature within man;' he speaks of 'the common principles in the conscience,' and in this form they are 'a law of nature writ upon the hearts of men, which will direct them to commendable actions if they will attend to the writings in the conscience.'

In establishing the existence of God in the opening of his most elaborate work, Charnock ever appeals to these principles of reason. 'What is the general dictate of nature is a certain truth,' and with Cicero he appeals to common consent; 'a general consent of all nations is to be esteemed as a law of nature.' He shews in regard to the conviction of the divine existence; (1) that it hath been universal, no nation being without it; (2) that it hath been consistent and uninterrupted in all kinds and conditions of men; and (3) natural and innate. 'Every man is born with a restless instinct to be of some kind of religion or other, which implies some object of religion. The impression of a Deity is as common as reason, and of the same age with reason. It is a relic of knowledge after the fall of man, like fire under ashes, which sparkles as soon as ever the heap of ashes is opened. A notion is sealed up in the soul of every man: how could these people, who were unknown to one another, separate by seas and mountains, differing in various customs and manner of living, had no mutual intelligence one with another, light upon this as a common sentiment, if they had not been guided by one uniform reason in all their minds, by one nature common to them all?' While he represents the belief in God as thus a dictate of nature, he does not allege that it is formed independent of the observation of objects, or without the exercise of discursive thought. 'The notion of a God seems to be twisted with the nature of man, and is the first natural branch of common reason, or upon either the first inspection of a man into himself and his own state and constitution, or upon the first sight of any external visible object.'†

He has occasion to make use of important metaphysical principles, but he does not discuss them as a metaphysician. He incidentally refers to our ideas of Time and Eternity. He accords with those divines who hold that God may stand in a different relation to time from that in which man does; but he does not give any countenance to the statements of those schoolmen, who, founding upon certain mystic expressions of Augustine, spoke of time as having no existence, no reality in the view of God. His view is characterised by his usual judgment. 'Since God knows time, he knows all things as they were in time; he doth not know all things

* Sermon on *Regeneration*, p. 111.

† *Attributes*, Discourse I.

to be at once, though he knows at once what is, has been, and will be. All things are past, present, and to come, in regard to their existence ; but there is not past, present, and to come, in regard to God's knowledge of them, because he sees and knows not by any other but by himself ; he is his own light by which he sees, his own glass wherein he sees ; beholding himself, he beholds all things.*

David Hume had not yet risen to compel philosophers to discuss the precise nature of causation. Charnock proceeds as Bacon had done, and as all thinkers of his time still did, upon the Aristotelian distinction of causes into material, efficient, formal, and final, a distinction, we may remark, founded on the nature of things, and having a deep but somewhat confused meaning. In regard to efficient cause he assumes that every occurrence has a cause, and with Aristotle, that there cannot be an infinite series of causes, and reckons this a principle of reason, though not formed independent of the observation of things.

But the metaphysical topic which fell more especially under the notice of the puritan theologians was that of the freedom of the will, which they had to consider and discuss as against the rising Arminianism. Really and professedly they followed Augustine and Calvin, whose doctrines however have often been misunderstood. These profound thinkers were most sensitively anxious to have their doctrine of predestination distinguished from the fatalism of the Stoics.† They held that man had an essential freedom given him by his Maker, a freedom which made him a responsible being, and of which he could never be deprived. At the same time, they maintained that this freedom had been much impaired by sin, which has injured man first morally and then physically, so that the will is now enslaved. This is the doctrine resolutely defended by Augustine (see *De Libero Arbitrio*), and by Calvin (see his *De Servitute et Liberatione Humani Arbitrii* in reply to Pighius). They were followed by the puritans generally. Thus Owen in his 'Display of Arminianism':—'We grant man in the substance of all his actions as much power, liberty, and freedom, as a mere created nature is capable of. We grant him to be free in his choice from all outward exaction or inward natural necessity to work according to election and deliberation, spontaneously embracing what seemeth good unto him.'‡ The puritans clung to the Scrip-

* *Attributes*, Discourse on Eternity.

† It is a circumstance worthy of being noted, that in modern times, we have reversed the meaning of the phrases used by the ancient philosophers, and thus produced some confusion. The Stoics resolutely denied *Necessitas*, but held by *Fatum* (see Cicero *De Fato*), by which they meant what was spoken or decreed by God, whom they represented as an intellectual fire, developing all things in cycles, according to a fixed and eternal order. The arguments advanced by them in favour of fatalism are substantially the same with those urged in modern times in behalf of Philosophical Necessity.

‡ In the same treatise, Owen speaks of that 'effectual working of his, according to his eternal purpose, whereby though some agents as the wills of men are causes free and indefinite or unlimited, lords of their own actions, in respect of their internal principle of operations (that is, their own nature), they are yet all, in respect of his decree, and by his powerful working, determined to this and that

ture doctrine of predestination, but they did not identify it with the philosophic doctrine of Necessity as Jonathan Edwards did in the next century. They drew their doctrine from the Word of God, and founded it upon the perfection of God's Knowledge looking into the future as well as the past and present, and upon his Sovereignty doing all things, but all things wisely, justly, and beneficently. Some Calvinistic divines we acknowledge have drawn distinctions to save the freedom of the will which have rather wrecked it, and have used expressions which make our moral nature shudder. Charnock is wonderfully clear of all such extremes:— 'God's foreknowledge of man's voluntary actions doth not necessitate the will of man.' 'It is certain all necessity doth not take away liberty; indeed, a compulsive necessity takes away liberty, but a necessity of immutability removes not liberty from God. Why should then a necessity of infallibility in God remove liberty from the creature?' 'God did not only know that we should do such actions, but that we should do them freely; he foresaw that the will would freely determine itself to this or that.' 'God did not foreknow the actions of men as necessary but as free; so that liberty is rather established by this foreknowledge than removed.' 'That God doth foreknow every thing, and yet that there is liberty in the rational creature, are both certain; but how fully to reconcile them, may surmount the understanding of man.' As to his sovereignty and election, he declares, what the experience of every Christian responds to, 'It could not be any merit in the creature that might determine God to choose him. If the decree of election falls not under the merit of Christ's passion, as the procuring cause, it cannot fall under the merit of any part of the corrupted mass.' But he ever falls back upon the goodness and justice of God as regulating his sovereignty, 'As it is impossible for him not to be sovereign, it is impossible for him to deny his deity and his purity. It is lawful to God to do what he will, but his will being ordered by the righteousness of his nature, effect in particular; not that they are compelled to do this, or hindered from doing that, but are inclined and disposed to do this or that according to their proper manner of working, that is most freely.' 'We grant as large a freedom and dominion to our wills over their own acts as a creature subject to the supreme rule of God's providence is capable of. Endued we are with such a liberty of will as is free from all outward compulsion and inward necessity, having an elective faculty of applying itself unto that which seems good unto it, in which it has a free choice, notwithstanding it is subservient to the decree of God.' 'The acts of will being positive entities,' 'cannot have their essence and existence solely from the will itself, and cannot be thus, *αὐτὸ ὄν*, a first and supreme cause endued with an underived being.' He distinguishes between will 'as it was at first by God created,' and 'will as it is now by sin corrupted;' yet being considered in that estate also, they ascribe more unto it than it was ever capable of.' 'There is both an impotency and an enmity in corrupted nature to anything spiritually good.' 'Even in spiritual things we deny that our wills are at all debarred or deprived of their proper liberty, but here we say indeed, that we are not properly free until the Son makes us free.' In his *Saint's Perseverance*, he says, 'The impotency that is in us to do good is not amiss termed *ethico-physica*, both natural and moral.' These extracts give the views entertained by the puritans generally, who meant simply to express the doctrines written on the very face of Scripture, but sometimes did so by doubtful metaphysical distinctions.

as infinite as his will, he cannot do any thing but what is good.*

The inspired writers as little profess to give a system of the faculties of the mind as of the material world. In mentioning the sun, moon, and stars, and the earth with its rocks, plants, and animals, they proceed upon the ideas of their time; and in the same manner they refer to the attributes of the soul in language understood by those whom they addressed—very often, we may add, imparting to the phrases and the notions embodied in them; a comprehensiveness and an elevation which they never could have had but for their association with spiritual verities. In the Old Testament, constant allusions are made to the special senses of seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling; to remembrances, imaginations, and knowledge; to thoughts, understanding, and comprehending; to belief, trust, and confidence; to devices, counsels, purposes, and intents; to fear and hope, grief and joy, pity and compassion, anger and mercy, hatred and love. Among the Hebrews, as indeed in most nations, particular faculties were connected with particular parts of the body; and we read of ‘bowels,’ the seat of sympathy; of the ‘reins,’ the seat of deep and anxious thought; and of the ‘heart,’ the seat of all inward reflection. And here we think it of some importance to call attention to the circumstance that the Scriptures do not distinguish, as we do, the heart from the head; and do not make the heart signify mere emotion, but use it to include all that passes through the mind prior to action; and we read of the ‘imagination’ and of the ‘thoughts’ of man’s heart,—hence the absurdity of arguing that faith consists in feeling, from the fact that we are said to believe with the heart. In the New Testament, we have a more advanced view; and we read of the ‘mind’ and ‘conscience,’ the ‘soul’ and ‘spirit,’ and ‘will’ has a higher place allotted to it. The preacher and divine must, like the inspired writers, proceed so far upon the distribution of the mental powers understood by their hearers and readers; but it will be found that when they take a limited view of the human mind and its capacities, both their preaching and their theology will be very much narrowed. It could easily be shewn that the inspired writers have something suited to every essential quality of man’s complex nature, providing symbols for the senses, images for the fancy, types for the imagination, aiding the memory by interesting correlations of time and number, presenting arguments to the understanding, rousing appeals to the conscience, a lovely object to draw forth the affections, and motives to persuade the will. The broad and comprehensive views of the faculties taken by the puritan preachers led them to address all the parts of man’s complex nature.

As the Bible is not a book of science, mental or material, so it is not a book of philosophy. Nor should preaching, nor should theology, affect to be metaphysics. If any thinker is discontented with

* *Attributes, Discourses on God’s Knowledge and Dominion.*

past speculative philosophy, he is at liberty to attempt to amend it. But let him do so in a professedly philosophic work, written always in a religious spirit, but without identifying religion with his theories. Still it will be difficult for the theologian, difficult even for the preacher, to avoid proceeding on an implied philosophy. If we do nothing more than exhort persons to beware of satisfying themselves, with a *speculative* without a *practical* knowledge, we are proceeding, whether we know it or not, on an Aristotelian distinction. A profound philosophy has in all ages sought to ally itself with theology. Religion may be inconsistent with a superficial or a one-sided, but not with a deep or a catholic philosophy. A shallow philosophy will always tend to produce a shallow theology. Suppose, for instance, we adopt the principle of Hobbes and the sensational school of France, and hold that all our ideas are got from the senses, it will be difficult to establish any of the higher truths of religion; or suppose we assert that virtue is mere utility, it will be difficult to vindicate the justice of God in the awful punishment of the sinner. Philosophic principles should certainly not obtrude themselves in the disquisitions of the divine; but philosophic conceptions may underlie his whole mode of thought and discussion, and impart a coherency and consistency to the system constructed by him. The profound views of human reason, in its strength and in its weakness, taken by the puritan divines, enabled them to construct a theology in some measure corresponding to the profundity of Scripture, and defective only in this, that at times it proposed to settle what should have been left free, and to embrace all revealed truths, which, in their entirety, will always refuse to be compressed within human systems.