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Preface

The Church of Jesus Christ is great and manifold and although the basic beliefs common to all members are simple the outworking of these into creed, practice and ritual may be seen, according to one's point of view, either as a fascinating diversity that may be cause for wonder and rejoicing, or an internecine divisiveness that must be deplored. Being born an American of European ancestors and having been introduced to the Body of Christ through the influence of Baptist theology, it has been almost an obsession with me, since my conversion, to know and to appreciate my brethren of other lands and communions. As a chaplain in the second world war I had my first taste of inter-confessional worship on foreign soil and I enjoyed it. Later, having the privilege of studying abroad in preparation for an interdenominational type of ministry, I was faced with the choice of a thesis topic and I chose the theology of Daniel Waterland for three reasons: he was Anglican and I had a degree in English history; he was an authority on the Eucharist and since this is the heart of the liturgical type of worship such a study could be calculated to reveal a new theological world to me; and no comprehensive study of his life and
works had yet been made.

The study has been rewarding and, although I did not realize at the beginning all that was involved in the gaining of a completely new outlook upon life as well as theology, I am convinced that there could have been no shorter route to my present understanding. Of course, a few years can never do what centuries have done but it is hoped that the lack in familiarity will be compensated in some measure by an objectivity in the treatment of the subject. I can say without reservation that I have admired Daniel Waterland both as a man and as a theologian and believe him to be deserving of a larger place in Anglican hearts than he apparently occupies at present. His intolerance of Evangelicals and non-conformity is, under the circumstances of his situation, perfectly understandable.

Most of the articles in the ten volumes of Waterland's collected works either expound or are directly related to his two principal themes: the Eucharist and the Trinity, and I have largely limited myself to the treatment of these doctrines. He also deals with the doctrines of Justification and Regeneration but writes only two short articles, one of thirty pages and the other of thirty-four and it is plain that he did not feel called to take it upon himself to expound these
doctrines as he did the other two. I have given a short account of his views in chapter II.

Waterland was firm in his refusal to forsake the writings of the Fathers as being the best means of determining the correct interpretation of the Scripture but he always regarded them as secondary evidence and never bases his case solely upon their testimony. Because it requires greater knowledge of patristics than my own to conclude, with any authority, which side has correctly understood the Fathers, and in the interest of conciseness, since very lengthy discussions persistently develop whenever the early writings are cited, with Waterland's opponents challenging his use of them with voluminous quotations of their own, I have devoted my attention chiefly to the evidence found in his use of Scripture and logic.

I wish here to express my sincere thanks for help and counsel received from the Reverend Principal John Baillie, the Reverend Canon R.K. Wimbush, the Reverend Professor John H.S. Burleigh, the Reverend Principal Charles S. Duthie, the Reverend Professor Thomas F. Torrance, and Mr. Andrew Walls, M.A., B.Lit. (Oxon.), librarian at Tyndale House, Cambridge.
CHAPTER I

WATERLAND'S LIFE AND TIMES

Daniel Waterland was an outstanding Church of England theologian who was engaged in the major doctrinal controversies of the first half of the eighteenth century. His lifespan (1683-1740) corresponds to a period in the history of thought that has left its impression on the entire field of theology. The period is usually defined as being those years extending from the time of Locke to that of Joseph Butler and its chief distinction from other periods is its rationalism. Since Waterland was completing his fellowship at Cambridge in the same year that John Locke died, it may be expected that most of his writing was directly related to the emphasis of this age begun by Locke.

Although Waterland is remembered for his writing on several specialized subjects, such as the Eucharist, the Trinity, and his surprisingly accurate critical study of the Athanasian Creed, he was a man of one theme. All of his major works with possibly one exception, were devoted to the defence of revealed religion, of orthodoxy as conceived by the founders of the Church of England. He resisted Arianism and Deism because they failed to do justice to God the Son
whom he conceived to be the heart of the revealed faith. He defended the Sacraments because he saw in them the means by which the benefits of the Divine revelation were extended to man. He stressed the doctrine of depravity because human self-sufficiency made revealed religion unnecessary. His view of the direct relationship between Christ and the credibility of the Christian revelation was stated in the following:

Low notions of the person of Christ are apt to bring in low notions of his merit and satisfaction, and of the use and value of the Christian sacraments, which represent and apply them. And when faith in Christ's blood is once depreciated or frustrated, it is natural to set up works, not only as the conditional, but as the efficacious or meritorious cause of salvation. The next step is to exalt morality in opposition to faith, and mere morality in opposition to instituted religion; which again prepares the way for looking upon all revealed religion as needless or useless which comes to the same thing with denying the truth, because an all-wise God can do nothing in vain.

Any form of religion that regarded revelation as unnecessary and which men claimed to find in nature, or in moral consciousness, or through the exercise of reason alone, he considered to be a threat to the foundation of the Christian faith. Natural religion was never denied a place in his thinking and he had high regard for reason but both of these were to be carefully defined. He faced all of the major issues arising out of the eighteenth century struggle for a reasonable faith.

Waterland does not fit neatly into any of the eighteenth century categories. Plummer states that High churchmanship was mainly political in the eighteenth century and could be referred to as Tory protestantism with conformity to the Established Church as its chief distinction but he said further that to a large extent it had lost veneration for antiquity and patristic authority. In this Waterland was not typical for he placed great importance upon the Fathers: "... we urge not their authority, but their testimony, their suffrage, their judgment, as carrying great force of reason with it; and reason we should all submit to". Furthermore, he was not a Tory but rather a decided Whig who had little sympathy for Nonjurors. Van Mildert, speaking of the political animosities at Cambridge when Waterland was Vice-Chancellor asserts that: "He was a steadfast supporter of the Hanoverian succession; which was by no means the prevailing sentiment at that time in Cambridge; the Tories having been, on several occasions, the strongest party."

He might properly be termed a Whig in that he advocated a measure of religious toleration if it did not menace what he considered to be the essence of the Faith, but when he made

3. The terms are indefinite but "Whig" was generally associated with a degree of liberalism in both government and religion and "Tory" tended toward conservatism usually having a slightly higher regard for constituted authority and being less lenient with dissent.
reference to the King he did not hesitate to use the term "sacred Royalty"¹ in the best Divine Right tradition. He could sound very like a Tory when he spoke of, "... the true and only cure, the Restoration." in which:

... the Sovereign resumed his throne; the nobility their ancient grandeur, and seats in parliament; the Bishops their sees; the loyal gentry their estates and privileges; the commons their rights and franchises; the whole kingdom their freedom, safety, and tranquility ... all things reverted to their primitive order and regularity, ... . . . . ."²

It is of interest, and its significance will be considered further in the following chapter, that the Broad Churchmen, otherwise known as Latitudinarians and represented by such distinguished men as Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and Burnet, were Whigs without exception. Canon Overton notes the close relationship in the following:

Broad Churchmen, on the other hand, were looked upon by those who differed from them as altogether Latitudinarians in religion and Whigs in politics—terms constantly used as practically convertible.³

To make these terms apply to the Whig, Waterland, of whom it was said, "Waterland did more than any other divine of his generation to check the advance of latitudinarian ideas within the Church of England"⁴ seems inconsistent but at least it

¹ Works, VI, 278.
² Ibid., VIII, 458.
reveals the problem of classification. That he was a Whig and was unswervingly loyal to his Church may be looked upon as evidence of his being especially worthy of historical consideration. Sykes is convinced that:

"The conversion of the Whig party into the situation of supporters of the position of the Established Church was undoubtedly the most important factor of the ecclesiastical development of the first half of the eighteenth century."  

A determined effort to maintain a balance can be traced in Waterland's theology. He perceived the dangers of Roman Catholic authoritarianism and of rationalistic relativism while he granted that there was need both for authority and personal freedom. In his doctrine of the Eucharist he sought to avoid anything resembling transubstantiation but he was equally opposed to making the Sacrament a mere memorial. A persistent determination to balance the doctrinal with the practical may be traced in his sermons and in his dissertations. Though he respects and makes good use of reason, he admits the element of mystery and insists on the necessity of faith in man's relationship with God.

1. Norman Sykes, Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century (1934), p. 34
I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. It is the purpose of this study (1) to determine the value and extent of Waterland's theological contribution to the Church of England; and (2) to formulate a doctrinal synthesis from his collected works with particular reference to the Trinity and to the Eucharist.

II. LIFE OF DANIEL WATERLAND

The only comprehensive biographical material from a primary source is that communicated by Theodore Waterland, Daniel's brother, and most of this is contained in the article found in the first edition of Biographia Britannica. Bishop van Mildert, in spite of exhaustive and scholarly research, was able to supply very few additional details. A work, dated 1736, and bearing the promising title: Memoirs of the life and writings of Dr. Waterland, being a summary view of the Trinitarian controversy for twenty years, between the Doctor and a Clergyman in the Country, etc. By a Clergyman, is utterly misleading as it contains no useful information at all but is instead a sarcastic denunciation. It was undoubtedly written by John Jackson who used the above nom de plume for other articles of like character.
Edward Churton published *Fourteen Letters from Daniel Waterland to Zachary Pearce* in 1868, with a considerable preface that sheds some light on Waterland's controversial activity. Van Mildert was apparently not aware of these letters when he published the collected Works in 1843, but in any case they would not have augmented his biographical sketch.

Jeremiah Seeds's sermon, preached at Waterland's funeral, was a splendid tribute to the man, and Joseph Clarke, a former pupil of the learned doctor, wrote an affectionate preface to a collection of posthumously published sermons, found in Van Mildert's edition of his Works, but it is doubtful whether such eulogy, though it be well earned, would be of benefit in a study of this nature.

All of the extant biographical material neglects the early part of Waterland's life so there is very little information pertaining to the years previous to 1699, the year of his admittance to Magdalene College. He was brought up in the vicarage of Reverend Henry Waterland, rector of Walesby, Lincolnshire, who found time in the midst of his parish ministry to teach his son the first rudiments of grammar. Both Daniel and Theodore, his elder brother, were undoubtedly destined for Magdalene College in Cambridge from the beginning of their lives as it is quite certain that the name entered

---
1. Oxford Press
2. *Vol. IX, i.*
in the college register on June 28, 1665, Henry Waterland, was that of their father. He also was the son of a clergyman and was granted a scholarship on the Wray foundation, which would suggest that he showed promise.

Daniel was able to obtain his scholarship in 1702, at the age of sixteen, proceeded to the degree of A.B. in the Lent term following and was elected Fellow of the college on February 15, 1703. He served the college in the capacity of Tutor, or Dean, for the next ten years, taking his Master's degree in 1706. It has been noted that the number of admissions increased greatly about the time he began his tutorial duties.

Upon the death of Gabriel Quadring, Master of the college, in 1713, an unusual opportunity came to this thirty year old scholar. The power of appointment to the Mastership is in Magdalene, which is unique among Cambridge colleges in this respect, a hereditary right exercised by the Earl of Suffolk and Bindon. Since there is no hint that political pressure was responsible for the selection of this young man, who had not yet gained his Bachelor of Divinity degree, it may be assumed that his appointment was a recognition of ability. It spoke well for his industry, after his elevation, that he did not apply, as was usual with Heads of Houses in Cambridge, for a degree by mandamus but followed the prescribed B.D. course just as any other student would do.
The Earl also presented him to the rectory of Ellingham in Norfolk but he continued in his tutorial work and paid a curate to care for most of the pastoral duties. It was in this period that the first of his works, later to be published, was written. *Advice to a Student. With a Method of Study for the First Four Years* must have been well received when first published in 1730 because Edward Churton, in his preface to *Fourteen Letters from Daniel Waterland to Zachary Pearce*, refers to a republication of this work, with additions, some time after 1735. The mediating tendency is seen even in this early production which advocates the combining of a well-rounded education with a vital spiritual experience.

It may be concluded that it was in these years from 1706, when he commenced his graduate study, to 1719, when he published his first considerable work, *A Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, that he acquired the store of knowledge which was to give him a command of the major theological issues of his day. Witness to the thoroughness of his preparation is borne by the intimate acquaintance with many fields of learning that his works reveal. The profitable use of this period of his life doubtless had much to do with the willingness of such a recognized Church of England historian as Overton to describe him as, "... an intellectual giant. ..."  

1. p.xxv.  
Although faced with administrative problems, arising chiefly out of political animosity, and in spite of additional responsibilities such as his being appointed in 1715 to the Vice-Chancellorship of the University, there were indications that he utilized the late hours in the attainment of distinction in his field. Lights were seen in his study night after night according to Cyril Jackson whose father was an under-graduate at Magdalene College in those years. It is regrettable that in this instance Waterland did not seem to apply his rule of moderation. His biographers intimate that his health was much impaired, and probably his life shortened, by too intense application to his studies.

His ability was frequently recognized in the early years of his public life. He was appointed in 1710 to the office of Examiner of the students proceeding to the degree of Bachelor in Arts. On the occasion of his graduation as B.D. he was publicly commended for his fluent and scholarly discourse in answer to the learned Dr. James. In 1717 he was selected to be one of the Chaplains in Ordinary to the King, in whose presence he was made Doctor of Divinity in the latter part of that same year at Cambridge. This degree was granted to him without request on his part, but it was probably an honour inevitably linked with his particular station in life. Two other Heads of Houses: Grigg, Master of Clare Hall, and Davies, President of Queens', were similarly honoured at the
same time.

Information pertaining to his marriage is very meagre but it is known that the woman he married, a Miss Jane Tregonwell, in 1719, was lineally descended from Sir John Tregonwell, Esq. of Anderson in Dorsetshire. That same year brought a change of direction in his professional career. Hitherto he had been an educator but now he began to take his place as one of the outstanding controversialists of the early part of the eighteenth century.

Although Waterland's literary activity was his chief interest in life it would be impractical to trace in detail the rapid shuttling of "queries", "defences", "replies", "vindication", and "remarks" between him and his opponents. He lived in an era of systematic and minute refutation which can make the resultant literature tedious unless one has followed the argument from the first "defence". Since Waterland participated in the main controversies of the period, it is possible to group those of his writings that pertain to each one and to arrange them in a modified chronological order with only occasional overlapping.

The numerous Arian and Socinian publications that appeared towards the end of the seventeenth century were the immediate cause of the great Trinitarian controversy that raged throughout the first half of the eighteenth century. Bishop Bull defended the orthodox conception of the divinity of Christ. For thirty
years, ending with his last publication in 1703, he laboured unceasingly to present the comprehensive historical view of the subject in performances that were conceded to have been superior in his times. This reference is made to him because van Mildert suggests that "the best view, perhaps, that can be taken of Dr. Waterland's labours, will be to regard them as a continuation of those of Bishop Bull."  

Samuel Clarke's *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, published in 1712 began a new phase of the controversy in that a considerable number of notable writers reacted against it in the belief that Clarke's writing was a threat to several of the Articles of Faith relating to the Trinity.

John Jackson, who signed himself "a Clergyman in the Country," took up the defence of Clarke's Trinitarian views. Waterland, in about 1716, had, at the request of friends, drawn up thirty-one critical questions which were styled "Queries" and which were opposed to Clarke's views as expressed in *Scripture Doctrine*. According to Waterland's account, these were never intended for publication but Jackson suddenly announced that he had committed them, along with his *Answer to the Queries*, to the press and that if further discussion were desired, it must be continued in this public fashion. Although Waterland considered it unsporting on Jackson's part to place

---

1. *Works*, I, 44.
an unpolished argument, intended only for private correspondence, before the public, it is possible that this surprising move gave the impetus required to launch his literary career.

Thus in 1719 there appeared A Vindication of Christ's Divinity: being a defence of some queries relating to Dr. Clarke's scheme of the Holy Trinity, in answer to a Clergyman in the Country, in which the queries were restated and bolstered against Jackson's attack. In this work Waterland sought to prove that the Arian distinction between an absolute and a relative Deity has no scriptural foundation. The skilful arrangement of the argument, based largely on Scripture exegesis, resulted in a powerful answer to Jackson.

Samuel Clarke, who soon responded in his own behalf against Waterland with a tract entitled The Modest Plea continued, or a brief and distinct Answer to Dr. Waterland's Queries,1 was a thoroughly capable writer who is described in the Dictionary of National Biography as "the first of English metaphysicians," and he held that title by common consent for twenty-five years following the death of Locke in 1704.

The theological arguments will be weighed in a later chapter but proof of Waterland's talent was revealed in his appointment, by the Bishop of London, Dr. Robinson, to preach

---

1. See Benjamin Hoadly's Account of the Life and Writings of Samuel Clarke.
the Lady Moyer's lecture which was endowed to encourage "an able Minister of God's Word, to preach eight sermons every year on the Trinity, and Divinity of our ever Blessed Saviour."\(^1\) This was doubtless an outcome of his performance in the *Vindication*. Waterland, in fact, stated in his preface to the *Eight Sermons*, that "they may be looked upon as a Supplement to my *Vindication*.\(^2\)

In 1718 there appeared a volume, written in Latin, entitled *Disquisitiones modestae in clarissimi Bulli Defensionem Fidei Niceneae* by Dr. Whitby. The book was dedicated to Clarke although the author was not entirely satisfied with Clarke's views. It was intended to be in answer to Bishop Bull's *Defensio Fidei Niceneae*, published in 1685. Why Whitby waited until after the death of the worthy Bishop was not explained. Waterland commented upon this questionable practice in his twenty-sixth Query and added that there were general fallacies running through the whole work. Whitby's answer led to the second chapter in Waterland's controversial writings on the Trinity. This exchange came to no conclusive end and Waterland's attention was diverted to another phase of the problem.

Clarke, in the first edition of his *Scripture Doctrine*, advocated subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles "for every person ... whenever he can, in any sense at all, reconcile

---

1. Extract from Lady Moyer's will, cited by van Mildert in *Works*, I, 50.
them with Scripture." This was labelled "Arian subscription" and resulted in extensive writing by several distinguished contributors. Sykes defended it and Whiston and Emlyn criticised it.

The appearance of an anonymous article, simply referred to as Remarks, was the incident that brought Waterland into the controversy. Arian subscription was a theme not unfamiliar to him as he had debated the lawfulness of it with Dr. James, his professor, in 1714 when he obtained his B.D. degree. The Case of Arian Subscription is rated by van Mildert as "one of our author's ablest productions." It appeared in 1721. Sykes began vigorous opposition to the position stated and numerous "replies" appeared before Waterland considered it useless to continue.

In the Spring of 1722 John Jackson renewed his attack on Waterland's "Queries." Clarke had given advance notice of this work at the end of his Modest Plea continued and there was some evidence that he made no small contribution to it. Jackson's biographer, Sutton, speaking of this work, admitted: "In this our author received considerable assistance from Dr. Clarke, as he has acknowledged to me" and he substantiated the admission with two letters from Clarke to Jackson, one of which, dated June 23, 1719, read as follows:

2. Works, I, 78.
I have interleaved W—d, and am making short notes for you throughout . . . I believe you need do little more than transcribe all the Places I have marked, with the Remarks I have made upon them; and then range them in some proper method under distinct Heads, such as they will naturally fall under.

In addition to the letters there was strong internal evidence that the piece was written by an abler hand than that of "the Country Clergyman."

Waterland's reply, in the following year, was a Second Defence of some Queries and it led to disputation which finally involved Clarke although he withheld his identity. The controversy ended when Waterland declined to answer Jackson's Farther Remarks on Dr. Waterland's Farther Vindication, published in 1724.

Somehow Waterland found time for research in these days of strenuous activity for he published a scholarly work entitled Critical History of the Athanasian Creed in 1723. This dissertation will serve in the following chapter as an example of the author's critical competence but it may be said here that many of Waterland's conclusions on this much debated subject are still valid. A second edition was required in 1728.

In the course of these years several lesser writers drew Waterland into doctrinal disputation but most of the writing is of little aid in gaining a conception of his life and works. His correspondence with a Mr. Staunton¹ that began in 1721

¹. Works, IV, 375.
revealed an interest in sincere seekers of truth however unlearned. Mr. Staunton began by confessing his ignorance in these matters although he had already written several tracts that indicated a heretical drift. Waterland continued correspondence until he recognized a decided unwillingness to come to the real points at issue. The incident revealed qualities of forbearance, unaffected frankness, and good humour that were not so readily seen in the formal writings.

To be included with the Trinitarian works was the Dissertatio upon the Argument a priori for proving the Existence of a First Cause which did not appear until 1734. Clarke had espoused the a priori argument in his Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God and in later editions of it published letters written in defence of the argument. According to Jackson's vindictive Memoire of Dr. Waterland, the dispute began some years before 1734. Waterland did make incidental reference to Clarke's argument in his first and second Defences. The Dissertation was Waterland's only strictly metaphysical composition but he proceeded carefully to analyse the matter in his methodical way and presented a formidable challenge to his opponent, who was conceded to be a foremost authority in this field. His interest lay chiefly in the relation of the a priori argument to the Arian controversy.
Waterland's largest and most valuable production dealing with the Trinity was *The Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, published in 1734. It was a summary work that served as a climax to this particular controversy and it was not directed against any specific author's doctrine although he refers to an anonymously written pamphlet of 76 pages entitled *A Sober and Charitable Disquisition concerning the Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity*. He was convinced that the prevailing confusion demanded a comprehensive treatise on this fundamental article of the Faith and undertook the task with a preparation of more than twenty years' consideration of the subject.

The first of a series of his writings that could be grouped under the heading "anti-Deistic" appeared in 1730. Many of his other trinitarian works might be so classified but are more correctly defined as anti-Arian."

Lord Herbert of Cherbury and other Deistic writers, in their contest with orthodoxy, insisted that they were loyal to the true spirit of Christianity. They claimed that they wished only to make doctrine and practice conformable to the standard of reason. Men were not to be asked to believe anything without the legitimate authority of rationality behind it. Tindal called himself a Christian Deist and published *Christianity as Old as the Creation* to prove that the

truths of revelation were merely a republication of natural religion.

Waterland's *Scripture Vindicated* was a direct reply to Tindal. This work appeared in three parts, the last being published in 1732, and every point in Old Testament Scripture that Tindal had questioned was reasserted and defended. Waterland's intention was to deal with the entire Bible in this fashion but he never completed the New Testament phase. He made extensive use of arguments that already had been advanced by others. \(^1\) The thesis that Bible-characters needed to be justified in all incidents of their lives before the Scripture could be acclaimed authoritative seems to have underlain much of his thinking. He did not disagree with his opponents in the matter of the validity of reason but maintained that there were issues that went beyond the scope of man's reason.

The most severe criticism he ever received from responsible sources came in reaction to these writings and much of it from professed friends of orthodoxy. He was charged with having given advantage to the cause of infidelity by placing the vindication of Scripture on untenable ground. Tindal's scathing reply was so full of railing that Waterland only made passing reference to it in the second part of *Scripture Vindicated*: "The author, I perceive, had exhausted himself  

---

1. Locke, Bull, Patrick, Burnet, Le Clerc, Glassius.
in his great work, and it is but very little reinforcement we are to expect from him. He has shown that he can rail, which nobody doubted of: . . ." 1

Conyers Middleton manifested personal ill-will toward Waterland from the early days of their academic life and evidently saw, in *Scripture Vindicated*, an opportunity to expose what he thought to be his adversary's weakness. *A Letter to Dr. Waterland*, containing some Remarks on his *Vindication of Scripture*, in answer to a book, entitled, *Christianity as old as the Creation*; together with a sketch or plan of another answer to the said book was published in 1731. The plan mentioned was that of making hypothetical concessions to the Deists that Christianity might be considered as only an imposture along with other impostures but that it was so firmly founded upon reason that it must be received. Zachary Pearce wrote in defence of Waterland who did not take part in the extended discussion of his original work. He probably felt that the personal animosity of his opponent would make such extension fruitless.

During this period the appearance of several other publications testified to his continual diligence. Some of these were: the "Charges" preached while he served as archdeacon of Middlesex; *A Defence of the Lord Bishop of St. David's*, who had proposed that some restraint should be imposed upon infidel writers; and a tract entitled, *Regeneration*

stated and explained which appeared in 1739 and was written in reaction to Wesley's and Whitefield's emphasis on the subjective aspects of spirituality. This latter piece was probably the last thing published while the author was alive.

His Eucharistic writings, the first of which appeared in 1730, form another section. Although Clarke died in 1729 he left his Exposition of the Church Catechism prepared for the press and it was published in the same year. In the following year Waterland responded with Remarks on the Exposition and Sykes, through his friendship for Clarke and his espousal of Clarke's doctrine, was drawn into the debate. It appeared that the real issue centred in the Eucharist and Waterland was obliged to write The Nature, Obligation, and Efficacy of the Christian Sacraments Considered in 1730. Sykes wanted to draw a sharp distinction between moral duties and positive duties but Waterland contended that the same authority instituted them and that they were therefore to be equally regarded.

In 1735 Bishop Hoadly startled orthodoxy with his Plain Account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He reduced the purpose of the Sacrament to a mere memorial with no mystical significance or efficacy in conveying pardon. Waterland made no direct reference to this work but he did begin an enlarged and comprehensive inquiry into the whole matter not long after Hoadly's publication because his Review of the
Doctrine of the Eucharist came out in 1737. His avoidance both of "superstition" and of "profane neglect" is plain in this treatise.

His last three "Charges" to the Middlesex Clergy, delivered in 1738, 1739, and 1740, the year of his death, all dealt with the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. They were, in general, opposed to the view of Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice and, although Johnson had died, his friend and admirer, Dr. Brett, took up his defence in a tract entitled Some Remarks on Dr. Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, 1738.

It should be remembered that, for most of these years, this voluminous writer served as pastor with the continual necessity of sermon preparation and other ministerial responsibilities upon him. He also was carrying the weight of the Magdalene College mastership. In 1721 he was presented by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's to the Rectory of St. Austin and St. Faith in the City of London where many of his published sermons were preached. In 1723 Sir William Dawes, Archbishop of York, recommended him to the Chancellorship of York which was a singular honour but did not impose many additional duties. The next ecclesiastical promotion came in 1727 when Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London, and Lord Townshend, Secretary of State, jointly recommended

him to a Canonry of Windsor. This led to his obtaining the Vicarage of Twickenham in Middlesex from the Chapter in 1730. He was obliged at this point to resign the Rectory of St. Austin and St. Faith in London. A further appointment, while he served this post, to the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, was made by Gibson. The principal obligation was a yearly "Charge" to the clergy.

The clergy of the Lower House of Convocation chose Waterland as their Prolocutor in 1734. Undoubtedly he was deeply sensible of the honour bestowed upon him but he found it necessary to decline the office. His letters to Mr. Loveday and to Dr. Gray, indicated that his state of health made the refusal necessary.  

Jeremiah Seed, who delivered the address at Waterland's funeral, hinted in the sermon that his elevation to the episcopal bench was intended. *Biographia Britannica* augments this with the claim that he was offered the Bishopric of Llandaff. No date is given but since the post was vacant in 1738 and in 1740 the offer doubtless was made in one of these years. Whether he declined because of his reluctance to abandon projected writing plans or because of poor health, or through knowledge of the scanty revenue then accruing from the See of Llandaff, is not known.

His letter to John Loveday, written from Magdalene College and dated July 6, 1740, described the situation that brought

---

both comfort and purpose to his last days.

It will not be long before I must return to Twickenham, to stay there a month or two, in the neighbourhood of the town. In the mean season I am here, in an agreeable situation, amidst plenty of books, printed and manuscript, entertaining myself, and serving distant friends in a literary way.

Many references in his correspondence indicate that his health was not good for quite a number of years preceding his death. In that weakened condition it required only an ingrown toe-nail to cause an infection that could not be checked by the medical science of that day.

William Cole, the antiquary, has penned on one of Waterland's letters to Mr. Gray, which appears in a collection of original manuscripts deposited in the British Museum, a comment that supplies some needed detail as to the closing circumstances of his life. His authority for it is not supplied:

He was attended here at Cambridge by the famous Mr. Cheselden for many days from London; and removing from Cambridge to Twickenham for change of air, died there. . . Mr. Cheselden attended for many days, at a great expense, and with Dr. Plumptre, the Professor of Physic, attended him to Town.

Death at the comparatively early age of fifty-seven was an occasion of deep regret to many who saw in Daniel Waterland an example of his via media in the combination of his keen

1. Ibid., X, 442.
2. Cole's Collections, XXX pp. 170 et. seq.
scholarship and genuine piety. His wife outlived him by twenty-one years and never remarried. There were no children. The encomium addressed to the Synod of the province of Canterbury within a year of Waterland's death by Archbishop Potter was an outstanding tribute. He made allusion to the honours which Waterland had "too modestly refused," which further supports the belief that he was offered a bishopric. There can be no doubt that the Church of England suffered a distinct loss through his untimely death.

III. THE HISTORICAL SETTING

Daniel Waterland, in particular, must be seen in the light of the influences that produced the "age of reason" because his entire life-work was called into being by his reaction to these influences. His tendency was to reject the novel and the untried but he himself bore the imprint of the new age more than he realized. A consideration of both the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries is necessary to a proper background for his works because he was a man of two centuries not only by right of the fact that he lived in both but also because in his mentality were blended traits of each in a unique manner. Because of the many volumes already written on these centuries and because their general features

---

are familiar, only a brief glance at some characteristics of those times will be necessary.

**The Seventeenth Century.** The poet who said "Something there is that does not love a wall" was saying metaphorically what many leaders in this century felt about the taboos and confinements that had long walled off certain areas from inquiry. The inevitable fruit of the Reformation with its challenge to authoritarianism, began to be borne in the form of a steadily increasing volume of questions; questions about justice, authority, freedom, ethics, and human destiny. And, though not apparent at first, the answers which began to be supplied seemed to move God, and His will, more to the circumference of things. To the consternation of some Reformers, it began to appear that the principles of the Renaissance and Reformation, and of justification by faith with its emphasis upon the individual conscience, had prepared the Protestant world to receive the seeds of a theological rationalism. It appeared that hard-earned truth would have to suffer, along with oppressive authority, as the price of liberation from that very oppression.

The exposition of Reformation truth was hindered by the fact that much of the theological writing conforms to the pattern of tedious point for point contention with a solemn parade of authorities behind each proposition and there is a certain vagueness of statement which, after allowance is made
for changing styles, still seems to have been intended. The very thorough documentation of H. John McLachlan's recent book lends weight to one of his concluding observations as to the cause of this obscurity:

... to argue from a man's silence that he did not hold an opinion for which he might be ruined and imprisoned or, up to 1699, even hanged, seems rather absurd. We have observed on the contrary, how opponents of the received doctrines often carefully trimmed their sails to the prevailing winds to avoid shipwreck and purposely used vague and ambiguous expressions.

But the sails of the man who wished to speak of reason needed no trimming because no party was prepared to declare itself opposed to having a sound rational basis.

The attraction of the "reasonable" grew steadily throughout the century and by the time of Charles II science, philosophy and theology were making their obeisance to the new goddess. S.L. Bethell has chosen the date of the Restoration, 1660, as a suitable division point between two different conceptions of reason. Pre-Restoration reason went beyond the mere function of mentality to include "faith, intuition, feeling, as well as the more strictly rational processes."1 Post-Restoration reason was more occupied with the structure of matter, mathematics and the impersonal

---

sciences leaving no means of dealing with the complex spiritual, material, and social nature of man. Nothing was provided to take the place of the old reason that was so much more than merely rational. T.S. Eliot probably refers to this development in the conception of reason when he says of the century that there was a "dissociation of sensibility" or split between thought and feeling. When reason thus became chiefly associated with systems of logic and mathematical formulae it was bound to affect the attitude of men toward a God who would always lie beyond any system or formula.

The seventeenth century quarrel with scholastic methods and dogmas, however, was not because of the insistence that faith was above reason, which was granted by the most liberal minded, but that further inquiry along experimental lines seemed to be discouraged. The right to question traditional authority became a passionate demand and this led to an increasing indifference to the testimony of history in general which cast suspicion upon anything from the past whether it was good or bad. A historically grounded Faith had to make ready its defences and men like John Locke were taking their places on the battlements. Locke's philosophical weapons were somewhat new in the armoury but they were ideally suited for a seventeenth century battle.

---

The word "Socinianism" began to be heard more and more as the century wore on. It was associated with Arianism, Arminianism, and Anti-trinitarianism and was applied equally to those who departed radically from the orthodox tenets and to those who allowed to reason its legitimate place in religion. While Arminius was, of course, in no sense an Arian, it is true that his more liberal theology, with its criticism of predestination and limited atonement, favoured the spread of Socinian influence.

The new mode of thinking, was in some ways typified by the Cambridge Platonists who were believed to share socinian opinions. The Platonists never intended any destructive criticism of fundamental Christian truth and their rationalizing was largely an attempt to avoid extremes but one of the unfortunate by-products of this unwillingness to risk any passionate commitment was a gradual decline toward mediocrity especially in the realm of personal convictions. The lethargic state of the church in the beginning of the eighteenth century is witness to the persistence of this declension.

The Church of England was apparently not too deeply disturbed by the new trend. McLachlan says that Socinian reasonableness was valued by more than a few churchmen and high-churchmen in particular were among the purchasers of Socinian books. It is significant that Locke and Newton,

who were decidedly anti-Athanasian and stoutly opposed to metaphysical theology, and who felt at liberty to interpret the Church's formularies according to their 'reasonable' standards, were never considered anything but loyal churchmen by the majority of their fellows.

A phenomenon of the latter part of this century was Latitudinarianism. The name Latitudinarian was originally applied to the Cambridge Platonists but was later transferred to the school of liberal-minded men like Joseph Glanville (1636-80), Simon Patrick (1626-1707) who became Bishop of Ely, Edward Stillingfleet (1635-99) Bishop of Worcester, and two Archbishops of Canterbury, John Tillotson (1630-94) and Thomas Tenison (1636-1715). They were, on the whole, conservative men who held Reason in high regard and who had utmost contempt for the various forms of ecstatic individualism which were then beginning to be known as 'enthusiasm'. The significance of this group will be more closely considered in direct connection with Waterland in the following chapter.¹

The one unifying factor in the midst of all the diversgencies was the common loyalty to the Bible. Verbal infallibility was apparently the underlying theory of Bible inspiration but the uncritical acceptance of the Bible did not lead even to the raising of such questions as the manner of inspiration. The slight change in emphasis, begun by Milton and

¹. p. 93
others who sincerely professed great reverence for the Book but who began to seek moral guidance within its pages rather than theological propositions, was the only precursor of the future struggles over its very authenticity.

The state of the Church during this period was extremely turbulent. It experienced in succession the early Stuarts, with their emphasis on Divine Right of Kings resulting under Archbishop Laud in an extreme form of Anglicanism; the Protectorate with its Presbyterian triumph; and the Restoration which, with James II, nearly reinstated Catholicism. As a further complication, following the establishment of the Hanoverian line, which should have restored some semblance of normality within the church, or at least a greater measure of tolerance, a considerable number of the clergy refused to swear allegiance to the new sovereigns. They had fought all their lives for the doctrines of Divine Right and Passive Obedience, and now they preferred to suffer rather than to abandon what they believed to be part of the divine will. Thus the Non-jurors, though admirable for their courage and conviction, deprived the Church of more than 4,000 of her leaders when she could ill afford to spare them.

Notwithstanding these chaotic conditions the last years of the seventeenth century saw some signs of active life within the Church. There was the formation of the Religious Societies, composed of godly young laymen who assembled for
prayer and discussion, pledged themselves to a monthly or weekly Communion, and interested themselves in philanthropic undertakings. And the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge arose in 1698, with its purpose of providing religious literature, catechetical libraries and free schools for the Church overseas as well as at home, especially in the villages where there were no libraries. There was also a growing humanitarian concern which expressed itself in prison reform, the foundation of hospitals and the formation of Societies for the Reformation of Manners. Whether these activities actually testify to the existence of life in the Church or to the fact that in some hearts there was an irrepressible desire to know God and serve Him, in spite of the uncertain state of the Church, would be difficult to assess.

In spite of the rational atmosphere of this century its theology was in many ways irrational. The irrationality of professing supreme devotion to the Bible and then subjecting its every precept to an obviously higher authority, of labouring to build a naturalistic structure on a supernatural foundation, of claiming that divine honours should be paid to Christ and just as steadfastly repudiating his Godhead, all indicate that rationalism in some aspects was little better than a surface movement. "Reason" began to degenerate into a relativistic common sense and this, along with the fear of enthusiasm and the unwillingness of many of the doctrinal innovators to risk
loss of preferment in the Church, led to an eighteenth century in which the mainsprings of both the religious and political life of the country were relaxed.

The Eighteenth Century. The beginning of this century has been called "the threshold of modern times" and it is, in a special sense familiar to the modern mind. Cragg pointed out that:

... the place of reason, the character of morality, the limits of authority, the nature of universe, the reign of law — these are all questions which we still debate. ... in essentially the same spirit. ... The man in the street was ready to consider the issues raised in the seventeenth century. Waterland, writing in 1732, quotes Nicholls who wrote at the turn of the century:

It is dreadful to think what numbers of men are poisoned by infidel principles. For — they begin to talk them in shops and stalls, and the cavils of Spinoza and Hobbes are grown common even to the rabble.

A unique development was the calling into question of the very foundations of natural religion itself. Berkeley and Hume no longer devoted much thought to the question of Christian evidences but were challenging the traditional conception of God. Shaftesbury was saying, before the century was even well begun, that if there were a God, He could do no

more than ratify the immutable and self-existent distinctions of right and wrong, beauty and deformity. Philosophers were beginning to resent the necessity of making their findings serve theology.

Locke's philosophy was typical of the eighteenth although he lived mostly in the seventeenth century. The passion that motivated his investigation of God and Bible was a desire for mathematical certainty. The distinction he made between reason and revelation became an eighteenth century norm:

Reason is natural revelation whereby the Eternal ... communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties. Revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God.

Christianity was to be simplified to the point of recognizing as a Christian any person who accepted Christ as a Messiah. Locke spoke against the traditional systems of theology but he held firmly what he considered to be the fundamentals.

John Toland was a great exponent of "natural religion" and he undermined revelation in his attempt to make reason and revelation the same thing which would relegate the Bible to a mere possible source of Divine direction. His complete indifference to Church authority resulted in his accommodation of Scripture to what he considered to be the voice of reason.²

He took Locke's premises to their logical conclusions but arrived at such a different point of view that he was usually associated with the rise of Deism whereas Locke's orthodoxy was seldom questioned.

The style of orthodox defence that developed in the first half of the century is represented by Joseph Butler. The main thesis of his *Analogy* was that the same mystery exists in both nature and Scripture so both must have the same author. He was answering the *Christianity Not Mysterious* theme of Toland and maintains that faith ceases to be faith if there is no element of mystery. He perceived that the real weakness of eighteenth century Deism was its inclination to make man the measure of all things and his penetrating analysis of such inadequacies contributed to the discrediting of Deism in the course of the first half of the century.

In commenting on the theological works of the period, John Dowden commends the Church for being willing to meet the opponents of revelation on their own ground. He thus acknowledges that the major writers were grounding their works on philosophy. He says further that "there has been a tendency to unduly underrate the labours of the eighteenth century and to regard contemptuously an epoch that did much valuable if not very brilliant work." A possible explanation

---

for the lack of brilliancy can be found in the metaphysical character of the arguments and in the prevalence of controversial writing in which skill is not so readily recognizable as in essays or treatises.

The early years of the eighteenth century were marked by fierce religious disputes in which the Presbyterians, who were bent on gaining rights equal to those of the Anglicans, attempted to take advantage of William III's Calvinistic predisposition. Finally, in the reign of Queen Anne, it appeared that the contesting parties reached a stalemate and there settled down over the country an era of exhaustion, rather than peace. The Tories were in power and in close alliance with the High Church party in 1702 but after their abortive attempts to restore the Convocations of the Church, the Whigs were able to gain the ascendancy and held it from 1714 to 1760. This fairly even balance of power meant that neither group could put through its reforms and both were depleting themselves trying to gain the majority.

The Church, as an influence in public life, probably reached its lowest ebb in this period. Although there were exceptions such as Bishop Burnet, Archbishop Wake, and Archbishop Sharp, the clergy was, as a class, unpopular. A combination of non-residence, pluralism, nepotism and sycophancy raised an ever more audible complaint that found its expression in non-attendance at the services as well as in
outright denunciation of the rich clergy for their avarice. The poorer servants of the Church, who often did all the work that was done in the place of their absentee superiors, were despised as being ignorant and untrained. As each bishop was obliged to spend more than half the year in London, and travel was so slow, he very seldom saw his own clergy and such functions as confirmation were regularly performed on a large scale because they were so infrequent. It is recorded that Wake, when Bishop of Lincoln, confirmed as many as 1200 at one sitting at Grantham in 1709.¹

The Industrial Revolution, in the latter half of the century produced enormous changes in the life of the people and was one of the great turning-points of history. New sources of power along with advance in technology created vast industrial areas and completely changed the pattern of life for a large number of people. The Church of England seems to have been largely indifferent to these changes, probably due to the lack of leadership and political stalemate. But a new outbreak of life, more often manifested outside the Church than within, did appear. The Evangelical Revival, as it has since been called, however irksome the 'Sabbath-keeping' of 'methodism' may have been, and however frequently denounced as 'fanatical', was led by earnest men who, being unacceptable in most churches of the Establishment, preached fiery, heart-searching messages on any street corner or in any available

¹ See the figures in N. Sykes, Church and State in England in the XVIII Century (1934), Appendix A.
barn so long as a crowd could be gathered. The influence of John Wesley was but a part of this great movement of the Spirit which affected the Church in many ways. There was some stirring within the High Church party at this time, chiefly in reaction to the Evangelicals but it was not far-reaching. The sounding of the voice of liberalism, criticising both Enthusiasm and Ecclesiasticism and calling for the reformation of creeds, liturgies and institutions, was, of course, to be heard in this progressive eighteenth century. As a result of their activity there were passed in 1791, a number of acts, calling for 'Relief' for Dissenters and Catholics. Through all these developments the established Church remained largely intolerant of other Christians, and even the Evangelicals within the Church were generally regarded as being insufferably puritanical and extravagant. Some of the incidents reported in Wesley's Journal could well justify such judgment but the only signs of spiritual vitality in this period seem to have been in these 'unofficial' movements.

This short summary reveals the extent to which Daniel Waterland, the loyal churchman, was caught up in the current of his times. His Church admittedly was decadent but it is, nevertheless, plain that any history of the eighteenth century must involve the history of that Church. All the distinguishable philosophical trends and patterns of thought were in some definite way related to it. The growth of scientific thought
and the love of Reason, giving rise to Deism, were in most instances an indication of a search by Church members for a purer and simpler faith. The pantheistic and unitarian character of Deism was perceived by few at this time. The appearance of the Evangelicals indicates a similar seeking for a more personal and vital religious experience which the Church apparently did not afford, but few of the evangelical leaders could have realized the far-reaching disruptive possibilities with which their quest was fraught. The spirit of liberalism expressed itself first in the longing for emancipation from tradition and provincialism as manifested in the Church but the request was always for reform and not for secession. Waterland is not typical of his century being conservative and often reactionary, but he reacted to the primary impulses of the age. These are better epitomized, perhaps, by the deeply religious churchman John Locke whose Christian faith rested upon three essentials - Reason, Simplicity and Morality.

Basil Willey has written one of the best recent accounts of the "Nature" of the eighteenth century. He shows that it loses all reference to what is original or primitive, and relates more to what is congenial to those in whom human nature is most fully developed, the educated of the more polite nations. ¹ Willey uses a typical phrase of Dryden's to

¹ Basil Willey, The Eighteenth Century Background, pp. 19f.
establish this: "those things which delight all ages, must have been an imitation of Nature." Who "all ages" were, was never made clear. This individualistic and relative standard is responsible for the uncertainty that appears in much of the theological writing of the time.

The eighteenth century revealed that "nature" was as much in need of explanation as some of the perplexities of natural phenomena and it became increasingly plain that the stress on reason, in spite of its acknowledged benefits, could produce a rationalism that became oppressive as it exercised a more and more constricting influence on religious thought. To force religion into a utilitarian mould was to make it inadequate for the needs of the whole man and rational theology could not replace from its own resources some vital principles of religion that were only to be found within the sphere of revelation. The success of the Wesleys in this period suggests that a reaction had already set in at the mid-century point and Hume strengthened that reaction by proving, with a compelling chain of reasoning, that man cannot live by reason alone. Kant's demonstration of the inconclusiveness of the Rationalist's theistic arguments further weakened the dominance of Rationalism as a philosophy and helped to prepare the way for Idealism.
CHAPTER II

WATERLAND AS A THEOLOGIAN

As Waterland was one among many eighteenth century theologians some of whom were only of temporary significance, and because his works are not cited as frequently as are many of his contemporaries, it is necessary to show, by the estimate of his friends and the respect of his opponents, by the judgment of qualified historians, and by a candid assessment of his scholarship, that his theological writing is of superior quality.

I. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

Waterland’s literary manner was suited to theological writing in that there was about it a dignity and composure that remained even when he found it necessary to retaliate to the utterly scornful treatment that seemed to be essential to the style of some controversialists. To be acquainted with Waterland’s works is to feel that Van Mildert was not indulging in biographical adulation when he said of his author:

... there was a generosity, a noble-mindedness in his disposition which, if it did not always restrain him from impetuosity, never suffered him to harbour a rancorous sentiment under the mask of affected.
candour and forbearance. 1

Waterland's willingness to recognize ability and other praiseworthy qualities of his opponents would seem to support this comment of Van Mildert. Waterland affirmed of Clarke that he did not wish to:

... undervalue what he has now, or at any time well written for the real service of religion; but the better he has performed in some points, the more necessary is it to take notice where he has deserved censure. 2

In referring to Clarke's character he was frank to say that he found "no fault with the author's morality, which is excellent; ... he appears to have been sincerely well affected to virtue and Christian morality. ", 3

Another observation that may aid the acquiring of a clearer conception of Waterland's approach to the problems of theology is that his style was enlivened by wit. It broke through the heaviness of the subject frequently and was displayed to good advantage particularly when his assailants remained anonymous. In response to the Objector's remark that Baalam's ass must have had quite a number of ideas to speak as it did, Waterland retorted:

Now as to the number of ideas which the ass must have; I believe, she had as many as asses commonly have; and he may please to count them at his leisure, for his own amusement! 4

1. Works, I, 343.
2. Ibid., V, 574.
3. Ibid., V, 427.
4. Ibid., in answer to Tindal's Christianity as Old as the Creation. VI, 108.
This quotation, and those of the previous paragraph, are cited to indicate the underlying attitude that prevailed in spite of the raucous name-calling that was part of the style at the time. Serious theological work was done in spite of this and done, certainly in Waterland's case, with considerable grace.

An appreciation of Waterland's controversial effectiveness requires an understanding of those special abilities that he demonstrated throughout his works. That he was a formidable antagonist could be concluded from Bishop Watson's comment on his writings: "... they were much esteemed by the orthodox, and they may be properly consulted by such Arians and Socinians as wish to know what can be advanced against their principles."¹ Overton judged him to be: "... the ablest controversialist, perhaps, of the eighteenth century."² The particular skill that called for the generous estimates cited above was his ability to pursue a given point through all the verbal twists and turns of his disputants. He was meticulous in pursuing the fine points but never seemed to get lost in the detail or to spend time on inconsequential matter.

¹. Cited by Wm.T. Lowndes in British Librarian, p. 629.
A careful reading of the Deistic literature that appeared in the latter part of the seventeenth century and the early part of the eighteenth, will reveal the tendency to retain familiar phrases but to redefine meanings. Waterland was expert in the detection of this and no doubt disconcerted any who might have been inclined to indulge in it by such meaningful thrusts as the following:

I was once of the opinion (but let it pass for conjecture only) that the Doctor, having a mind to introduce the Arian heresy, thought to do it obliquely; not by calling the Son a creature, which is gross, but by denying his necessary existence, which comes to the same thing; and yet this was to be done covertly, under the name of self-existence; a word with two faces, one to oblige friends, the other to keep off adversaries. But this may be my fancy only.

It was this insight, combined with a remarkable clarity of expression, that resulted in "lucid controversial writing" that would assure him "a standard place amongst English theologians," at least in the opinion of Debary. Overton's recognition of this unique combination is apropos here:

... the faculties both of thinking clearly and of expressing thoughts clearly are absolutely essential. These two qualifications Dr. Waterland possessed in a remarkable degree. He always knew exactly what he meant, and he also knew how to convey his meaning to his readers. His style is nervous and lucid, and he never sacrifices clearness to the graces of diction. But no one can ever complain that Dr. Waterland is obscure.

1. Works, II, XVIII.
There were other abilities that contributed to the quality of Waterland's theological writing and some of these will be recognized as they appear in the actual study of his doctrine. His insight and precise manner of expression were mentioned in this preliminary statement because they do characterize all of his works.

The Testimony of his Friends and of his Opponents.
A theologian's friends and correspondents will usually indicate something of his standing. In this case, the names are significant: Bentley, Sherlock, Law, Jenkin, Grey, Baker, Lewis, Chapman, Wheatly, Felton, Horbery and Hearne. It will be recognized that these men, who were his personal friends, were among the foremost leaders of the Church of England. There may be added to these names those of Archbishops Potter and Dawes, and of Bishops Robinson and Gibson, who by commendatory speeches or other recognition of his prowess, testified to the quality of his theological contribution. Although Bishops Watson and Van Mildert were of a later date, their high esteem for his works has significance.

A further revelation of a controversialist's standing is seen in the calibre of his opponents. Clarke, Whitby, and Sykes were all men of distinguished ability and, although Jackson's reputation stood at a slightly lower level, his dogged determination must class him as a worthy foe. Indirect opposition came from Middleton, Hoadly and Whiston.
The Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament, which was published in 1735 by Bishop Hoadly, who was a disciple and friend of Samuel Clarke, was one of the reasons for the appearance of Waterland's treatise on the Eucharist that came out in 1737.

In view of the number of Clarke's antagonists, it is enlightening to read Debary's opinion that, "Clarke's chief opponent in this controversy was Dr. Waterland",¹ It is too much to say, with Hore, that Waterland "... utterly demolished Clarke and his teaching",² but at least it is justifiable to conclude that they were in the same class.

Leslie Stephen is the only recognized writer who has devoted any real effort to his criticism of Waterland's theology within the last seventy-five years. A brief consideration of the man and of his theological point of view may be useful in assessing Waterland's theological worth since his discussion of Waterland was a singular performance and of comparatively recent date.

Stephen decisively rejected the historical evidence of Christianity in 1862. He had begun his training for the Christian ministry and, although he "... had never taken the clerical vocation very seriously",³ he did not relinquish his orders until 1875. His essays on "Free Thinking and Plain

¹ Debary, op. cit., p. 456.
Speaking", published in 1873, constituted him a leader of the agnostic school and a chief challenger of the orthodox faith. He was president of the Ethical Societies of London and a further manifestation of his interest in ethics appeared in the publication of his **Social Rights and Duties** in 1896. His interests were in these ways typical of nineteenth century religion and it was therefore not surprising that he should refer to Waterland's writing as a

... brutal theology which gloried in trampling on the best instincts of its opponents, and which is, in the sphere of religion, what a cynical admiration of brute force is in the sphere of politics.  

nor that he should describe it as "... this most unlovely product of eighteenth century speculation".  

This was but an eloquent way of saying that he objected to Waterland's "... natural tendency to ground the evidence of religion upon the testimony of facts", and could not tolerate that the "... historical basis was the sole and sufficient basis.  

Stephen's ethical key-note and his rejection of much of the Bible obliged him to criticize Waterland's theology.

**The Estimation of recognized Historians.** It is admitted that the evaluation of Waterland's theological contribution by men writing on the period, even though they are for the most part church historians and well acquainted with theological

---

2. **Loc. cit.**
3. **Loc. cit.**
literature, may reflect their own bias but the following references are not submitted for the sake of accurate classification but rather for the purpose of providing a consensus of opinion of those familiar with the century.

John Dowden, after surveying the theological literature of the Church of England, called the eighteenth century "the age of the Christian Apologists". This designation, combined with Dowden's great appreciation of Waterland, would make it appear that, in the estimation of one who was familiar with the whole field of theological writing, the work of Waterland had left its mark on the century. Overton, after discussing Waterland's method, concluded the remarks by describing him as "... this great writer - one of the few really great divines who belong to the eighteenth century and who handled the mysterious subject of the trinity." The word "great" is again employed by Creed and Boys Smith when they state that: "Though there were exceptions, such as Waterland, the great theological writers of the eighteenth century were not interested in patristic learning as the divines of the seventeenth century had been..." 

A judgment of Waterland's writing as religious literature is found in the affirmation of Plummer:

When we look more particularly at religious literature there are some great names... works which are still of great value; and Waterland's Critical History of the Athanasian Creed.\(^1\)

Miller lists Waterland with Swift, Berkeley, Butler and others as being evidence that, among the learned professions, "... the clergy produced as many authors of distinction as any other."\(^2\)

There seems to be no difference of opinion among historians as to Waterland's loyalty to the fundamentals of the Faith. Leslie Stephen was convinced that he was "the greatest living champion of orthodoxy" which is a denotation of particular interest because Stephen's antipathy for Waterland's doctrine was so pronounced that he would hardly give him undue recognition.

It was the considered opinion of Creed and Boys Smith that England, in the second half of the eighteenth century, "... no longer maintained the position in theological thought she had held during the earlier half of the century."\(^3\) In view of the agreement of numerous writers that Waterland's theological influence was important, it would not be overstraining the point to conclude that his untimely death in 1740 had some

---

3. Creed and Boys Smith, op. cit., p.xxvi.
bearing upon the qualitative reduction in English theological thought in the second half of the century.

**Reasons for the loss of interest in Waterland's works.**

The question that remains to be answered after viewing the numerous testimonies to Waterland's genius is: why is he so seldom quoted or read to-day? It is true that his name appears in the title of a book published as recently as 1940¹ but it can safely be said that his works are not usually rated with those of the foremost theologians of his period. This observation may be substantiated by a perusal of the Table of Contents of any recently published eighteenth century studies. Chapters are devoted to Butler, Clarke, Tindal, Whiston, Sherlock, Law or Wesley but not one book contains a similar article on Waterland. This seems inconsistent with the commendation given him by many of these modern authors in passing references.

There is no evidence that Waterland's writing was in any way inferior to the others. The surrounding circumstances were undoubtedly responsible for the apparent loss of interest in his contributions. In the first place nearly all of his work was done in opposition to someone else's theology and with frequent reference to it. The only major exceptions to this

---

were his **Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist**, and **Critical History of the Athanasian Creed**, both of which it has been noted, were generally recognized as being superior. The genius of pursuing a point through the intricacies of theological verbiage, sometimes deliberately obscure, and of continuing the chase through a series of "replies" to a well-defined and clearly stated conclusion, may not be as apparent as in the case of a carefully worded treatise. Waterland was convinced of the absolute necessity of this pursuit:

> We desire no metaphysics but in our own necessary self-defence; if you begin in that way, we must also enter the lists in the same way, and oppose false metaphysics with true; to show the world your wanderings and your inconsistencies, even in what you most rely upon, . . .

but he tried, as far as possible, to avoid useless quibbling.

He often protested the devious paths of his opponents:

> . . . it was with me a preliminary article, that we should not run from point to point, to make a rambling and fruitless dispute of it; without settling and clarifying any thing. . . . It would be endless for me to explain my meaning every time you mistake it; for every explanation will still want a further explanation, and so on ad infinitum. I have neither leisure nor inclination to proceed in this way; nor do I see to what purpose it is.  

Waterland was quite aware of the limitations of such debate and would, without doubt, have chosen a more effective means

---

of accomplishing his end but there seemed to be no alternative. Doctrine had been advanced that needed counteraction, he had launched upon his career at the crucial time, and his abilities were particularly suited to polemical writing.

A second reason for Waterland's loss of prominence was that his works did not echo a certain characteristic note of the eighteenth century. He thought that the revolt against tradition and history was a passing reaction and was unwilling to surrender the light shed by the early writings upon the Scripture. In this matter he found himself at odds with many who gained public recognition by their avowal of the newly exalted arbiter of truth, reason, which was believed to be antagonistic to tradition in general. He was no opponent of reason in its proper sphere, nevertheless, his patristic emphasis quite possibly has diminished his importance for historians of eighteenth century that is generally remembered for an "enlightenment" that revolted against the past.

That Waterland's influence has always been classed among conservative forces would certainly lessen the possibility of his being given equal recognition with those that provided historians with a new and thus distinctive means of classification. Waterland was not a conservative in any extreme sense but Cragg, writing of seventeenth century men who also were wary of novelty, supports the contention that the tendency is to forget the contribution of those who do not forsake the
past so readily:

... nor should the contribution of the conservatives be overlooked. An 'anchor out of the stern' may help to forestall disaster.¹

**Waterland's scholarship.** From the account of his life it is plain that he was of a studious nature and that he sought to utilize every opportunity to improve his mind. He wrote of his controversy with Jackson:

I was more inclined to it, for my own instruction and improvement, ... no method could be more proper for the training up one's mind to a true and sound judgment of things, than that of private conferences in writing; exchanging letters, making answers, ... .²

Waterland greatly appreciated scholarship and had little patience with those who tried to base their arguments on their sincerity alone. He advised one of his correspondents to:

"... believe also that others, as sincere as you, have carefully studied the same Scriptures; ... Our business is not to consider the sincerity of the men but the nature, quality, and tendency of the doctrine ... by the strength of the evidence."³

Not only did he argue from evidence but he displayed an unusual ability in knowing what could or could not be safely admitted, what was irrelevant, and what was really pertinent to the argument. In controversial literature this is, in a special sense, a mark of scholarship.

Although the need was generally ignored in the early eighteenth century and most of the issues that challenged

2. Works, I, iii.
3. Ibid., III, 8.
Waterland did not require it, there was an indication of a critical approach to the ancient manuscripts in several of his incidental remarks. His reference to "a marginal gloss.. afterwards foisted into the text", and his contention that he had "good reason, and sufficient authority, even for correcting the manuscripts in relation to that word; showing by an historical deduction and critical reasons what the reading ought to be, . . . "2 are at least suggestive of his technique in study.

One of his accomplishments which was never employed in any of his printed works and thus not generally appreciated, was a proficiency in English Bible manuscripts. In his letters to Lewis3 he revealed familiarity with at least ninety versions and manuscripts and he made detailed reference to twenty-five major manuscripts. Painstaking work in English etymology is displayed throughout the correspondence and he must have been acquainted with most of the larger libraries in England to have gained such thorough knowledge of the subject. Van Mildert attested his ability in this field with the following:

Many of his observations on the peculiarities of style, phraseology, and orthography, in the earliest English translations of the Bible, and on the internal evidence of the times in which they were written, show much critical sagacity and discernment: . . . .4

2. Ibid., IV, 62.
3. Ibid., X, 288 f.
4. Ibid., I, 299.
In dealing with Waterland's doctrinal teaching there will be opportunity for only indirect reference to his scholarship. For this reason a short account of his *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed* is here provided as an example of the thoroughness of his work and the calibre of his erudition. That he made a creditable contribution is proved by the fact that nearly all further research relating to origin and authorship of the Creed takes his findings into account.

The issue that led Waterland to take up this study grew out of the effort of Clarke and others to undermine the Trinitarian teaching of the Creed by showing that it was of a much later date that had been formerly concluded. The antiquity of such a document determined the degree of authority that it could wield in doctrinal disputes and so there was need for a competent investigation of its sources at this particular time.

He first listed the opinions of thirty-two modern scholars who had expressed their views on the date and authorship of the Creed. The majority dated it in the fifth or sixth century but there was considerable variation as to the author. The largest number of the scholars who were in agreement was the eight who believed the author to be Italian. Clarke's views in the matter were included and the lateness of the date he advocated was conspicuous. In the next chapter Waterland cited the ancient testimonies as to its public reception and use,
beginning with the Council of Autun in 670 and coming down
to the year 1439. Of the thirty-six authorities, sixteen
implied a date for public reception earlier than 1000, which
was Clarke's date for its first admission into the Church.
In the third chapter evidence relating to the title and re-
ception of the Creed was gathered from the manuscripts of
ancient commentators and paraphrasts. The first of these
was Venantius Fortunatus in the year 570 and there were twelve
others of various nationality, each succeeding the other
chronologically until the year 1478. The fourth chapter was
entirely devoted to the Latin manuscripts since there was
little doubt that the Creed was originally written in Latin,
and began with a text which Archbishop Ussher had dated at
600. Twenty-four others were taken in order concluding with
a manuscript from the Bodleian Library which was written in
1400. He took particular notice of whether the Psalters were
Gallican or Roman in this section intending to use the informa-
tion in determining the place of origin. Only two were Roman,
neither being among the earlier ones, and the rest were
Gallican. The fifth chapter was devoted to the ancient
versions, printed or manuscript. The examination of these
shed light on the time and place of reception and indicated
the value placed upon the Creed in the different countries.
The French versions were the earliest, beginning at 850, and
the others, listed chronologically according to the date of
each country's version, were: German, 870; Anglo-Saxon, 930; and the Greek versions which were much later. The sixth chapter was then used to consider the reception of the Creed in the churches of the different countries. France or Gaul was again first with the date 550. The chronological listing of the others resulted in the following order: Spain, Germany, England and Italy. Rome was separately considered and listed last having received the Creed in 930. There was a concluding general consideration of the Eastern churches. In the seventh chapter Waterland proceeded to incorporate the findings of the preceding chapters with the evidence gained by examination of the early records as to the specific heresies that appeared in different periods of early church history and from this he drew conclusions relating to time and place of authorship. The eighth chapter dealt specifically with the identifying of the author of the Creed. In the ninth he further substantiated his affirmation that the Creed contained nothing but the doctrines held by the Church in the very earliest times by placing, in parallel columns, the Creed and passages pertinent to the credal doctrine from authors who lived and wrote before 430. In the tenth chapter he provided a complete commentary on the Creed attempting to show the logic and solid scriptural support upon which the various articles were based. In the final chapter he endeavoured to vindicate the Church of England's receiving and retaining of the Creed.
Waterland concluded that the Creed was first published in Gaul about 430 and he ascribed its composition to Hilary, Bishop of Arles. His reasons for selecting Hilary may be summed up as follows: (1) the Creed reads like a statement of faith such as a bishop might compose upon the beginning of his episcopacy, (2) Hilary's ability is acknowledged to have been equal to such a work, (3) Honoratus, who compiled a life of Hilary, made reference to his work entitled Symboli expositio ambienda which was similar to a title prefixed to some copies of the Athanasian Creed, (4) Hilary admired Augustine which could account for the similarity between the Creed's phraseology and the expressions of the Bishop of Hippo, (5) Vincentius, who belonged to the monastery of Lerins, of which Hilary was once abbot, appears to imitate many of the phrases in the Creed, (6) the character and style of Hilary's extant writing is very similar to the terse, antithetic language of the Creed.

Although it would have been no reflection upon Waterland's ability, had later discoveries proved him wrong, it is interesting that modern scholarship, has sought the origins of the Quicumque Vult in much the same general direction. The final Report of the Ritual Commission of 1867, which raised the issue of the use of the Creed in the Church, led to fresh investigations of its early history. J.R. Lumby's The History of the Creeds, appearing in 1873, and C.A. Swainson's works in
1870 and 1875\(^1\) both supported the view that there were two separate compositions that were not brought together to form the Creed, as we have it to-day, until the ninth century. The two-portion theory was also supported by Professor Harnack and this theory prevailed for a time although G.D.W. Ommanney's works, *The Athanasian Creed* in 1875, and *Early History of the Athanasian Creed* in 1880, opposed the theory and contended for fifth century authorship. Lumby challenged the dates which Ommanney assigned to three early commentaries; the Paris, Bouhier, and Oratorian, which were the mainstays of his case, and thus the matter was left undecided. By 1897, however, Loofs could declare that the two-portion theory was dead.\(^2\)

More significant was A.E. Burn's *The Athanasian Creed and Its Early Commentaries*, published in 1896, in which he concluded that the two-portion theory rested on evidence that was incomplete, that the earliest commentaries demonstrate the union of the portions in a single work from the inception of the Creed, and that the internal evidence points irresistibly to the time of the Apollinarian heresy which latter

---

1. There were two: *The Athanasian Creed and its Usage in the English Church*, (1870), and "An Account of the Growth and Reception of the Sermon on the Faith Commonly Called 'The Creed of St. Athanasius'", contained in his work entitled *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, (1875).

2. In 1897, F. Loof's *Athanasium* appeared in the third edition of *Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. 
conclusion was the exact original argument of Waterland. Burn substantiated the conclusions of Waterland in practically every item except the identity of the author. He based his selection of Honoratus, founder of Lerins and Bishop of Arles in 427, upon two funeral sermons preached by Hilary and Faustus. Faustus was unknown to Waterland.

In one of the last articles that the aged Dr. Burn wrote, in 1926, entitled The Authorship of the Quicumque Vult, he says: "I have always contended for the theory of Waterland that the creed dated from Apollinarian times." And goes on to explain that, after reading Seeberg's review of Brewer's article with its very scholarly presentation of evidence favouring fourth century authorship by Saint Ambrose, he is quite convinced that no better conclusion had been reached.

No one devoted more attention to the Creed's history than the French Benedictine Dom Germain Morin and his changing opinions reflect the complexity of the problem. He was first led to postulate Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, (died in 542), another member of the Lerins community, as the author.

4. This conclusion is largely accepted by F.J. Badcock, History of the Creeds, 2nd Ed., (1938).
By 1911 he felt there was no certain testimony to the use of the Creed before the time of Isadore of Seville.¹ But the brief note in his "Études, Textes, Découvertes"² suggests a reluctance to abandon the earlier date and Caesarian associations, which, of course, approximate more closely to Waterland's findings³.

The value of painstaking and astute research, even under the handicap of certain source limitations, was demonstrated in this early eighteenth century treatise by the Master of Magdalene. The wisdom of concurring with Headlam's reference to, "the well-known work of Waterland, an admirable example of English scholarship"⁴ will be recognized.

---

3. Cf. also A.C. Headlam, History, Authority, and Theology.
II. BASIC FACTORS IN WATERLAND'S THEOLOGY

General views on doctrine. Waterland repeatedly stated that his basic test for the truth of any doctrine was that it must "... be tried by Scripture, reason, and antiquity." The order of these was important and never varied: Scripture was revealed truth; reason led to the best interpretation of revealed truth; and antiquity provided confirmation of that interpretation of revealed truth. Thus Revelation must always be given first place, but it was linked with antiquity in the particular sense indicated in the following:

There are two ways of proving the antiquity, and consequently the verity of a doctrine; namely, Scripture and Church history; and these two differ only in the manner of proof, or in the degree of moral certainty. Since each of these three will be examined separately this brief recognition of their importance to Waterland's theological structure will suffice except to point out that the strength of his doctrinal writing lay in the combining of historical evidence with rational interpretation. He did not deny the value of nature's verification of theological truth, granting that:

... all the marks of wisdom, power, or majesty, discoverable in this grand palace, and august structure of the universe, are so many arguments of his divinity and proclaim him to be the eternal and omnipotent God.

1. Works, II, xiii.
2. Works, V, 270.
3. Ibid., II, 52, Letter to Mr. Stanton.
but the recognition of God's omnipotence was of little value without historical revelation.

Waterland saw himself as a defender of Primitive Church doctrine against all who menaced it and he did not feel it presumption to say, in writing to a friend: "My hands . . . are pretty full at present in maintaining the Catholic cause (allow me to so call it) against the Arians; . . . " Calvinism was a departure from the "Catholic" teaching because of its antinomian tendencies and, in this issue, he identified himself with Bull:

Bishop Bull's bitterest adversaries were mostly systematical men (properly so called) and such as had been bred up (during the great Rebellion) in the Predestinarian and Antinomian tenets . . . that excellent man prevailed over his adversaries; truth over error, antiquity over novelty, the Church of Christ over Calvin and his disciples.2

Little reference to Arminius is made in Waterland's Works but there is abundant evidence that he shared in the widespread reaction, in England, against the harsh expressions of Calvinist determinism.3 There was a presage of Arminian thought long before the name of Arminius came to be associated with it. Latimer, Hooper, Andrewes, Hooker and the Puritan, John Goodwin, were obviously influenced. Laud and Juxon were mainly responsible for bringing the teaching directly into relationship with the High Church theology but it was the Broad-Churchmen, Tillotson, Chillingworth, Stillingfleet and Burnet who first

2. Ibid., I, viii.
3. Cf. Works, II, 374 f. 389, where he states that the Articles and Liturgy are not Calvinistic.
showed signs of a theological system constructed on Arminian lines. The humanistic spirit of the Renaissance was translated into the theological and exegetical sphere by means of the Arminian school, but it may not be assumed that this spirit always led into the dogmatism of the common sense philosophy, with its war against the positive authority of revelation. The balanced outlook of the Cambridge Platonists, who were Arminian, is sufficient testimony of this.

Waterland's great admiration of the Latitudinarian bishops and his frequent quoting of such, of the Platonists, as Cudworth, (with only mild criticism of some of his views)¹ John Smith, Henry More, and Nathaniel Culverwell, would intimate that he would not take exception to their Arminianism. He sensed, with the others, that here was a doctrine more congenial to the strengthening of the scientific temper and to the principle of moderation. His reference to "Calvinian rigours"² is indicative of his underlying attitude that could not countenance the severe exclusiveness of the limited atonement.

Waterland evinces, to some degree, the doctrines contained in all of the Five Articles set forth in the Remonstrance of 1610, in Holland and West Friesland, as being the salient points of the Arminian position. He dwells sufficiently upon the necessity of man's choice to indicate his belief in conditional

2. Works, II, p.381.
election with its thought of God predestinating only according to His knowledge of our use of our wills. No hint of limited atonement is to be found in his writings. He quotes Archbishop Whitgift in favour of universal atonement and obviously is in agreement. The inability of man to exercise saving faith, or to accomplish anything really good without regeneration by the Holy Spirit, is of course, common ground to both Arminian and Calvinist but Waterland's doctrine of Depravity can be seen to be tempered somewhat with the thought that it is a bias toward evil which has been met and neutralized by Christ and leaves man responsible for, and capable of, choice. There is abundant evidence in his articles on Regeneration and Justification, that he definitely recognized the possibility of falling from Grace. While it is true that in Holland Arminianism gradually became incorporated into the Socinian theology and that it was sometimes rightly suspected of affinity with Pelagianism in England, there is no evidence that these tendencies were far-reaching within the Church and they certainly do not appear in the thinking of Waterland.

2. Cf. Ibid., VI, pp. 348, 352, 361.
Only two short articles on regeneration and justification appear among Waterland's works and his doctrine was that of many eighteenth century Anglican theologians; but the position is so interestingly stated that it would be amiss to omit some reference to it. His regeneration tract was published in 1739 when Wesley and Whitefield, with their emphasis on the New Birth considered as an experience quite apart from Baptism, seemed to require an answer setting forth the Anglican conception of baptismal regeneration. Remembering the strong Arminianism of Wesley, his steadfast advocacy of the necessity and efficacy of infant Baptism and his continual stress on the importance of good works as an evidence of regeneration, it may be assumed that much of the supposed difference of opinion involved terms instead of meanings. Wesley continually maintained, with considerable success, that he had not departed from the Prayer Book Articles and Homilies. What Wesley and Whitefield would call "regeneration", Waterland would call "renewing"; in every other sense their conceptions were similar. There was perfect agreement as to the efficiency of infant baptism until the age of accountability. Whitefield,

of course, was a Calvinist, but the charges of his Antinomianism are groundless. The evangelicals' unorthodox manner of preaching and the resultant physical demonstrations would quite naturally be viewed with alarm by such men as Waterland, with his abhorrence of extremes. His readiness to counteract the teaching, although it was doubtless sadly misrepresented at this time, is understandable.

The crux of the actual differences between Waterland and the Evangelicals was in the relation of Baptism to regeneration. His key text was Titus III, 4-6 which relates to "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." He drew a distinction between regeneration and renewing or "renovating." The regeneration was directly related to Water-baptism in that the water applied outwardly to the body, together with the grace of the Spirit applied inwardly to the soul, regenerated the man; or, in other words, the Holy Spirit in and by the use of Baptism, caused the new birth. The reference in John III to being born of "water and of Spirit" signified the Spirit as being the primary and effective means, and the water as being the secondary and instrumental means.¹ In this event it was God that adopted, regenerated and justified. Man is the recipient although he may be active

in the sense of meeting God's qualifications, as in the case of adults, or may be entirely passive, as in the case of infants. This regeneration carries with it the remission of sins and a covenant claim, for the time being, to eternal happiness. These privileges may be forfeited, or finally lost, if a person revolts from God, and he is no longer in a regenerate state; but God's original grant of sonship remains in force and becomes active the moment the revolter repents or turns. In such a case he will not require regeneration but renewing.

Renewal has to do only with adults and should be operative before, in and after Baptism. Signs of this renewing are the faith and repentance which are qualifications previous to Baptism and necessary to render it salutary. In the normal Christian experience this renewing effect will continue and increase throughout the Christian life. This is the meaning of Romans XII, 2 "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind". A chief difference between regeneration and renewal is that the former occurs only once and the latter may be often repeated. In the case of adults they must go together; otherwise the regeneration is not complete or effective.

Faith and repentance alone do not ordinarily regenerate without Baptism; however, under unusual circumstances it is presumed that God makes allowances. Strictly speaking an unbaptized believer is not buried with Christ into death nor
can he experience the likeness of his resurrection, and is not a member of Christ nor a child of God, nor a citizen of Christ's kingdom. The Baptism of a child confers on it all the covenant privileges and delivers it from the curse belonging to its state of nature. In the case of a hypocritical or impenitent candidate for Baptism, as the Holy Spirit consecrates and sanctifies the water, giving it an outward and relative holiness, so He consecrates the individual also in an outward and relative sense, whether good or bad, and the Baptism has its effect, either to the salvation of the person, if he repents, or to his greater damnation if he does not. Thus, under no circumstances, is it necessary to re-baptize.

As to the marks, or evidence, of the regenerate state Waterland was, typically, wary of any kind of emotion and felt that the man should be known by his heart and life and measured by the Commandments. This did not imply that a Christian lived without sin but:

"if we sincerely take care to do the best we can, are daily gaining ground of our vices and our passions, and find ourselves, after the strictest examination to be upon the improving hand, then may we comfortably believe that our regeneration abides, salutary and entire, and that we are in a state of grace and salvation." 2

1. Romans VI, 3-4.
2. Works, VI, p. 372.
The word "justification" is to be understood in two senses: in the active sense it signifies God's pronouncing a person just, and His accepting him as such; but in the passive sense it signifies man's being so declared, and accepted into new privileges and benefits. God, as Governor, contracts with man, laying down the terms of the covenant, and man accepts the terms and enters the covenant. This contract guarantees the remission of sins, a title to life eternal, (provided that the man lives up to the terms), and sanctification by the Holy Spirit. The term "sanctification" is further defined as meaning "unction" or "sealing", which must accompany all saving Baptism. It appeared to have much the same meaning as Waterland's "renovation" or inward renewing of the heart and mind but it obviously would not apply, to infants incapable of moral distinction in this sense, in spite of the fact that the infant, justified in its Baptism, is sanctified. Waterland distinguishes between sanctification as it applies to adults and to unaccountable children.

Justification is distinguished from regeneration in that the latter relates to the first admission of the believer to the rights and privileges of Sonship by regeneration, while the former continues throughout the spiritual life. A further distinction is that regeneration may be "salutary" or "not salutary" while justification imports a title to salvation, for the time being, on Gospel terms. And regeneration can
never be totally lost but justification can cease both totally and finally.

A number of constituent causes of justification are listed, in the order of their importance, by Waterland:

"... we are justified by God the Father, considered as principal and first mover; and by God the Son as meritorious purchaser; and by God the Holy Ghost, as immediate efficient; and by Baptism, as the ordinary instrument of conveyance; and by faith of such a kind, as the ordinary instrument of reception; and lastly, by faith and holiness, as the necessary qualifications and conditions in adults, both for the first receiving and for the perpetual preserving it."1

Waterland in concluding his tract on justification points out the two extremes to which men are liable in their conceptions of justification. The one is the "proud" extreme which disdains the grace of God because of self-sufficiency, and the other is the "libertine" extreme which abuses the doctrines of grace in order to serve the ends of licentiousness. It is unfortunate that the two articles dealing with regeneration and justification were so short and obviously written under pressure (the regeneration tract was the last thing he wrote before his death and he had been ailing for some time) because they do leave a number of questions unanswered. There is evidence2 that he undertook the article on justification in response to a special request by Dr. Grey and it would appear,

2. Ibis, I, p. 287.
apart from the state of his health, that he was not as at home with this subject as with some others.

The antipathy of the English Church for Roman Catholicism was shared by Waterland. He described the "professed Papists" as:

... men of the most inveterate hatred to our religion, laws and establishment, and to whatever tends to the prosperity and honour of the English Church or the English nation; who have been contriving all imaginable ways to blast and ruin our happy Reformation from the first commencing of it; have been concerned almost in every commotion of State, and active in every rebellion.†

"Popish infallibility" he contrasted with "Protestant certainty" characterizing the one as being an authoritarianism that forbids examination, and the other as being a certainty having a moral quality and being based upon Scripture and reason both of which encouraged examination. He believed in the exercise of private judgment but he checked the abuse of it by the precaution that, until it was certain that personal opinion was superior to the reasoning behind the precepts of antiquity, novelty must be avoided.

Theologians of Deistic tendencies were classed with rabid Calvinists and Roman Catholics as being among those who departed from the "Catholic" truth. Whereas the Calvinists and Romanists had been too authoritative in their different

ways the Deists wanted to eliminate authority, making fundamentals so few and so indefinite that one could believe anything and still be counted a Christian. Waterland found it difficult to be tolerant when he encountered a treatise that was,

... so indefinite and loose, that one scarce knows what it aims at; except it be, that nothing should pass for a fundamental which has been ever disputed by men calling themselves Christians, and professing Scripture, however interpreted, to be their rule. Which is judging of important truths, not by the Word of God, soberly understood, nor by Catholic tradition, nor by the reason of things, but by the floating humours and fancies of men, as if all Christian doctrines were to be expunged out of the list of necessaries which had the misfortune to be disputed among us. ...

Waterland had much to say about "fundamentals" but it was not extreme talk and it differed from that of many who also chose to defend the said "fundamentals." In the first place he recognized that not all doctrinal truth was of equal importance:

... there are some Scripture-doctrines of greater importance than others; and they generally make their estimate of that greater importance, by the relation or connection which any doctrine is conceived to have with Christian practice or worship, or with the whole economy of man's salvation by Christ. ... more depends upon it. ... more affects the vitals of Christianity.

A second feature was his reluctance to specify the exact number of primary doctrines. This concession, not always found

2. Ibid., V,p. 6.
among those of orthodox persuasion, was an indication of Waterland's respect for private opinion:

... there is no giving an exact catalogue of those important or fundamental doctrines; though it is for the most part easy to say of any particular doctrine which may be mentioned. ... We cannot give a complete catalogue of virtues any more than of articles of faith so as to be positive, that those particular virtues, and in such a particular degree, are necessary to all persons, or to any person that shall be named. The precise quantity of virtue absolutely necessary to salvation, is no more to be defined, than the precise quantity of faith.

This latitude may seem slight but when seen in a foremost champion of orthodoxy of the early eighteenth century it has meaning.

A third step in the same direction was an aversion to doctrinal discord where it could possibly be avoided. Some of Waterland's vigorous arguments would seem to disparage peace, but there is no reason to question the sincerity of the following:

... in slighter matters... not nearly affecting the vitals of Christianity, the rule is for Christians to bear with one another; not to divide or separate, but to agree among themselves; ... Peace is a very valuable thing and ought not to be sacrificed even to truth; unless such truth be important, and much may depend upon it. ... as to weightier matters, it concerns us carefully to observe, that rules of peace are but secondary and subordinate to those of piety or charity and must veil to them.²

---

2. ibid., V, p.10.
A fourth indication of concern for the graces as well as the doctrines is his admonition to be cautious in judging another's doctrine. He would "... not multiply necessaries without or beyond reason; ... "nor" ... be prying and inquisitive into their retired sentiments, ... " referring to lay-Christians. Ministers and candidates for the ministry should, in his opinion, be subject to careful examination but even where heretical tendencies were recognized, brotherly treatment was not to cease:

... not to proceed to rigours with any man till all gentle measures have been first tried; nor to break communion with any who do not openly espouse and pertinaciously abet false and pernicious doctrines. ... Where divine truths and human customs clash, we must 'obey God rather than man,' in other cases civility and tenderness toward all men, is true obedience towards God. ... but this is certain, we are as much (yes and more) obliged to maintain the fundamentals of faith as to keep the peace.²

It would appear that Waterland made a real effort to balance devotion to the truth with all possible concessions to private judgment but he could not, on the premises he had established, tolerate a compromise of the "prime articles." True Christian obedience must involve faith in the fundamental truths of Christianity but if a fellow-Christian chose to disbelieve, Waterland felt that this was within the realm of his personal rights and he was not to be restricted unless he tried to propagate his heresy.³

2. Ibid., V, p. 148.
3. Ibid., V, p. 234.
The oft-repeated charge of "dogmatism" was directed at Waterland by men with whose doctrinal leniency he would have agreed as it pertained to the individual, but in establishing the groundwork upon which the Church must build, especially when parts of that groundwork were being seriously undermined, fundamentals needed both definition and defence. The use of civil authority, in restraining heresy, was frequently debated in the eighteenth century and it was quite natural that the orthodox, accustomed to the close relationship between Church and State, should not object to its use. Waterland did not advocate civil interference unless, "... persons endeavour to poison the minds of the people with atheistical principles of irreligion and infidelity,"¹ in which case he felt that such imposition on the public warranted the use of civil authority as a measure of public protection.

Jackson's bitterest criticism of Waterland was expressed in reaction to Waterland's supposed disposition to "... threaten his adversaries with human authority."² He left no possibility of misunderstanding his meaning by saying further, "... if the Dr. has a Mind to see Heretics, as he calleth them roasted, he may soon have the Pleasure of it, by taking a Journey into Spain or Portugal."³

3. Ibid., pp. 11 f.
The statement that prompted such a denunciation was Waterland's remark that:

... every person, upon examination ought to find those things true, which the Church has formed into Creeds and Articles because they are, in the main as true and certain as mathematical and arithmetical demonstration and have such a degree of moral evidence to attest them, that the reason of mankind ought to receive them.

The extreme interpretation and deliberate exaggeration are plain in this instance but Jackson reveals to what lengths he would go to discredit creeds and credal subscription.

Waterland's answer to Jackson and others, who asserted that the requirement of subscription was as authoritarian as Roman Church compulsion, was that creeds were the result of self-evident truths and therefore men ought to examine them, (if capable) in order to ensure that they were true. If they examined with care, and decided with impartiality, they could not find them otherwise. He believed that there was nothing savouring of persecution in the imposing of such creeds under pain of church censures or in the exclusion of non-conformists from the ministerial function, "... but there is good order and discipline in it." Waterland's other main argument for credal subscription was that most of the articles that had been added to the original baptismal

2. Works, V, p. 141.
formulae, which were short, were included for the purpose of combating specific heresy. He was certain that heresy was still a force with which the Church must reckon.

The question of conscientious subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles was very much alive at this time and, because many of those who contended for the right of a subscriber to insert his own meanings were thought to be Arians, such subscription was called "Arian subscription." Waterland dealt with this question in his usual thorough manner maintaining that one subscribed not to words but to propositions and not for purposes of maintaining peace but for the assertion of personal belief. In as far as words conveyed established meanings, and the compilers and imposers had left little doubt as to what they meant by the words, he believed that subscribers could, with honesty, only testify to their acceptance of those very meanings. If there were some latitude in the meaning of the word, it would be certain that the correct understanding would not run counter to the "... known sense of the Church." Waterland challenged Clarke's statement that one need only subscribe, "... in such sense as is agreeable to Scripture..." and said that this really amounted to no more than subscribing, "... so far as is

2. The Case of Arian Subscription Considered, Works, I, p.279.
in their opinion agreeable to Scripture."¹

One of the main objections to creed-subscription appears to have been that such subscription was restrictive of personal liberty. Waterland answered this assertion by saying that if creeds and creed imposition is a fault, it is common to all parties. Doctrines were being imposed upon the public by those who:

... have as long creeds as others, only not the same creeds, and who are as confident in dictating, and as dogmatical in defining, and as eager to impose their own sentiments as it is possible for men to be. ... the real matter in controversy is, who shall have the drawing of them, or who shall impose them...²

Waterland, of course, held that constituted authority as found in the unanimous teaching of the Fathers was far more suited to prescribe terms of Church communion.

That subscription to a creed should not determine fellowship and that the requirement of such subscription was persecution of the worst sort was flatly denied by Waterland. He said that it was not persecution but rather obedience to scriptural injunction when,

... good Christians have suspended their good opinion of them ... Not for thinking as they please, (for thoughts are free), but for overt acts of heresy, or perhaps blasphemy; for making public appeals to the people, in order to draw them off from listening to their better guides, to seduce them from the faith.³

---

¹ Loc. cit.
² Ibid., V, p. 139
³ Works, V, p. 137.
If the maintenance of Christian truth is persecution, said he, then were Christ, the apostles, and the martyrs persecutors.

Waterland did not share the eighteenth century abhorrence of mystery. He never preferred mystery if understanding were possible but this demand that all things should either yield to human inquiry or be rejected led him to suspect that the root of this intolerance of mystery was an effort to avoid the commandments and the demands of Gospel teaching. He was convinced that the popular mind was being conditioned to doubt the existence of the unknown without realizing the intent of those who were exploiting the humour of the times to undermine the revelation that at least gave some meaning to the mysteries. It was, "... the property of the divine Being to be unsearchable; and if he were not so he would not be divine,"¹ said Waterland. He contended, as did Joseph Butler, that the fact of the incomprehensible should not restrain belief because the prevalence of mystery in the natural world was admitted by any student of nature and yet none were inclined to question the reality of that world. To reject mystery would be to reject all belief and could end only in atheism.

The eighteenth century quest for mathematical certainty had led philosophers to look for infallible proof in religion

¹ Works, V, p.13.
but Waterland maintained that, in the basic tenets of the Faith as well as in the other phases of life, the only degree of knowledge fitted for human capacities was not infallibility but "proper certainty." "The infallibility of science resting upon the nature of things and the supposed truth of our rational faculties, is quite another thing from personal infallibility. . . ." ¹

The controversy about infallibility was so employed by the opponents of orthodox doctrine that they could discredit any claims for revealed truth. They were saying, said Waterland, "Either you have certainty or you have not; if you pretend to certainty, that is claiming infallibility; if you renounce it, you have no authority to determine faith, or prescribe terms of communion." ² Waterland met this apparent dilemma by insisting that there were kinds and degrees of certainty and that, although infallibility was beyond the reach of man, he could have certainty sufficient to guard against scepticism or heresy, and to establish a legitimate authority. ³ He used a lengthy quotation from Chillingworth to support his position. The substance of the section quoted was: though the Church was not infallible, it could provide a basis for certainty through the combined,

¹ Works, V, p. 122.
² Ibid., V, p. 127.
³ Loc. cit.
evidence of Scripture, reason, and universal tradition. The evidence so derived enabled Chillingworth to believe the Articles of Faith to be as certain and as infallible as any geometrical theorem.¹

Waterland's doctrinal conservatism did not blind him to the value of reformation, but he conceived it to be a return to the original truths rather than an advancement through the development of novel ones. He illustrated this aptly:

Reformation is good, when reformation is wanting; but to be always reforming is no reforming at all; it is behaving as children tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine. All errors of any moment have been purged off long ago, by the care of our Reformers, and why then are we still reforming? Physic may be proper at certain seasons but to pretend to live constantly upon it, instead of food is a certain way to impair, and in a little time to destroy the best and soundest constitution in the world.²

This, of course, is consistent with his basic conviction that Christianity rested on historical fact and that the earliest interpretations of the fact were the best. Innovation must always be questioned because:

... in subjects which have already passed through many hands, and which have been thoroughly sifted and considered by the ablest and best heads in the course of 1700 years, there appears to be a great deal more room for judgment than for invention; since little new can now be thought on that is worth notice.³

2. Ibid., V, p.230.
3. Ibid., VII, p.10.
As proof of this he showed how an argument advanced by Descartes had been considered and confuted centuries before in the early Church. The foundational truth had been given and it was futile for men to attempt to augment it.

In keeping with the avoidance of extremes was his intense suspicion of "passion." The emotionalism of the Protectorate which, with its disruption of order, was to Waterland the extreme of retrogression and a demonstration that, "Violent passions and unruly affections are the worst guides imaginable." He doubtless had the Evangelical revival in mind when he said that true religion required, "... both a warm heart and a cool head; especially in a minister of it, if he proposes to do any good service in his function."

In summarizing his doctrinal approach it suffices to say that Waterland, in reaction to the extremes of Calvinism, followed the more moderate and rationalizing school of Arminius. He thought that reason should determine what was the irreducible minimum of fundamentals but at the same time, he recognized the limits of reason. His dogmatism always related to the basic doctrines and it was for the protection of the Church that he advocated credal subscription. The historical grounding of his faith was evident everywhere in his writing.

1. See Works., IV, p.462f.
2. Ibid., VI, p.377.
3. Loc. cit.
Waterland's evaluation of Scripture. The claim of Christian revelation that is so offensive to modern thought is, according to Oscar Cullmann, "... that all Christian theology in its innermost essence is Biblical history." He then goes on to say that, in his conception of theology, "There is... no room for speculations concerning God that ignore time and history." To preface a summary of Waterland's doctrine of Scripture with this modern example of the persistence of historically grounded theology is to recall that, although his presentation is more than 200 years old, it is not remote. Metaphysical notions of the Deity, such as Shaftesbury's, were rife in his day but;

... to pretend to believe that there is a God and a providence and a future state, and at the same time to desire no external revelation from God, no instructions from heaven, (as needing none, and being wise enough without any), is so wild and so extravagant a thought, that nothing can match it, or compare with it.  

This may sound unduly vehement but he recognized the Bible as the Church's complete rule of faith and manners, saying that, "Whatever Scripture contains, either in express words rightly understood or by consequence justly deduced, is Scripture doctrine and ought to be religiously believed and obeyed; ..." This recognition of deduced truth being on a

2. Works, VIII, p.23.
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par with truth stated in express words of Scripture has especial importance in the eighteenth century since a number of the controversies turned upon this point.

Waterland believed that there would always be someone, encouraged by "the grand enemy of mankind," who would try to corrupt and adulterate the charter but in his opinion,"... if such practices are suffered to go on without rebuke, there is an end of Christianity." His underlying objective in all of his writing was to counteract those interpretations of Christian doctrine that might be used to undermine Christianity itself.

Waterland detected the infiltration of eighteenth century philosophical relativism into Christian concepts and for this reason declared that, "There is an absolute necessity of fixing a certain rule, to prevent the endless excursions of flight and fancy. That rule is Scripture..." His dependence on the Scripture-rule to settle differences is not to be regarded as a naive escape from problems for he clearly saw that, as long as men used the Bible to support their private notions, and he was sure that they would always do so, it could never be an infallible means of silencing disputes but, he contended, both Scripture and antiquity would have their effect among reasonable men, and that was sufficient.

2. Ibid., V, p. 429.
As was previously mentioned, Waterland frankly admitted that not all Bible truth was of equal importance. This assertion must be considered extraordinary in a man so devoted to the Book and who lived when the critical approach was hardly born. He states that, "Scripture contains points of an inferior moment, as well as those of a high nature; and all the truths contained in it are neither equally clear nor equally important."¹ Cullmann in denying his support of a rigid Biblicism, characterized the false Biblicist attitude as being that of regarding all portions of the Bible of equal worth,² so by this definition Waterland was not a rigid Biblicist. A further clarification of his doctrine appears in the following:

... every Scripture tenet is not fundamental, so neither does Scripture, strictly speaking, contain all fundamental truths. The certainty of the canon in general, and the authenticity of the sacred code, are fundamental articles, and are previous to those which Scripture itself contains; and our obligation to receive them resolves into this fundamental principle of natural religion, that we are bound to receive with reverence whatever God shall sufficiently make known to us as his law, word, and will.³

Since fundamentals lay in the realm of Bible interpretation and were thus subject to human judgment, he made no effort to restrict them. The only stipulation was that new articles of faith, or new catechisms, should be produced as new and

3. Ibid., VIII, p. 108.
not imposed as expositions of the old, and both were to be tried by Scripture-rule.

The question of inspiration was only beginning to be raised in the first half of the eighteenth century and Waterland said nothing specifically about it but it is plain that for him there was no question of degrees of inspiration or of inspiration for certain parts of Scripture. He was aware of the translation difficulties but he still regarded the Bible as being perfect in that it was:

... full and complete to be a rule of life and manners without taking in any additional rule to join with it. But if we speak of Scripture being perfect in regard to words, or style, we can mean only, that it is as perfect as words can be, and words (to us now) of a dead language. Whatever imperfection necessarily goes along with all languages, must of course go along with Scripture language; which though dictated from heaven, or conducted by the Spirit of God is yet adapted to the manner of men, and must take its construction from the common rules of interpretation agreed upon among men.

The words, "... dictated... or conducted by the Spirit of God..." suggests an uncertainty as to the manner in which the Word was communicated and also indicates that he had given it some thought. He was certain that every part of the New Testament was equally inspired and, although he never stated it categorically, his minute defence of the Old Testament would argue that he felt the same about it as he did about

the New. The isolation of any particular section from the rest of the Bible was as wrong to him as it was to H. Wheeler Robinson who wrote that: "... to select certain portions of the Old Testament as Revelation and to reject others, is to make the anthologist the inspired voice of God, ..." or to A.G. Hebert who feels that "... we can scarcely do a greater wrong to the Old Testament, therefore, than by insisting on treating each writer as a separate individual. ..."

There is evidence that questions of criticism and inspiration were being given wider circulation in the early eighteenth century than was formerly thought. Richard Simon (1638-1712) was one of the first to broach the subject and Jean Astruc (1684-1766) laid the foundation of modern higher criticism of the Pentateuch. Both Locke and Newton, without labelling their approach to Biblical studies, were raising issues of a critical nature. Of Waterland's opponents it was Middleton who was most outspoken in referring to "moral fables and allegory," and in protesting against the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. He said, "... we are under no obligation of reason or religion, to believe that the Scriptures are of absolute and universal inspiration ..." and he held the contrary opinion to be "... necessary to a rational

defence of religion. . . "¹ He drew no distinction between
the authority attributed to every part of a generally inspired
writing and the absolute dictation of every part by the direct
influence of the Holy Spirit. Waterland never referred to the
matter specifically, but in incidental references to it there
is no evidence that he accepted the dictation theory. He
appears simply to have believed in the absolute and universal
authority of every portion of the Scriptures.

In scriptural interpretation, a fundamental rule of
Waterland's seemed to be that a true interpretation would never
run counter to any plain, certain principle of natural reason
because truth would never be contrary to truth. A second
rule was that a true interpretation would not violate the
teaching of other passages. The third was that such inter¬
pretation would be supported by the normal meanings of words
and have no recourse to forced usages. And a fourth was
that the interpretation would have the countenance of antiquity.
"If it has only some of those positive characters, or one
only, the rest not interfering, it may be a good inter¬
pretation; but the more it has, so much the surer."² As an
interpreter of Scripture he obviously had no illusions about
his being infallible but simply sought to apply the best

rules he knew to the problem of interpretation.

He agreed with the majority of scholars that the authenticity of Christian revelation depended chiefly upon the miracles and the fulfillment of prophecy but since these made little impression on the Deists he devoted his main effort to the establishment of the reasonableness of the inspired text. In his *Scripture Vindicated* he varied the means of vindication somewhat and in dealing with the so-called immorality of the Old Testament, particularly as it implicated God Himself, Waterland took refuge in God's omniscience saying that if He commanded a particular action, it must be right.¹ The other main defensive argument, used particularly in the case of the Old Testament, was that there must be a frank recognition that even God's men could sin and still be "... dear and acceptable to God for their repenting of those faults, and for their many good qualities."²

The widespread formal allegiance to the Bible made it necessary for theologians who hoped to gain a hearing to ground their argument upon it and each in turn insisted upon his loyalty to it. Clarke similarly professed his regard for the sacred Writings in his *Answer to Dr. Waterland's Queries relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity*, printed in 1720. He claimed that Waterland did not concern himself with

¹ See *Works.*, VI, p. 215.
Scripture but employed the metaphysical opinions of the Fathers almost exclusively in his argument. Of Waterland's thirty-one queries, twenty-four are entirely grounded on Scripture, or on Dr. Clarke's own propositions. If any charge brought against Waterland were groundless, it was this accusation that he preferred metaphysics to the Bible. Of necessity he took part in philosophical discussion but he invariably used Scripture as a basis for his own thesis unless the entire question devolved upon an interpretation of the Fathers.

Waterland's evaluation of the Fathers and of Scholasticism. Waterland's continual reference to the doctrine of the primitive church and to the Fathers caused him not only to be identified as a specialist in patristics but as a perpetuator of Scholasticism. As recently as 1951, the historian, S.L. Bethell, implied that Waterland's use of Scholastic quotation in the Dissertation upon the Argument A Priori indicated the persistence of the Scholastic tradition in the eighteenth century.

The evidence found in Waterland's works will show that he carefully drew a line between an implicit reliance upon the Fathers of the early Church and the deference which is due to them as the earliest and most unbiased witnesses of the truth.

His principal argument for the use of their writings was that they provided the best commentary upon the Scripture, and he cited the Canon article of 1571 in support of this contention:

That the Clergy should teach nothing from the pulpit, as being of religious obligation to the people to believe, but what should be consonant to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops had collected or concluded from thence.

He did not quote the Fathers "... to superadd new doctrines to Scripture, but only to secure the old, not to complete the rule, but more strongly to assert and maintain both its true sense and whole sense." He illustrated the danger of neglecting this qualified guidance by referring to Faustus Socinus who extolled the perfection of Scripture but deserted the ancients, trusting only to himself and his uncle Laelius. The innovations of socinianism were an illustration of the distance one might drift into heresy without an authoritative standard of interpretation.

There may have been more respect paid to the opinions of the Fathers in the eighteenth century than appeared in the more popular theological works and Waterland did not fail to point out that such men as Whitby, who could hardly be suspected of prejudice in this regard had stated, even if negatively, that those doctrines rejected by the leaders of the

early Church were to be considered heresy.¹ It is certain that Archbishop Tillotson, in spite of his affiliations with the Latitudinarian party which was said to be opposed to traditional authority, greatly appreciated the guidance of the Fathers:

...the general tradition of the Church next to Scripture, is the best and surest confirmation of this great point now in question between us; and that which gives us the greatest and truest light for the right understanding of the true sense and meaning of Scripture, not only in this, but in most other important doctrines of the Christian religion.²

While Waterland was not alone in his refusal to forsake antiquity he was usually classed separately because of his profound knowledge of patristics and extensive use of the early writings.

He did not overstate the case for antiquity, always holding that the superior proof, in doctrinal matters, must be found in sacred Writ, but for subordinate proof he regarded the Fathers as a reliable source of guidance and a collateral evidence in determining the prime doctrines. His technique in controversy was to produce evidence that, "...we have as plausible arguments, to speak modestly from Scripture as you can pretend to have... And besides all this, we have what you want, the concurring sense of the ancients plainly for us."³

³. Works, I, p. 325.
In his use of the teaching of the Fathers he placed greatest importance upon that of the "first and purest ages," meaning the first three centuries. He considered Eusebius a "late" authority. The opinions of these early churchmen were to be respected for the following reasons: (1) they lived nearest to apostolic times, (2) they had knowledge of rites and customs that had disappeared in later times and (3) some of them would be able to retain in memory what the Apostles or their immediate successors taught. Waterland was certain that any doctrine differing from that of those early teachers could have little Scriptural support, but if a given doctrine were clearly proclaimed throughout those first three centuries and had persisted through more than 1700 years, having been "... thoroughly sifted and considered by the ablest and best heads... there appears to be a great deal more room for judgment than for invention...." It was "... wiser and safer to take the most valuable observation of men most eminent." Waterland's deep respect for Bishop Bull appears in this connection:

... however cogent and forceable his reasonings from Scripture appeared to be, yet he modestly declined being confident of them unless he could

2. Ibid., VII, p. 10.
find them likewise supported by the general verdict of the primitive Church; for which he always expressed a most religious regard and veneration; believing it easier for himself to err in interpreting Scripture, than for the universal Church to have erred from the beginning.¹

Waterland never considered the Fathers to be infallible nor did he recognize an interpretation as being authentic merely because it was old. He was sure that the men who lived nearest the times of the inspired writers would have a more accurate interpretation of the truth than taught, but he acknowledged a gradation even of these writings and did not hesitate to describe some of the later writings, such as The Apostolical Constitutions, Ignatius's larger epistles, and the Arian Councils of Sirmium, as being "spurious or worthless."²

In answer to the persistent efforts to discredit the Fathers, Waterland maintained that, of the alleged mistakes, some were imaginary, some were problematical, and the more grievous sort are the mistakes of only a few either not ancient or not universal.³ Their misinterpretation of certain texts could be proved and Waterland readily granted that the eighteenth century commentators must be superior to them in critical ability but the crux of the problem was: were they faithful in relating what were the primary teachings

¹ Works, I, p. vi.
² Ibid., IV, p. 82.
³ Ibid., V, p. 293f.
of the early Church? He contended that the more they differed in rituals, or in details of discipline, the more regard should be paid them in the matters wherein they agreed.¹

Waterland asserted that the "incredible pains" taken to discredit the Fathers were in reality the first step toward undermining the credibility of Scripture. Public reaction would brand any who openly attacked the Bible as infidels and so this indirect approach was necessary. Of his opponents such men as Clarke, however, were as anxious to enlist the support of antiquity as he was and the debate then became a matter of interpretation.

One concluding observation on Waterland's attitude to the authority of antiquity is necessary. He thought it important to know what the most eminent writers and teachers of all ages had taught because, whether ancient or modern,

... the common reason of mankind is properly the rule of interpretation in both cases; and that common reason shines out the brightest, and appears in greatest perfection, is the united verdict of the wisest and most excellent men.²

Even though he was known for his patristic scholarship in the eighteenth century he differed from those who emphasized reason only in that he was certain that reason's voice could best be heard in the cumulative utterance of those qualified

¹. Works, V, p. 315.
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leaders who had been in places of responsibility since the first century.

Scholasticism is generally conceived to be a philosophy characterized by a profound veneration for the teachings of the Fathers and a rationalistic approach to theological issues. That this definition is inadequate is demonstrated by the fact that Waterland, with his patristic emphasis and respect for reason, was critical of much that was taught by the Schoolmen. He was strongly averse to the use of philosophical subtlety in doctrinal discourse. His familiarity with the philosophical field lends significance to his statement that:

The introducing false maxims of philosophy into religion has done infinite mischief to the Church of God. It is making Scripture bend to human inventions, and is contriving a kind of motley religion part Pagan and part Christian, instead of the religion of Christ. ¹

He resented being charged with teaching "... something merely scholastic..." when he had been "... only following the concurring judgment of the ancient Fathers."² He maintained that the doctrine of the Trinity had been exposed to attack by the Schoolmen although he felt that this was not intentional. They had: (1) aired all the difficulties and thus furnished matter for Socinians, (2) confused plain

¹. Works, V, p.413.
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doctrine with distinctions and subtleties and thus obscured it, (3) scandalized the doctrine by making it appear to subsist on Scholastic subtleties, and the opponents of the doctrine had found these perplexities easier to confute than plain Scripture.

He was apparently not blind to the faults of Scholasticism and he was particularly opposed to syllogistic argumentation because he found that in it lay the main strength of Arianism. After the heresy had been postulated, it was only philosophy and metaphysics that could be called in to support it. Furthermore, he thought that the a priori argument for God, supported entirely by metaphysical disquisition, was a very insecure foundation for the whole of the Christian Faith, and he challenged Clarke, who was the main proponent of it, with quotations from the greatly respected Locke:

... it is an ill way of establishing this truth, and silencing Atheists, to lay the whole stress of so important a point upon that sole foundation — and out of an over fondness of that darling invention cashier... other arguments...

Waterland never denied that there were abiding values in the Scholastic system. He made practically no use of allegory in his own interpretation of Scripture, but felt that allegorizing as performed by Augustine, Vitringa, and others, did enrich the meaning of the letter. Where it led off into the resolving of true history into fables or parables,

he rejected it utterly. While admitting that the Schoolmen were deserving of criticism for their excesses in many things, he maintained that in doctrinal points where logic was the primary means of explication they carried great authority:

... where they had no bias to mislead them... and where a question turned upon a right understanding of technical terms or phrases, and a thorough acquaintance with logic and metaphysics; being a matter of pure abstract reasoning... if the sharpest wits of these later days shall undertake, upon their own stock to furnish out a new scheme of school divinity or metaphysical theology, it will be a long while... before they arrive to such perfection in some part... as many of the Schoolmen.

Metaphysics, as such, was for Waterland a science that had importance and deserved respect when kept in its place.

He stated, in criticism of Clarke's system of reasoning, that true metaphysics was nothing else than true divinity, "... let but your reasonings be clear, solid, and pertinent, and we shall never find fault with them for being metaphysical."²

Basil Willey defined the great value of Scholasticism as being "... its testimony to the primacy of the 'truths' of religious experience"³ after saying that we were once again asking the same fundamental questions that Scholasticism asked. Daniel Waterland, two hundred years before, while frankly acknowledging the limitations of its exclusively
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rational account of reality, appreciated the painstaking determination to understand God's truth and, unlike most of his contemporaries, he attempted to assess and utilize its findings rather than reject it completely.

**Waterland's view of reason.** Most theologians of the eighteenth century had to make a place for reason in their scheme regardless of what school of thought they followed and, as has been pointed out in the resumé of the century in the first chapter, in some cases the resulting natural structure on its supernatural foundation, was ludicrous. Certainly Waterland recognized the problems raised by this union and much of his writing was, fundamentally, an effort to solve these problems. He agreed with those making the new emphasis on reason but he felt that the rationalists in the Church were exposing it to impoverishment by the infidels. If reason alone were to decide matters of faith, it could be as well employed in the establishment of the complete sufficiency of the religion of nature. If unbelievers saw Divines labouring to distort Scripture in order to avoid doctrines supposedly contrary to reason, this must inevitably lead to questioning the Bible as a whole. And if these same Divines made the institutions of the Church insignificant, and stressed the moral duties which reason could discover, it provided a pretext for discarding the entire system.
According to Waterland the phrase, "sufficiency of reason", which was frequently heard in his day, should never be taken to mean that reason was an absolute and in itself a sufficient guide in religion. Its sufficiency could best be seen first by being sensible of its insufficiency, and second in "... its steady adhering to supernatural light, so far as it can be had: this is the first lesson of true wisdom." So, for Waterland, the authority of reason never outweighed that of Divine Light and this must be kept in mind in the consideration of all that he said on the subject.

He believed that the rational faculties were not to be suspected but were a God-given means for discerning truth and error. God's view, or in other words, objective truth, was the entirely and truly reasonable view so, in every question, there was only one absolutely reasonable view and man could only attain it to a degree. Since human reason was always partial it must be fallible and was therefore incompetent to make a final judgment as to the reasonableness of certain New Testament commands and ordinances:

He is a proud and saucy servant that will never obey his master, but where he sees the reason of the command ... there may be ... greater excellency and more real virtue in obeying positive precepts, than in any moral virtue.
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For a man, in the name of reason, to take the business of God out of His hands and prescribe the laws and sanctions as his own fancy suggested was tantamount to a denial of His existence. The truly reasonable interpretation was to be gained by using the means that God had provided against any other wiles of Satan, or any other temptations: "... prayer and watchfulness, care and endeavour, and the use of proper means." "

With reason thus defined Waterland could go on to specify that mere authority should never prevail over reason. He even allowed that if the doctrine of the Trinity could be proved to be absurd or impossible, we should be obliged to deny the authority of those Scriptures that appeared to teach it, or to explain them away in some manner, but he was certain that: "Reason never has, never can demonstrate the thing to be impossible." 

An important distinction in Waterland's understanding of reason was demonstrated in his reference to the Unitarians who "... chose to follow philosophical conjectures, (which they call reason), rather than the dictates of true and sound reason, which will tell us that we ought not to be wise beyond what is written ... nor leave a safe path." In the same vein, he denied Jackson's charge that his explication of

3. Ibid., II, p. 61.
Christ's divinity was only metaphysical. Waterland maintained that such truth was plain to the common sense of men, learned of unlearned, who knew the difference between God and a creature.¹ His appreciation of the role of common sense in theological concepts did not blind him to the fact that it had its limits and this admission saved him from the fate of many in the eighteenth century who, in their lack of balance, demonstrated that even common sense could tyrannize. Waterland's understanding of reason enabled him, after listing seven types of Scriptural mysteries and then showing by these how God's attributes must largely remain mysterious frankly to acknowledge that in those instances where the conception went beyond the reason of man, the right attitude consisted of, "... an humble mind; a just sense of our ignorance in many things, and of our imperfect knowledge in all."² To hearken to right reason was to submit not to human authority, but to God who gave us reason for our guide.

"Moral certainty" or "moral evidence", constituted the main strength of reason for Waterland. These terms signified that there were some things so certain, such as well-founded creeds, that the reason of mankind ought to submit to them and he considered the affirmation of such truth as was

¹ See Works, III, p.4.
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contained in these creeds to be no more presumptuous than
telling a man that he would find Euclid's propositions true. ¹
He was assuming that reason would be reason with every man;
that human faculties were true in their judgment under
normal circumstances; that there was such a thing as moral
certainty; and that this certainty provided the governors of
the Church sufficient ground upon which they could base their
faith. The true interpretation of Scripture would never
run counter to any plain principle of natural reason (since
truth can never be contrary to truth), nor to other Scripture
if rightly interpreted.²

In explaining his reliance upon the writings of the
Fathers, Waterland makes it plain that reason was the real
authority behind antiquity: the Fathers had the same common
reason to direct them and used as much care and diligence
and were blessed with as great integrity as any modern theo-
logian; the qualification of the Fathers for their work of
Scripture interpretation and their authoritative scholarship
was well known; since common reason appears in greatest per-
fection in the united verdict of the wisest and most excellent
men, then that agreement must most closely approximate the

1.  See Works, V, p. 140.
2.  See Ibid., V, p. 289f.
reasonable interpretation. It was in this fashion that Waterland concluded that Protestant certainty rested on reason and not on the dictum of any authority conceived as infallible.

Waterland looked upon reason as the corrective, the final arbiter of those inevitable conflicts that would arise in the human interpretation of both Scripture and the Fathers:

... though we cannot expect to work miracles by the help of antiquity and Scripture together, (for heresies there will be notwithstanding, and Scripture itself intimates there must be) yet they are both of them of very great use, and may have their effect, in a human way, among reasonable men; which is sufficient ... and when we have so done all that is proper, or required, and without effect, the appeal must lie to the common reason of mankind. 2

As for the credibility of the religion of Christ as a whole, he believed, with Chillingworth, 3 whom he quoted in support of the assertion, that we could be infallibly certain. We could only have a degree of certainty about individual doctrines, but we could be most certain about those doctrines directly relating to the establishment of the faith.

Waterland's criticism of natural religion. Reason and natural religion were very closely associated in the minds of most eighteenth century theologians and although Waterland

2. Ibid., V, p. 321.
recognized the relationship he was far more suspicious of natural religion and was most careful in defining it. Locke's explication of it had led to the idea that the "State of Nature" somehow caused things to work out for the best if left to themselves. Waterland was not convinced, as was demonstrated in his debate with Sykes, whose thesis typified the Deism of the times. Said Sykes:

By the religion of nature, men may know that God is and what he is, and how God is to be worshipped; it will show how men, beings placed in the circumstances they are ... may be reconciled to and accepted by God; it will show a future state of rewards or punishments; and it will show the duties we are to practise one to another.

Waterland's response to such assertions as these was that to believe in God, in providence, and a future state, and to desire no external revelation from God because of being sufficiently wise without it, "... was so wild, and so extravagant a thought that nothing can match it, or compare with it." 2 In responding to Sykes' statement that men could discover how to worship God by the religion of nature, Waterland cited Clarke which must have been difficult for Sykes, who was defending Clarke, to answer. Clarke had said that, "... the manner in which God might acceptably be worshipped, these men are unavoidably ignorant ... what kind of service ... 

---

1. A Defence of the Answer to the Remarks upon Dr. Clarke's Exposition of the Church-Catechism, (1730), pp. 95f.
2. Works, VIII, p. 28.
cannot be certainly discovered by reason. ¹

It was the Deists who argued that the "intuitive evidence" of natural religion should be the supreme argument for the existence of God, but Waterland saw in this argument a reflection of the Deist's effort to make God a convenience for man. Waterland conceived God as being "... the ultimate end of all, and to whom all things are to be ultimately referred." and he objected to making Him,

... subservient to man, or to the creature, as if they were the end, and God was to be referred to them. ... the Head of all society is God; and the duties that directly terminate in him are the prime duties.²

He described the Deistic position as being a system of morality without God at the head of it, obligation without law, a religion of nature without a Deity, and duty without a superior.³

The preference for a natural religion that could dispense with revelation was, in Waterland's estimation, only subterfuge to screen the effort to make religion convenient, and he used the inconsistency of Hobbes and Spinoza to support his charge. After labouring to show the unreasonableness of religion in general, they taught that the rational being should adopt the magistrate's religion,⁴ whatever it

¹ Works, V, p. 534.
² Ibid., V, p. 461.
³ Ibid., V, p. 500.
was, making it plain that religion for them was a political expedient. Waterland's condemnation of these "imposters" was in no sense indefinite:

... set themselves up, in the name of God, uncalled, and as rival teachers to Moses and the Prophets, to Christ and his Apostles; who recommend their own loose systems in the room of God's word, and substitute their reveries in the place of the Bible: whose religion is nobody knows what, because it is to be what every man shall carve out for himself by his own internal light. . . . whose morality . . . defective as wanting a proper authority to support it, and sanctions to bind it . . . whose God is either universal nature, or else a kind of Epicurean Deity tied up from interposing at all by miracles, and from issuing out any positive laws. . . . from doing exemplary justice upon sinners hereafter . . .

If "natural religion" was only a recognition of the evidence of God in nature, or that one could receive a witness of God by rational process, Waterland had no objection to make. It was "... an excellent thing and worthy of all acceptation so far as it goes. Natural religion and Deism are not the same thing, but widely different." He even recommended the systems of natural religion of Cumberland, Wilkins and Wollaston which were, in his opinion, rational, consistent and would inevitably terminate, when properly pursued, in a serious belief in Divine revelation. He quoted from Wollaston's dissertation to support this latter conclusion: "... whatever is immediately revealed from God, must

1. Works, VIII, p. 78f.
2. Ibid., VIII, p. 61f.
as well as anything else, be treated as what it is; which cannot be, if it is not treated with the highest regard, believed, and obeyed."

Waterland's criticism of the Deists was not that they believed in natural religion but that they had dispensed with all standards, having as many "natural religions" as there were men of different circumstances and abilities. Their determination to have a religion of their own making, must lead only to libertinism and irreligion under the name of "the religion of nature." The true natural religion, as Waterland conceived it was the totality of all things evidencing a God and all things indicative of His worthiness as to worship, apart from revelation. It was from this standpoint that he said:

natural religion, justly so called, is bound up is revealed, is supported, cherished, and kept alive by it; and cannot so much as subsist in any vigour without it. To take away revealed religion from it, is to strip it of its firmest aids and strongest securities, leaving it in a very low and languishing state, without lights sufficient to explain it, or guards to fence it, or sanctions to bind it.

In this one doctrine, Waterland agreed with Calvin, who taught that there was a sense of Deity naturally engraven on the human heart and would allow a place for a "small flame" of natural knowledge of God. Unaccompanied by revelation, it

2. Works, VI, p. 22.
was entirely inadequate for the needs of man and those who insisted that it was adequate signified their contempt of the Church.

III. THE PROBLEM OF WATERLAND'S CHURCHMANSHIP

The problem of determining Waterland's relationship to the various parties in the Church of England, and the allied political parties, was reserved for consideration in this latter part of the chapter so that the conclusions previously reached might be incorporated in this delicate problem of classification.

It must first be established that Waterland was entirely loyal to the Church of England. A man who used words as precisely as he did, must have been expressing his own deep conviction when he spoke of "our excellent Church"\(^1\) or of "the purest and most justly celebrated Church in the world"\(^2\). The combination of loyalty to the Church and forbearance to those outside it, is well expressed in the following:

Religion is a cause that deserves our zeal; and if many will be offended with us for telling them the truth, and not complying with such errors as would lead both to their and our destruction, the fault is their own; we should still as much as lieth in us live peaceably with them. Not by betraying the cause of Christ, not by ceasing to 'contend earnestly for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints,' not by pleading for amendments and alteration in the purest and best constituted Church of any in the world, but by condescending to hearken to and answer any modest scruples,

\(^1\) Works, VIII, p.456.
\(^2\) Ibid., II, p.v.
by meekness and gentleness, by patience and forbearance.\textsuperscript{1} It was this estimation of the Church that made him suspicious of moves for reconciliation with Dissenting groups and that caused him frequently to exhort his brother ministers to proclaim the truth in spite of loss or cause of offence. In these ways he was a High Churchman and seized every opportunity to dissuade Dissenters although he did not favour legal restriction except in the case of outright advocacy of atheism. His letters on lay-baptism\textsuperscript{2} reveal his unwillingness to permit ministerial prerogatives to be exercised by unauthorized Dissenting leaders and indicate the high conception he held of the responsibility of priesthood.

That he was a Whig, politically, is at once a problem and an indication. It is a problem because, in spite of his support of the Hanoverian succession, his writings disclose nearly every distinguishing trait of the Tories. The indication of his Whig affiliation is toward a form of Latitudinarianism in the political sphere, despite the fact that he is, in the realm of religion, invariably associated with extreme orthodoxy.

It is admitted that the term "Latitudinarian" was applied to men of very different opinions and seemed to be of uncertain

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Works, IX, p.18.
\item Ibid., X, p.1.
\end{enumerate}
\end{flushleft}
definition, but the fact remains that it was descriptive of a particular type of thinking and was sufficiently clear to many historians still to be considered by them a proper means of indicating the outlook of some of the greatest leaders of the Church of England in the eighteenth century. Should the meaning be confined to "one who departs from orthodoxy" it could not possibly be used of Waterland, but C.J. Abbey says that this definition could not be the leading idea and was "... sometimes not even part of the idea, of those who spoke with praise or blame of the eminent 'Latitudinarian' bishops of King William's time." His reference to Latitudinarian bishops recalls the fact that such men as Burnet, Patrick, Stillingfleet and Tillotson, to mention only four of them, occupied the episcopal bench in practically unbroken succession after 1688. Abbey rightfully regretted the fact that:

... many men of undoubted piety and earnestness who had done distinguished services in the Christian cause, and who had greatly contributed to raise the repute of the English Church, were constantly ranked as Latitudinarians in one promiscuous class with men to whose principles they were utterly opposed.  

Abbey was, as has been pointed out, a great admirer of Waterland, but when speaking of the above mentioned bishops, he can say with equal enthusiasm that they were men "... who

1. Abbey and Overton, op. cit., p. 147.
2. Abbey and Overton, op. cit., p. 112.
must count among the most distinguished ornaments of the English Church."¹ Because there was no better term to describe the liberalism of the period, Plummer determined to use "Latitudinarian" in a good sense after distinguishing five different meanings² that had been given to it by various writers. Two of those meanings were: (1) a desire for freedom that is consistent with that definiteness of belief and organization without which the Church would collapse, and (2) an appeal to reason in the interpretation of Scripture, and the criticism of doctrine, such as the Cambridge Platonists made as over against the narrowness of Calvinism. Latitudinarian, so defined, could be ascribed to Waterland as well as to any progressive theologian of the Restoration period.

Because of Waterland's competence in the knowledge and use of patristic literature, and because of the particular doctrines he chose to defend, and because of his opposition to such liberals as Clarke, he has been associated in the minds of many with the ultra-conservatives. If it can be proved that he can properly be classed among such progressive theologians as Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Burnet and Patrick, it should cast an entirely different light on his theological

¹ Loc. cit.
² Plummer, op. cit., pp. 51 f.
contribution. Although "Latitudinarian" was often a term of opprobrium, Waterland selected, for his only reference to such persons, a quotation which favours the men so designated. This quotation is significant in that he uses it as support for his view of the reasonableness of receiving the judgment of the Fathers:

Reason is that Faculty whereby a Man must judge of every thing: nor can a Man believe anything except he have some reason for it; whether that Reason be a Deduction from the Light of Nature... or a Branch of Divine Revelation in the Oracles of Holy Scripture, or the general Interpretation of genuine Antiquity, or the Proposal of our own Church... And it is admirable to consider how the same Conclusions do naturally flow from all these several Principles; and what, in the faithful Use of the Faculties that God hath given, Men have believed for true, doth excellently agree with that Revelation that God hath exhibited in the Scripture; and the doctrine of the ancient Church with them both.

It will be seen how this coincides exactly with his views. Evidently he was not reluctant to claim the support of the statement even though the title of the article was "A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitude-Men."

Actually, Latitudinarianism stood for a temper rather than a creed although enough of a creed emerges, upon examination of the writings of the principal exponents of it, that one can draw conclusions about it. The temper was a calm, dispassionate and reasonable outlook upon theological matters

---

and no better example of it could be found than Daniel Waterland. What needs to be understood is the point made by Cragg\(^1\) that reason never overshadowed revelation in the thinking of the prominent Latitudinarians. Against the "fanatics" they maintained the essential congruity between reason and revelation; against the pure rationalists they insisted on the supreme importance of the truths God had revealed, "But the Latitudinarians were more conscious of the challenge from the first group than from the second..."\(^2\) and this resulted in their being linked with rationalism. A proof that the more prominent Latitudinarians were never disposed to minimize revelation is seen in Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacrae* which was acknowledged to be the chief theological work of the Latitudinarians and which had as its grand conclusion, not the supremacy of reason, but the divine authority of the Scriptures. Waterland must have been acquainted with these facts, because in the course of his published works, he either quoted Stillingfleet, or referred to his writings, at least forty-three times. That Waterland evinces not a trace of doctrinal criticism in all of these references, is not without meaning.

Another distinguishing feature of the Latitudinarians was an unusual mixture in their political philosophy and if Waterland can successfully be identified with them in this it

\(^1\) *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason*, p.70.
\(^2\) *Loc. cit.*
explains the previously mentioned paradox of his professed loyalty to and veneration of the King over against his Whig party affiliation. With the Restoration came the reassertion of the theory of the divine right of Kings and the early Latitudinarians accepted the principle of passive obedience in the same sense that they professed loyalty to the Church, but with the fall of James II they abandoned the principle more quickly and more publicly than any other group of churchmen. They were particularly sensitive to the evils of fanaticism in high places whether it was Puritan or Roman Catholic, many of them having been London clergymen and having seen at first hand what a demand for unquestioning obedience could mean when the king was over-zealous for his religion.

Waterland agreed with them that loyalty to the king was essential but it was a reasonable loyalty that found the measure of control afforded by the Whig policies desirable.

Because Tillotson said some startling things about reason and dwelt insufficiently upon some of the distinctively Christian doctrines and, because he was an Archbishop, which caused his pronouncements to be especially subject to scrutiny and distortion, by those who opposed him, he was charged with heresy. It was, of course, always the conservative leaders who expressed their disapproval and Waterland often made

1. E.g. The Charge of Socinianism against Dr. Tillotson. (1695), p.13.
reference to certain of Tillotson's views with reservations but never imputed heresy to him. He was "... not altogether accurate in his notions."\(^1\) or there was "... inaccuracy in the comparison and fallacy also in the argument..."\(^2\) or there were "... one or two points of doctrine... justly exceptionable:..."\(^3\) but he was, in spite of all this "a great and good Prelate"\(^4\) whose sermons Waterland could recommend to students as being the finest, and who could be described along with Bishop Bull and others as "... able and learned Divines."\(^5\) Waterland's judgment in this matter is confirmed by Abbey who stated categorically that "... the charges of heresy against Tillotson were unfounded..."\(^6\) and that he was "... a sincere, and in all essential points, an orthodox believer in the tenets of revealed religion."\(^7\) Waterland could hardly avoid commending him because they were in agreement on many things: the value of tradition, the importance of external evidence, the right of private judgment, the importance of the doctrine of punishment, and the fallacies of Unitarianism and of Arianism.

---

Another Latitudinarian bishop who was also a Whig was Burnet. Waterland disagreed with him on the issue of lay-baptism, which disagreement was sufficient to demonstrate an independence of thought that would not conform for the sake of gaining the official approval of the higher church authorities, but he did freely cite Burnet's works throughout the *Scripture Vindicat*ed. He recommended to his students Burnet's *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles* and *History of the Reformation*\(^1\) and he quoted from the "excellent words of Bishop Burnet" statements which he, as an authority on the Church of England Sacraments, considered to be "... a good summary account of what our Church and the Protestant Churches abroad, and the primitive Church likewise, believe concerning Baptism and the Eucharist."\(^2\) Waterland must have been acquainted with Burnet's vehement denial\(^3\) of the charge that Orthodox Latitudinarians were concealed Socinians and apparently was satisfied with the denial or he would not have signified his approval of Burnet by citing his works so frequently.

There is no record of Waterland ever expressing even a slight disagreement with the theology of Bishop Patrick, whose Latitudinarianism was unquestioned, and he refers to Patrick's

---

1. *op. cit.*, VI, p. 313.
2. *Works*, VII, p. 34.
works at least twenty-five times. The Latitudinarians recognized a danger of abusing patristic authority and wished to avoid the extremes of Scholasticism but they did not discredit tradition. Waterland must especially have enjoyed quoting the following passage from Patrick's work, which was not an exceptional Latitudinarian expression:

We reverently receive the unanimous tradition of the doctrine of the Church in all ages, which determines the meaning of the Holy Scripture, and makes it more clear and unquestionable in any point of faith, wherein we can find it hath declared its sense. For we look upon this tradition as nothing else but the Scripture unfolded; not a new thing, which is not in the Scripture, but the Scripture explained and made more evident.

Mention of only one other of the great Latitudinarian bishops will suffice for the purpose of showing Waterland's accord with them. The bishop is Stillingfleet and he was renowned for his masterly works in defence of the right use of reason but Waterland, in the more than forty times that he quoted Stillingfleet or directed readers to his works, is careful to point out that he also accepted the authority of antiquity and defended the doctrine of the Trinity. Stillingfleet also acknowledged the authority of faith to be ultimately stronger than the authority of reason, and was

4. Ibid, V, p.278.
careful to insist that Scriptural authority is greater than that of reason. ¹ Certainly Waterland would not recommend Stillngfleet's works if he did not have confidence in his theology.

It would be untrue to say that Waterland was in total agreement with the most prominent Latitudinarians of the period, but it is true to say that, in his fundamental beliefs he differed no more from them than they differed from each other. While he did quote them extensively in his works, it is important to note that he did not confine his references to the Latitudinarians, having quoted in his works at least twenty-three bishops and six archbishops. This evidence of his wide acquaintance with the works of the authoritative leaders in his church would argue that he did not need to look to the Latitudinarians for support if he had any hesitation about subscribing to their views. Although it would seem natural for a man as loyal to his church as he was to quote his bishops in support of his doctrine, it could be contended that he was too much inclined to prove himself in agreement with them and may have been careful that his doctrine did not offend his superiors.

Aside from the fact that such a policy does not suit the character of the man, it has been seen that he wrote of

¹ Origines Sacrae, p. 418.
his disagreement with both Tillotson and Burnet in no uncertain manner and in his Case of Arian Subscription he openly contested Bishop Hoadly’s ideas on subscription. Edward Churton sought to cast reflection upon him for failing to answer Hoadly’s Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament, but Waterland’s letter to Dr. Grey states his position in the matter:

It is a great pleasure to me, to find that there is no necessity of my writing at all; or at least, that I may reasonably take what time I please for it. I have drawn out a rough sketch of what I intended in a general way, taking in the whole compass of the subject, and discussing such points as fell in my way, either against Papists, or Lutherans, or others; but particularly Socinians. I shall take due time to consider whether it may be proper to publish at all or what improvements to make if I do.

Obviously the thing that caused his "pleasure" was the number of capable men who were opposing Hoadly. The work that took in the "whole compass of the subject," was not forthcoming until 1737, a time lapse of two years from the date of Hoadly's publication, which could partially be accounted for by failing health. He evidently did begin the work immediately after the Plain Account appeared and when his Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist was published it was acknowledged to be one of the most comprehensive treatments

4. The number of volumes he published per year was greatly reduced in the period from 1731 to the time of his death.
of the subject ever accomplished by a Church of England theologian. Hoadly was properly answered although his name did not appear in the Review.

Daniel Waterland, the erudite Master of Magdalene, imbued with the Platonist spirit which especially pervaded Cambridge, was a moderating theologian whose very nature seemed adapted to the age in which he lived. He cautiously assessed the "Age of Reason" as only a very reasonable man would, with an attempt to make the spirit of the times serve his basic presuppositions. These presuppositions were unreasoned although he said, in faith, that they must be founded upon ultimate Reason. He did what every modern theologian seeks to do: enable mankind to 'save face' logically while believing in Reality which must, for ever, outdistance human rationality. That Waterland should have grasped the intricacies of the age of rationalism so soon, should have adjusted his thinking to its demands so quickly, should have perceived how its impetus could further the cause of Faith, and should have so wisely set up his defences against those elements which could only lead to atheism, must distinguish him as a theologian uncommonly gifted with insight. His latitudinarian temper, and he was certainly as much a man of latitude as Stillingfleet, was ideally suited to the theological need of his times: thinkers who could distinguish the essentials, holding them in the face of shifting opinion, and making these essentials so appear that they might actually
be strengthened by the new willingness to examine hitherto undisturbed convictions.

Waterland's ability to adapt his arguments to the new currents of thought will have been observed in this chapter. In the face of the rationalism that would abandon history he showed that there could be no more reliable source of Christian authority than the collective voice of the Fathers, being closest to the source of truth and less influenced by the tendencies of later history. He agreed generally with those who turned on Scholasticism because he saw how neatly the disquisitions of metaphysics could fit into the hands of those who would dispense with revelation entirely. He heard the cry for Natural Religion, defined it as being an important part of man's quest for God, expressed his approval of it, and then showed how Nature, without revelation, was totally inadequate and was never intended to be sufficient in itself. He anticipated the conflict of men's 'reasonable' interpretations of both Scripture and the Fathers, and hastened to affirm that here was a case where Reason was supreme Arbiter. The true interpretation of Scripture was the highest reason.

Waterland, very conscious of the uncertainties created by the philosophical upheavals of his era and having something solid in his own certainty about the Christian faith as a whole, was, as a theologian, skilful enough to justify the retention of some old stabilizing elements by making them look
new. That he was in a measure successful is due, of course, to the fact that these elements: an immanent God, a divine Mediator, and a reliable, written revelation of Him, are actually timeless. There was need for a host of writers possessing similar literary craft. The confused masses, feeling the tension of their times but not understanding it, and without means of distinguishing between the benefits and limitations of reason, constitute a primary cause of the lethargy within the eighteenth century Church. Admittedly another cause in which Waterland had his share, was the emphasis on moderation, expressing itself typically in the resistance of the Church against the spontaneous life of the Evangelical movement, seen only as 'extreme' and therefore, in a measure, forced outside the Church instead of being retained and refined. It is nevertheless unfortunate that theological skill, such as his, especially as employed in its contribution of enlightenment on two of the most inexplicable doctrines in Church teaching, the Trinity and the Eucharist, was not in greater abundance.

Waterland was conservative but he was no obscurantist; he valued the Scriptures but he approached them reasonably; he appreciated the Fathers, but he rejected the typically Scholastic point of view; and in his loyalty to the Church he was a Tory but in his politics he was a Whig. This delicate balance, combined with his skill in writing, made him a formidable controversialist as well as a versatile theologian.
CHAPTER III

WATERLAND'S DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

If any one doctrine has been associated with the name of Daniel Waterland, it is that of the Eucharist. His scholarly and exhaustive Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, the largest of his works, was chiefly responsible for this association. The particular time of writing was also important in this connection because there was a decided need for a summary work that would tend to balance the extreme views being advanced in the eighteenth century, varying from John Johnson's idea of material sacrifice to the Zwinglianism of Hoadly. The quality of Waterland's work would seem to be evidenced in the fact that the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York requested the re-issue of his Review 128 years after his death, and in the further fact that Gresswell in 1886 prefaced his Analysis of Waterland on the Eucharist with the following: "I may add that Waterland on the Eucharist is one of the subjects required by several of our Bishops of candidates for Holy Orders."¹

It is surprising, in the light of these testimonies to Waterland's ability, that no comprehensive work that treats of all his writing on this important subject has yet appeared.

¹ H.W. Gresswell, p. xi.
Gresswell's *Analysis* deals only with the *Review*, and makes no attempt to draw conclusions or to postulate the doctrinal position, but simply gives the gist of each chapter in the same order as that found in the *Review* itself. Van Mildert has given a chronological account of the eucharistic writings, and has indicated the circumstances that called forth each work, but his object was only to provide a brief summary. Dugmore's recent book gives a good account of the relationship of Waterland's teaching to that of the prominent Anglican divines of the two preceding centuries, but actually devotes only twelve pages to Waterland. There is need for a systematic doctrinal presentation of his teaching on this subject that will embrace all nine of his extant treatises.¹

It should be kept in mind that, despite the furore of controversy over some eucharistic issues, kept alive by books and pamphlets that issued steadily from the pens of the major English theologians such as Hooper, Ridley, Bradford, Cranmer, Jewel and Hooker, there was a great deal that these men, and their descendants, held in common. None of them were purely

¹. They are in the order that they appeared between 1730 and 1740: Remarks on Dr Clark's Exposition of the Creed; Nature, Obligation and Efficacy of the Christian Sacraments; Supplement to Nature, Obligation ...; Doctrinal Use of the Christian Sacraments; Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist; The Christian Sacrifice Explained; Appendix to the Christian Sacrifice Explained; Sacramental Part of the Eucharist Explained; Distinctions of Sacrifice.
Zwinglian holding a mere memorialism that excluded any other type of reality. They all rejected a local or substantial presence (meaning corporeal or sometimes referred to as 'real') as well as Lutheran ubiquity, and believed that the actual Body and Blood of Christ were in heaven. They denied that the unrepentant, or 'wicked' received Christ’s Body and Blood even though they did partake. They saw no necessity for any propitiatory sacrifice. They held that Christ was using figurative language at the Institution. They agreed that the Body and Blood was spiritually received although this was variously explained, and that the souls of the participants were refreshed along with their bodies. They also appear to have agreed that the assurance of union with Christ, and the blessings won for believers by his death, were renewed.

Waterland did not develop a new conception of the Lord's Supper but he demonstrated the compatibility of the various interpretations, and with an insight that had been hitherto lacking on the part of other writers, he gave detail and order to the doctrine of the Central Churchman. To set down in order the major emphases derived from his entire eucharistic writings will be the object of this chapter.

Waterland’s work in the eucharistic field is best seen against the background of those who preceded him in that field, but this background need not be extensive because it is this
particular phase of the study that has been so well done by Dugmore. Hooker's works constitute a good introduction to the subject because the typically Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist took shape in the period between Hooker and Waterland. The position of the Central Churchman was fore-shadowed in Hooker who found the tolerant Elizabethan religious temper to his liking. He believed that there was in the Eucharist a real participation in the Body and Blood of Christ but that the manner of it was unimportant. It was Archbishop Ussher who began to give more definiteness to the position of the Central Churchman which was that there was a spiritual reception, by faith, of Christ's Body and Blood, but there was no change in the elements except in the sacred use to which they were put. He was seeking a conception of the real presence of Christ that would avoid the difficulties of the extreme sacramentalism of the High Church school and the inadequate doctrine of Receptionism. From Ussher, the line descended through Jeremy Taylor, Simon Patrick, George Bull, William Wake, and John Tillotson. One of the last men to make a real contribution to the Central Churchman's emphasis, before Waterland began to be recognized as a leader in this same school of thought, was William Beveridge who died in 1708. He stressed the eucharistic sacrifice as being a sacramental representation, commemoration, and application of the real sacrifice on the Cross.
It was this general position that Waterland chose to defend and to illuminate still further by taking up some of the knotty problems that had been ignored previously.

The other main school of thought is distinguished by the term "High Church" and its representatives affirmed that they did not disagree with the Roman Church regarding the "real presence" but unanimously repudiated the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Because of the difficulty that must always be experienced in explaining the "real presence" they were unable to show the consistency of their position. This inability contributed to the decline of the party, and to the advancement of its opponents, who were more explicit in their reasons for differing from the Roman Church.

After Andrewes and Laud, the principal early supporters of High Church teaching were Bramhall, Thorndike, Ken and finally Johnson, whose work was carried on by Brett in Waterland's time. Johnson and the Non-Jurors are probably the best representatives of the later development of the doctrine. The Eucharist was a proper material sacrifice which had two ends in view: (a) the acknowledgment of God's dominion and other attributes, especially His Goodness in redeeming the World by Christ: (b) the procuring of Divine blessings and the pardon of sin. Johnson still found it difficult to describe the state of the elements after
consecration, because they were neither substantially nor figuratively the Body and Blood of Christ. He was content to say that they were "... made the Body and Blood in such a manner as human reason cannot perfectly comprehend."¹

The Zwinglian school, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, was small but outspoken and under Deistic influence it made the Sacrament only a "remembrance". Hoadly was probably their most distinguished leader. At the other extreme, of course, was the Roman Catholic group in England that was taking full advantage of the conflict of opinions as well as of the lack of clarity in much of the material that was being written on the subject. The precise, scholastically developed theory of the Transubstantiation made urgent the need for a systematic setting forth of the Anglican viewpoint. Further proof of the need appeared in the uncertainties of the High Church teaching. Waterland proved himself to be a man of the calibre that the hour demanded. In the first chapter of his Review, he stated the problem in the succinct style that is typical of his ability: "... the Socinians reject the invisible grace, the Romanists destroy the visible sign, and both run counter to the true notion of a sacrament, by their opposite extremes."²

---

1. The Unbloody Sacrifice, Johnson's Works, I, 266.
2. Works, VII, 35.
Some recurring themes that appeared throughout Waterland's eucharistic writing should be mentioned in these introductory remarks. In the first place, he never suggests that scholarship could hope to eliminate all mystery surrounding this sacrament. He was sure that God worked through the elements to accomplish His purpose, but to explain the exact manner was to explain the miraculous. Secondly, he confessed that any bias he might have, would tend to magnify rather than minimize the significance of the Eucharist. "Where there is room for doubt, it is prudent to err rather on that side which ascribes too much to the Sacrament than on that which ascribes too little." He felt that the passage in I Cor. XI, 27-29 referring to the danger of drinking damnation to one's self was sufficient warning against too lightly regarding it. Thirdly, he concluded, after a careful study of the original institution of the Holy Communion, that there were at least ten resemblances between the Passover and the Eucharist, and so he assumed that the Eucharist was in a great measure copied from the paschal feast, and was intended to take its place. The fourth and last thing that can be noticed throughout is a decided interest in the practical aspects of the doctrine.

1. Works, VII, 10.
One could hold any view of the sacrament and completely disqualify himself by unworthy reception. It was more than a theoretical question for Waterland.

I. MORAL LAW AND POSITIVE\(^1\) INSTITUTIONS

The Deistic notions that were abroad in the eighteenth century made it necessary for Waterland to prove first that the observance of the Sacraments was even of sufficient importance to be considered on a level with moral concepts. Dr. Samuel Clarke in writing his *Exposition of the Church Catechism* plainly stated that "positive institutions", were only a "... means to an end, and therefore they are never to be compared with moral virtue."\(^2\) Since Clarke died in 1729, the year before the *Exposition* was published, Sykes came forward in defence of Clarke's opinions and in the same strain maintained that positive institutions were not important because reason could not fathom those things that exist only by command of a Supreme Being.\(^3\) Furthermore, he insisted that positive institutions had to be considered purely as external observances, that they were not obligatory at all times as was the case with moral duties, and that the

---

1. The term was used to describe sacramental observances.
superiority of moral law could be seen in his claim that the moral distinctions between good and evil were antecedent even to Divine law.

Waterland immediately recognized the fundamental nature of the question, and devoted two works of considerable length to its consideration.¹ He first countered the idea of the moral law being prior even to the Deity by asking if there could be a cause prior to the first cause, or a lawgiver higher than the highest. After showing that virtue and religion were but two names for the same thing, and that both were resolved into obedience to God, he demonstrated that even common virtue looked beyond this world for its substantiation.² To be just only so far as was consistent with temporal interest had no more moral good in it than payment of debt to keep one's credit good. To be honest, knowing that one lost by it was folly and indiscretion unless God made it otherwise. To set Him aside was to have no morality at all.

Waterland believed that the whole of the Christian faith would be seriously weakened if the institutions were held in contempt. He saw the inevitable result if it should be agreed that morals discoverable by reason alone, were the

¹ The Nature, Obligation, and Efficacy of the Christian Sacraments Considered, and Supplement to the Nature...  
² See Works, V, pp. 501 ff.
essence of Christianity. He maintained that God was not arbitrary in laying down positive commands, that both moral and positive duties would continue as long as God saw that there was occasion for them, and that submitting to God's authority was most highly honouring Him and showing the profoundest reverence, and humility. The conclusion reached was that contempt of positive duties must be worse than contempt of duties toward our fellow man because of the greater profaneness involved in setting these aside. To neglect Communion was worse than neglecting to feed the hungry, because it was a wilful failure to renew our covenant, to repent of sin, and to improve our spiritual life. Man's obligations to God, if they meant anything, must be superior to his obligations to his fellow man.

A further point was that one could never legitimately separate morality from sacramental observance. Participation in the Sacraments was a part of Christian virtue, and he showed that there was an exercise of love for God and of obedience, worship, humility and thankfulness in the proper observance of them. Both moral and positive duties arose from the will of God, but the former were founded on perceptible grounds, and the latter upon reasons perhaps known only to God. In moral laws we see the reasons first, and come to the knowledge of the law afterwards. In positive laws we know the
laws first, and afterwards the reasons so far as they can be known. Waterland was willing to grant that sacramental observances could not be classified along with moral law as being natural or eternal or indispensable. To do this would make the observances moral instead of sacramental, but it was a natural, eternal and indispensable rule of morality to obey God, even in matters of a positive nature.

In answer to Sykes' denial of any moral requisites for worthy participation, Waterland pointed out that the very nature and end of the Sacrament required of the participant the exercise of love of God, faith, hope, charity and humility because it was a covenanting with God which assuredly had moral connotations. This covenant-like aspect of Holy Communion was the cause of the real difference of opinion between the disputants, and for Waterland it was man's covenant with God that accounted for the direct relationship between moral and positive institutions.

Waterland's final contention in this matter was, that grace from God actually accompanied the Sacraments in that Baptism was the entering upon the Christian life, and the Eucharist was its constant renewal. This made the Sacraments

1. See Works, V, 511.
2. Ibid., V, 525 f.
primary duties. Faith, expressed in obedience to the positive duties, was a means of obtaining grace. Human virtue alone could not possibly constitute the core of Christianity, as was being contended by Sykes, because mankind, even at its best, could not possibly dispense with God's grace. Although Sykes was not ready to eliminate revelation, he persisted in making man the judge of what God ought to require of man and Waterland saw in this an attempt to eliminate God as a necessity. Waterland was certain that the growing gulf between moral and positive institutions could account largely for the rise of Deism and he traced it as follows:

... Deism has sprung up out of the same doctrine about moral and positive institutions. For it was not long before men of corrupt mind took advantage of it, first, to join in the same cry, that positive institutions were of an inferior nature to moral, as means only to an end; next, to look upon the whole Christian religion, or all instituted religion, as positive ordinance, and subservient only to morality; and, lastly, for the finishing stroke, to give broad hints that the means might conveniently be spared, since the end, they imagined, might be obtained without them.¹

Waterland thus defended the importance of positive institutions against what he considered to be a man-centred faith, and demonstrated that God's commands relative to positive observance were of a decidedly moral character; he then completed his case by pointing out that God's

¹ Works, V, 489.
conception of morality found man desperately in need of His grace, and utterly unable to attain salvation by means of his own moral standing.

II. THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRAMENT

Any discussion of a sacrament requires careful treatment because the term, not appearing in the Scriptures, is subject to widely differing interpretation. Waterland, in his formal definition gives only the general conception:

> ... the word "sacrament" is of great latitude, and capable of various significations ... admits of a threefold acceptation in Church writers: sometimes denoting barely the outward sign of each, [baptism and communion] sometimes the thing signified, and sometimes both together, the whole action, service, or solemnity.†

In his typically cautious manner he first states what he has discovered in the writings of the Fathers, and then proceeds to set down the conception of the term as found in the two extremes; the Socinians and the Romanists. The Socinians, represented by Smalcius and Volkelian, were offended by the term because it served to keep up the sense of something mysterious and they denied that it was "an outward sign of an inward grace" because they "allow of no inward grace at

all." 1 The Romanists, in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, make it impossible to consider the Sacrament to be a sign, because it actually becomes the thing signified.

O.C. Quick provides one of the best modern descriptions of the mediating position Waterland was seeking. He says after referring to two extremes to which the meaning of the Eucharist can be taken:

It leads either to a barren rationalism, which finds God nowhere because it seeks Him everywhere at once, or else to a narrow mysticism which identifies the reality of God's action with the explicit consciousness of it in the soul. The via media seems to lie in insisting that the sacraments are both true parts and yet representative parts of that process whereby the divine activity elicits from human souls the heavenward growth of which they are capable in virtue of their inherent and unchanging relation to God. 2

The Sacramental Conception as opposed to the Sacrificial. A spokesman for the High Church party in the early eighteenth century, John Johnson, had been saying that the offering of sacrifice was the main purpose of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Waterland's reaction to this is clear: "The sacramental part of the Eucharist ... is as much superior to the sacrificial as God's part in that holy rite is superior to man's". 3

1. Loc. cit.
His resistance to receptionism, with its denial of the Real Presence, begins here. The question turned upon the function of the Holy Spirit in relation to the elements.

Waterland begins his case with considerable evidence that nothing appears in the early writings about the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the elements until the fourth century.¹

¹ Since Waterland’s day, discussion of the origin of the epiclesis has continued and new discoveries have been made. The Apostolic Tradition, of Hippolytus, springing from Rome about 215 A.D. has in most of its principal versions an epiclesis of the Holy Spirit. (See ed. by Dix, London 1937, iv, 12, p. 9). But the textual problems of this work are notorious and awkwardness both in grammar and theology give rise to suspicion. Dom Gregory Dix excises the invocatory clause as a later interpolation; and, though he has not been universally followed in this, it is clear that if there was an epiclesis in the original text of Hippolytus, it was to beseech a blessing on the participants, not to consecrate the elements. (Cf. B. Botte, L’épîclesis de l’Anaphore d’Hippolyte RTAM, xiv, 1947, pp. 241-251). Similarly, the epiclesis in the early third century sectarian Acts of Thomas (H.R. James, Apocryphal New Testament 1924, p. 422) is extremely obscure; and it is an invocation of the name of Jesus rather than of the Holy Spirit. The description of another Eucharist in the same work (ibid. p. 432) has no mention of an epiclesis of any kind.

The words of Dix are worth quoting in view of Waterland’s conclusion: “outside Syria the use of the Eucharistic epiclesis of the Spirit cannot anywhere be traced back further than A.D. 375. In Syria the earliest certain evidence goes back to A.D. 330, though there are some traces of the theology it embodies to be found in Syrian documents of the third century. But apart from this no trace of the theology that the Spirit plays some part in the consecration of the Eucharist can be found in the pre-Nicene Church at all.” (op. cit. p. 79.)
Bishop Bull had dealt with this question and had shown that Justin and Irenaeus taught that it was the Logos, not the third Person of the Trinity, who descended upon the elements, not to reside in them, but rather to accompany them, and that to the worthy only. It was a union of concurrence, not of infusion or inherence.

Waterland conceived the actual work of the Holy Spirit as being the changing or the translation of the elements:

from common to sacred, from elements to sacraments, from their natural state and condition to supernatural ends, and uses, that they might become holy signs, certain pledges, or exhibitive symbols of our Lord's own natural body and blood in a mystical and spiritual way.

He plainly rejected the possibility of any change in substance and saw no benefit in or necessity for any kind of outward effect produced by the Holy Spirit in the elements.

The basic error of confounding figure and verity, or of exalting signs into things signified is traced from the ninth century through the Reformation and the Council of Trent, and then, in final recapitulation, Waterland shows the absurdity of sacrificing the Divine essence by raising such obvious problems as, whether grace and pardon are first lodged in the elements and then transferred. The only

2. Works, VIII, 232 f.
way a bread-sacrifice could have efficacy would be to nullify the sacrifice of the Cross because Christ was to be sacrificed only once. Christ must have been establishing a sacrament at the last supper with the need of the Church in view and since the sacrifice was to be once offered on the Cross, there remained only the provision of a means for conveying the grace once supplied at Calvary to the successive generations of believers. That means was the sacrament of the Eucharist.

The Question of the Sacramental Feeding in the Eucharist.

Waterland's leading contention here is that Paul's reference in I Cor. X, 3-4, "... did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink", related as it was to the Old Testament manna and water from the rock, was a symbol of spiritual manucation which was to find its fulfilment in the Eucharist. Paul goes on to say that Christ was the heavenly meat and drink of the true Israelites and He must also be ours. The true Israelites fed upon the same heavenly food as we only by different symbols, and in a fainter light. In order to understand this it is necessary to determine in what sense the elements are Christ's Body and Blood. After consecration, the elements are called by the

1. Works, VIII, 279 f.
2. See Ibid., VII, 145 f.
names of that which they pledge and are ordained to convey:

... because they are, though not literally, yet in just construction and certain effect, (standing on Divine promise and Divine acceptance) the very things which they are called, viz. the body and blood of Christ to all worthy receivers. In themselves, they are bread and wine from first to last, but while they are made use of in the holy service, they are considered, construed, understood, (pursuant to Divine law, promise, covenant) as standing for what they represent and exhibit.

For illustration of this idea, Waterland drew upon the famous simile of St. Bernard that likened the Eucharist to instruments of investiture that were only emblematical of what they belonged to, but were at the same time means of conveyance, such as a title-deed. It is not a real estate, but it conveys one.

In attempting to arrive at exactly what Christ meant when He said, "This is my Body" Waterland becomes quite explicit as to the true nature of the Sacrament. If Christ had intended only a bare memorial he need not have said, "this is my Body". To say that He meant only that this was His Body in power and effect, seems to carry in it some obscure conception either of an inherent or infused virtue resting upon the bare elements, and operating as a means which makes it uncertain whether the elements are natural, or sacramental,

1. Works, VII, 147.
or both in one. Waterland felt that it was more reasonable to say that the elements are the Body and Blood (the natural body and blood) in the light of the construction put upon them by Christ Himself. The symbols are not the Body in power and effect, if efficiency is meant, but if the recipient has received the symbols according to the terms specified by Christ, then they are not literally but are interpretatively, and to all saving purposes, that very Body and Blood which they so represent with effect. By construction of Gospel law, and in Divine intention, and therefore in certain effect or consequence, there is a reception of the thing signified. Moses was God to Pharaoh, not literally but in effect, a man and wife are one flesh not literally but in effect. In the Old Testament, particularly in the sacrificial language, there are many examples of this manner of speaking.

Waterland was convinced that this symbolical or mystical construction, in which the body and blood of Christ were appointed as such by Christ, were accepted as such by God the Father, and made such in effect by the Holy Spirit to every faithful receiver, was the view of the Church generally until the eighth century. He shows further that the conception persisted, with some variation, in the teaching of the Reformers and then concludes with a quotation from Cranmer:
And so the olde writers many tymes dooe say, that Christe and the Holy Ghoste be presents in the water, bread, or wyne, (whiche be only the outward vysyble Sacramentes) but that in the dewe mynistration of the Sacramentes, accordyng to Christes ordynance and institution, Christe and his Holy Spirite be trewly and inded present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace in all them that worthily receyve the same.

Waterland definitely believed that sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist was feeding upon the Body broken and Blood shed, under the signs and symbols of bread and wine. The result of such feeding was the strengthening or perfecting of our mystical union with the body of Christ glorified and so, properly speaking, we feed upon the Body as dead, and we receive it into closer union as living.

In the course of Waterland's treatment of sacramental feeding he dealt at length with John VI, 53, where Christ says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you." He believed that this had no reference to the Eucharist because it plainly says that those who feed have life, and those who do not, have no life. This would put the emphasis on mere participation whether worthy or not. If "eating" simply means the act of believing in Christ, then it must be qualified by an allowance for those who have not heard and could not

believe; those who believe but do not obey, and those who are incapable of believing through personal incapacity.

The correct interpretation, for Waterland, must not be loaded with particularities:

... whether with faith or without, whether in the sacraments or out of the sacraments, whether before Christ or since, whether in covenant or out of covenant, whether here or hereafter, no man ever was, is, or will be accepted, but in and through the grand propitiation made by the blood of Christ.

If eating and drinking means receiving, then certainly Christ is to be received. It is the fruit of His death and atonement that constitutes the believer's food, and it is the very hand of God that administers it. Ordinarily, we take this food in faith and in the use of the sacraments, but God may extraordinarily convey it to those incapable of receiving it otherwise. This partaking of Christ is the foundation of all our spiritual privileges and the effect of this feeding is our right to be fellow-heirs with his body glorified, and to have the presence of His Divine nature abiding in us and dwelling with us.

Waterland was aware that some of the Fathers generally interpreted John VI as speaking of the Eucharist, but he distinguished between interpreting and applying. The general doctrine of John VI could be applied to the Eucharist.

---

considered as being worthily received, because the spiritual feeding there mentioned is the thing signified in the Eucharist. The Fathers did not interpret John VI as directly applicable to the Eucharist:

"... because it has not one word of the outward signs or symbols of the spiritual food, but abstracts from all and rests in the general doctrine of the use and necessity of spiritual nutriment, the blood of Christ, to everlasting salvation."

Waterland noted particularly that Cranmer likewise only applied John VI to the Sacrament in a secondary sense. He said in a summary of Cranmer's doctrine:

"... spiritual manducation is a privilege belonging to the Eucharist and therefore John VI is not foreign to the Eucharist; has such relation to it as the inward thing signified bears to the outward signs."  

Waterland's interpretation of I Cor. X, 16 "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?", is very much to the point in this discussion. In this passage and the verses following, there are three communions mentioned: that of Christ's Body and Blood, of the Jewish altar, and of devils. Paul's argument is: as the Eucharist is in significance a participation

2. Ibid., VII, 141 f.
3. Ibid., VII, 196.
of Christ's Body and Blood, and as the Jewish feasts were a participating of the altar, so the eating of idol-meat was, in significance, a participating of devils. His doctrine of the Eucharist then is that it is a communion of Christ's Body and Blood in this sense.

Waterland comes closest to actually defining the "how" of this partaking when he lists six things that he does not think I Cor. X, 16 means: ^ not Transubstantiation because it was not heard of for 800 years after the institution; not a receiving of His natural Flesh and Blood together with the symbols because there is in this the same error as in Transubstantiation and Christ's actual Blood was to be spilled only once; not the eating of Christ's glorified Body by faith, or with the mind only because whatever is corporeal cannot be literally the food of the soul and it is the Body crucified, not glorified, that is represented and eaten in the Sacrament and it cannot be received either with mouth or mind, excepting only in a qualified and figurative sense; not a joint partaking of the outward signs of Christ's Body and Blood because Paul does not say that it is only commemoration, and this aspect would make the participation all sign and nothing signified; not only spiritual feeding, or receiving Christ's promises and doctrine because Paul did

not say that the Eucharist is only a declaration of communion but actual communion and not a communion with Christ our head but a communion of His Body and Blood; not a simple holding of fellowship with Christ because this in no way carries out Paul's reference to a communion of Christ's Body and Blood or the further implication that we become partakers of them. What it does mean in its primary intention and in its certain effect to all worthy communicants is a real communion of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed which implies "... a part in our Lord's passion, and the reconcilement therein made, and the blessed fruits of it."¹ The Body broken and Blood shed are equivalent to the single word "death" with its fruits, and this is what we spiritually receive.

Then the true sacramental content of the Eucharist for Waterland was in the experience of spiritual manducation which is a present receiving of spiritual blessings additional to those experienced before, and this is to be distinguished from other religious duties, which may be described as applications of men to God, by the understanding of the elements as being applications of God to men. They are instruments of the conveyance of the benefits of the death of Christ. The best illustration of this functioning that occurred to Waterland

¹ Works, VII, 208.
was the preaching of the Word. By the Word God conveys His graces but even the inviting or exhorting men to be reconciled to God is not the equivalent of sealing the reconciliation. Preparing the man for covenanting is not the same as covenanting with him, which is accomplished in the sacrament of the Eucharist.

The Remission of Sins in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

That the remission of sins is related to the matter of the sacramental character of the Eucharist, is seen in the Homilies quoted by Waterland to show that the traditional viewpoint had always recognized this function of the Eucharist. One of the clearest was:

As to the number of Sacraments, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of sins, and of our holiness, and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Not only does this suggest that remission is conferred, but that the Eucharist could not in strictness be reputed a Sacrament if there were no remission.

Waterland maintained that God's remission is not always final, but there is a present remission distinct from the final one which may or may not continue to the end.

He seems to intimate a progressive character in all remission:

Indeed, remission of sins of a kind of continued act of God towards good men, often repeated in this life, and more and more confirmed the more they improve; ascertained to them, against all future chances, at their departure . . .

There was no disagreement about the fact that present remission was ordinarily conferred in the sacrament of Baptism so Waterland used this agreement for a starting point. That remission once had been granted was no argument against repeating and renewing it, if there should be a new occasion for it. Although there was not the same need after Baptism, there was nevertheless a great need. Augustine held that baptismal remission covers past and future and has its federal effect for remission of sin repented of all our lives long, but he still believed that the Eucharist was instituted to function similarly. He understood Baptism to be primarily the instrument of justification while the other was of sanctification and although these were distinctly set forth in Scripture, they are so closely connected in the spiritual life that they commonly went together and what increased one, increased the other.

1. Works, VII, 238.
3. Waterland uses this term in the sense of a compact or covenant.
If it were argued that remission was promised only upon repentance, Waterland agreed, but was not the receiving of Communion, as an article of Christian obedience, included in the notion of repentance? Repentance alone, without continual application of the great atonement was of no avail from the standpoint of the Christian covenant. The least that could be said of the expediency of the Eucharist was that it was the application of Christ's merits for rendering our repentance acceptable and thus it had a close relationship to the promised remission. Against the contention that the Eucharist, if it were a renewal of the baptismal covenant, must carry in it a renewal of baptismal remission as well, Waterland urged that repentance was the primary thing in man's relation to God, and therefore Divine wisdom must have added Baptism to stress man's repentance, to render it more acceptable, and to make the pardon therein granted more affecting and memorable. The Eucharist was fitted to serve like purposes.

III. THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRIFICE

The correct understanding of the Eucharist as a sacrifice was important to the Church of England in the early eighteenth century, because Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice being widely received, was believed to be a movement toward the Transubstantiation of the Romanists. Johnson had died
before Waterland took up the matter but his views were ably championed by Dr. Brett who published a tract in 1738 that was entitled "Some Remarks on Dr. Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist."

The Nature of the Christian Sacrifice. Waterland began his explanation of this intricate question by establishing a division of the ceremony into two integral parts: the sacramental, and the sacrificial. A federal or covenanting rite between God and man must involve God's gift to man as well as man's gift to God, and the only suitable sacrifice a man can offer to God in the Eucharist is a spiritual one.

"Spiritual sacrifice" is a term first used by Peter and it agrees with Paul's phrase of "reasonable service". This same idea is apparently what Christ conceived in speaking of worshipping God "in spirit and in truth". This kind of sacrifice does not mean mental service only,

... but takes in mental, vocal, and manual, the service of the heart, mouth and hand; all true and direct service, bodily service, as well as any other, since we ought to serve God with our bodies, as well as our souls.  

1. I. Peter, II, 5.  
2. Romans, XII, 1.  
It is made clear by several references to Roman theologians that they were not agreed as to whether the spiritual sacrifice could be excluded as improper and merely metaphorical. Aquinas\(^1\) said that a sacrifice, proper, is anything performed for God's sole and due honour, in order to appease Him. He plainly makes it a work, or service, not a material thing, and by that very rule determines that the sacrifice of the Cross was a true one, and must therefore be both proper and acceptable. When the Roman Church claims that the Protestants offer no true sacrifice, and thus are not a church, the answer must be that Christ is the Church's sacrifice, and that in the Eucharist there is a participation in that sacrifice, as well as a commemoration and application of it. The offering of prayer, praise, and commemoration, which are visible and public, are the only sacrifices left to offer.

Mede, in his *Christian Sacrifice*, which affirms that the elements in the Eucharist are offered to God in sacrifice, speaks of "proper" and "improper" sacrifices. By "proper" he meant a material sacrifice. A sacrifice made symbolically, or of a spiritual kind was "improper". Waterland demonstrated by many patristic references\(^2\) that

---

1. See *Summa Theologica*, par. iii, q. 48, cited in *Works*, VIII, 149.
the Fathers never referred to spiritual sacrifices by any such name as "improper" or "metaphorical" but rather held that such sacrifices were true and were the noblest and divinest that could be offered. The High Churchman, Laud, spoke of three sacrifices: Christ's own sacrifice, commemorated before God by the priest alone in his breaking the bread and pouring out the wine; the sacrifice made by priest and people jointly of praise and thanksgiving; and the self-sacrifice of every communicant. Laud said nothing of proper or improper, considering all three to be proper even if spiritual.

After Laud, another group, claiming to follow Hooker's teaching, began a new emphasis that depreciated the sacrificial aspect. Hooker had declared that, "... sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry" and that "we have now nosacrifice". He obviously was thinking of the term in a purely propitiatory sense, and in this sense Waterland would agree with him, but he did not make clear whether there was not a sacrifice of another type.

A third set of Divines sprang up to correct what they thought to be a weakness in Hooker's teaching and they, led by Mede, began to contend for the material nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Two fundamental flaws in Mede's system were: his endeavouring to base his definition of a Christian sacrifice on the Levitical law, as if typical and true were the same; and his inability to establish the sacrifice he preferred by the very rules that he adopted. He rightly observed that in the Levitical peace offerings, God was assigned a portion, and this was very necessary to the completion of the federal part of the oblation, but when Mede tried to make the analogy apply to the Christian feast, he could find no corresponding place for God because, nothing was ever said about God's partaking, in the words of institution.

The idea behind this "new scheme", as Waterland called it, was that the sacramental body was supposed to be substituted for the natural, so as to be exclusively an equivalent for it. This substitute was made so by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit according to Mede and his school. Then is the Spirit sacrificed along with the Body? And if grace and virtue accompany the elements as we partake, then how, in presenting them to God as one must do in material sacrifice, can pardon and sanctification be presented, as a sacrifice
to God? And would not the baptismal waters have as good a claim as the Eucharist to being a substitute? These are a few of the questions raised by the scheme that seemed to Waterland unanswered.

In concluding Waterland's views of the nature of the Christian sacrifice, it may be helpful to set down his analysis\(^1\) of Mr. Johnson's system since it was the backbone of the "new scheme". Johnson began by maintaining that Gospel ministers were proper priests, and since priests need a proper sacrifice, the Eucharist would best seem to serve the purpose. The notion that no sacrifice could be proper unless it was material had prevailed for about a century so pains were taken to prove the Eucharist a material sacrifice. But an evangelical priesthood needed more than a material sacrifice to offer. This made it necessary to enrich the elements with the Spirit, borrowing from the sacramental conception of the Eucharist to augment and advance the sacrificial. The next difficulty in the scheme was the accounting for the sacrifice of the elements if it could not be proved that Christ so sacrificed them in the original Eucharist. Proof of this was impossible so it was simply asserted that He sacrificed the elements as His sacramental body and reasons and authorities were brought in to maintain it, but the fact

---

remained that Scripture spoke often of Christ's offering Himself but never once of His offering the symbols in sacrifice. The further attempted solution was to say that He offered Himself in the Eucharist, but by, and with the symbols. This was plainly an after-thought that did not fit well with former parts of the scheme. One further difficulty remained: how to account for the fact that the New Testament plainly teaches that Christ sacrificed Himself once. Either it was not done in the Eucharist or not on the Cross. The defenders of the doctrine seemed to Waterland to have resolved to give up the sacrifice of the Cross.

In further defining the nature of the Christian sacrifice, Waterland makes a distinction in the understanding of the term "commemorative sacrifice".

If that phrase means a spiritual service of ours, commemorating the sacrifice of the cross, then it is justly styled a sacrifice commemorative of a sacrifice, and in that sense a commemorative sacrifice; but if that phrase points only to the outward elements representing the sacrifice made by Christ, then it means a sacrifice commemorated, or a representation and commemoration of a sacrifice.  

Before he proceeded to examine the testimony of the Ancients, as his manner invariably was on such points as these, he laid

2. Ibid., VII, 349.
down his own definition of the above mentioned spiritual
service which he conceived to be incorporated in the sacri-
ifice of the Eucharist:

1. The sacrifice of alms to the poor, and oblations to
the Church, when religiously intended, and offered
through Christ, is a Gospel sacrifice. Not that the
material offering is a sacrifice to God, for it goes
entirely to the use of man; but the service is what
God accepts.

2. The sacrifice of prayer, from a pure
heart is evangelical incense.

3. The sacrifice of
praise and thanksgiving to God the Father, through
Christ Jesus our Lord, is another Gospel sacrifice.

4. The sacrifice of a penitent and contrite heart, even
under the Law (and now much more under the Gospel, when
explicitly offered through Christ) was a sacrifice of
the new covenant; for the new covenant commenced from
the time of the fall, and obtained under the Law, but
couched under shadows and figures.

5. The sacrifice
of ourselves, our souls and bodies, another Gospel
sacrifice.

6. The offering up of the mystical body of
Christ, that is, His Church, is another Gospel sacri-
fice; or rather, it is coincident with the former,
excepting that there, persons are considered in their
single capacity, and here, collectively in a body.

I take the thought from St. Austin, who grounds it
chiefly on I Cor. X, 17 and the texts belonging to the
former article.

7. The offering up of true converts,
or sincere penitents, to God, by their pastors, who
have laboured successfully in the blessed work, is
another very acceptable Gospel sacrifice.

8. The sacri-
fice of faith and hope and self-humiliation, in comem-
moreating the grand sacrifice, and resting finally upon
it, is another Gospel sacrifice, and eminently proper
to the Eucharist.

It was in this sense then that ministers performed the office
of evangelical priests. They were commemorating the same
sacrifice below that our High Priest commemorates above, and

they were yielding up through mediation the prayers and services of Christians to Christ, and they were offering up to God all those under their ministry who were sanctified by the Spirit.

In substantiation of this general idea of both Christian sacrifice and priesthood, Waterland explored the opinions of most of the best-known of the Fathers. This investigation is well done, and results in considerable evidence in support of the idea of spiritual sacrifice, but it will serve this present purpose to examine only a few of the more outstanding of the men whose writings Waterland cites.

Clement of Alexandria, in answer to the question, what sacrifice is most acceptable to God? answers that it is a contrite heart, and goes on to say: "How then shall I crown, or anoint, or what incense shall I offer unto the Lord? A heart that glorifies its Maker is a sacrifice of sweet odour unto God".¹ He elsewhere describes meekness, philanthropy, piety, humility, and sound knowledge to be among the acceptable sacrifices.² Again, he says that the sacrifices of the Christian Gnostic are prayers, lauds, reading of Scripture, psalms and anthems.³ It is not claimed that he applied

these general principles of Gospel sacrifice directly to the Eucharist though he might have, with no violation of his principles.

Tertullian speaks of his superior sacrifice: "I offer unto God a fatter and nobler sacrifice, which himself hath commanded; viz. prayer sent out from a chaste body, an innocent soul, and a sanctified spirit:"\(^1\) and again he says: "We sacrifice indeed, but it is with pure prayer, as God has commanded; for God, the Creator of the universe, hath no need of any incense or blood".\(^2\) In speaking directly of the eucharistical sacrifice he carries the same thought further:

"We are the true worshippers and the true priests, who worshipping in spirit, do in spirit sacrifice prayer... this is what we ought to bring to God's altar, devotion from the whole heart, fed with faith, decked with truth, by innocence made entire, and clean by chastity, crowned with a feast of charity, attended with a train of good works, amidst the acclamations of psalms and anthems."\(^3\)

It will be noticed that he describes the Christian and spiritual sacrifice of prayer in phrases borrowed from material sacrifices and he is undoubtedly referring to the

---

Eucharist, because, previous to this quotation he speaks of public psalmody and responses, and he mentions the altar in the quotation, also the feast of charity which was connected with the observance of the Sacrament in the early days.

Cyprian, in comforting some in prison who could not communicate, said:

Neither your religion nor faith can suffer by the hard circumstances you are under, that the priests of God have not the liberty to offer and celebrate the holy sacrifice. You do celebrate and you do offer unto God a sacrifice both precious and glorious, and which will much avail you towards your obtaining heavenly rewards.

It is clearly shown here that Cyprian looked upon the Eucharist as a sacrifice, that in case of exclusion from the Sacrament he conceived that spiritual sacrifices alone were equivalent to it, and therefore he could not conceive of any sacrifice offered in the service as being the archetypal sacrifice itself, or in any sense equal to it.

The last of the Ancients to be consulted was Augustine, and Waterland showed, from references in De Civitate Dei, that he classified all the Gospel sacrifices under two headings: one was our Lord's sacrifice on Calvary and the

other was the Church's offering of herself. His notion of the eucharistical sacrifice resolves itself into one compound idea of a spiritual sacrifice in which the communicants offer up themselves, and in this act they commemorate the grand Sacrifice.

These testimonies, along with the others, provide foundation for the conclusion that the spiritual sacrifice conception of the Eucharist is in accord with the federal view because it comprises a solemn renewing of former engagements under the symbols God has appointed. Thus the true understanding of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist involves a spiritual offering that is most helpful in Christian practice and those who would materialize it, do a great disservice to practical religion.

IV. THE EUCHARIST AS A MEMORIAL

Because God cannot receive by any human act an advantage that He does not already possess, Waterland concludes that the ultimate end of all provisions that God has made is the happiness of man. God appointed the Sacrament for man because He delights to exercise His goodness and so the ultimate end of it is the glory of God as it is coincident with man's happiness. But the proximate or immediate end

---

of the institution of the Eucharist by God the Son, is the commemoration or remembrance of Christ and particularly the remembrance of His dying for us. This chief objective in no way conflicts with the sacramental or sacrificial aspects of the Eucharist as previously described.

The commemoration of the death of Christ includes two things; the consideration of Him as Lord, and as dying; one expressing His personal dignity, the other expressing His suffering for us.

The Remembrance of Christ in the Eucharist. The Greek rendering of the phrase "This do in remembrance of me" is capable of bearing several meanings and Waterland shows that these meanings, as they are emphasized by various schools of thought are of great importance in determining the significance of the Sacrament. The three main meanings are: In remembrance of me; in commemoration of me; for a memorial of me, or, for my memorial.

The Socinians had seized upon the first of these, "In remembrance of me" in an effort to eliminate all possible mystical reference. Undoubtedly, this simple commemoration of Christ is a principal end in the observance, but it does not discount the other Scriptures that define in what capacity He is to be remembered. To remember Him as a great and good man is to do no more that the pagans and Platonists
of the second and third centuries did. To recall Him as our Master to whom we owe such regard as do any followers owe to their leader is to place Him on the level with Moses, whom the Bible states to be but a servant of Christ and again practically anyone but infidels and apostates would agree to this understanding. It is insufficient to remember Him as an eminent prophet, or one of the chief prophets, or ambassador from heaven who wrought miracles and lived a good life and who will return to judge humanity, because this is in perfect accord with the Mohammedan conception which must be recognized to be substantially lower than any legitimate Christian conception, or than the Bible account. One must completely ignore many plain passages of Scripture to be content even with a consideration of Him that makes Him higher than the angels, or older than the systems of the world.

In answer to this Socinian "remembrance" Waterland demonstrated that the whole tenor of Scripture indicates that He is Divine Lord and Master in such a sense as to be also regarded as Jehovah, God of Israel, or God before creation by whom all creatures are made and by whom the foundations of the earth were laid. As such He is worthy of worship and adoration and He ought to be so remembered at the Communion.

Table. Because the value of what He has done rises in proportion to the dignity of His person, it is most important that His proper divinity should be appreciated in the Eucharistic remembrance.

"In commemoration of me" the second possible rendering of the original words spoken by Jesus, contains the idea of extolling, honouring, or celebrating and is thus somewhat beyond a mere remembrance. Waterland agreed that "Commemoration" was an adequate conception when properly understood. It must include a remembrance of the benefits and an outward celebration of the same and it all hinged on the recognition of the divinity of Christ. Such passages as Hebrews X, 13-14, "how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." were considered sufficient ground for the establishment of such divinity in that Waterland understood by "eternal spirit" a direct reference to Christ's Divine nature.

A more inclusive rendering than either of those already given, according to Waterland, was "for a memorial of me" or "for my memorial" in that these seemed to include both of the former. He was not sure that there was in the word ἀνάμνησις any allusion to the sacrificial memorials of the

Old Testament and he was inclined to doubt the validity of building any premise upon the fact that the same word was used twice in the Septuagint because it was used in another sense. ¹ But that the service of the Eucharist should ascend as a memorial before God as much as Cornelius' prayer and alms did, seemed utterly logical to Waterland. Any Gospel services rightly performed are accepted memorials in the sight of God.

Therefore, the highest view of the Eucharist is, that it is a commemoration before God, but Waterland points out that it is also a memorial before men in the same sense as the Passover. God said to Israel that the Paschal service was to be "unto you for a memorial". ² This New Testament memorial was to be "a memorial left to the Church of Christ to perpetuate the memory of that great deliverance from the bondage of sin and Satan. . . ." ³ Even as all the Passovers, after the first, were a kind of representation and commemoration of the original, so all Eucharistic Passovers were a sort of commemoration of the original. This view does not prevent the Supper from being a memorial of Christ and His passion as well.

¹. Works, VII, 67.
². Exodus, XII, 14.
³. Ibid., VII, 69 f.
The Remembrance of the death of Christ in the Eucharist.

In commemorating the death of Christ there is obvious need for an understanding of the meaning of His death, and Waterland seized upon this ideal opportunity to proclaim his convictions regarding the substitutionary atonement. Christ's sacrifice was a "willing sacrifice to Divine justice for the sins of mankind." "... a vicarious punishment of sin, a true and proper expiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind:"¹ His explicit and scripturally substantiated account reveals his concern over the drift toward the Socinian theory or the atonement which looked upon the death of Christ as but the death of a noble martyr. He felt that it was impossible for a man to come worthily to the holy Communion if he had no appreciation of the sacrifice there commemorated, and if he were relying upon a righteousness of his own that was independent of the grace of God in Christ.

For Waterland, the substance of the gospel was contained in Paul's phrase, "Christ, and Him crucified" and it was only by virtue of this sacrifice that we received the benefits of atonement, redemption, propitiation, justification, reconciliation, and remission. In presenting the cause of our salvation Waterland states that it all must begin with Divine philanthropy.

¹ Works, VII, 72.
This is the principal cause. The conditional cause is the performance of our duties, such as faith and repentance, as we are enabled by Divine grace. The meritorious cause is the sacrifice made in the death of Christ which sacrifice recommends and renders acceptable our imperfect performances. The instrumental causes are the Divine ordinances and, more particularly, the two Sacraments. Through these God applies to men that are fitly disposed, the virtue of the sacrifice.

The relation of Christ's atonement to the observance of the Eucharist is based upon Christ's continual intercession in heaven in that this is a kind of commemoration of the sacrifice.

If that sacrifice is represented and pleaded in heaven by Christ himself for remission of sins, that shews that there is an intrinsic virtue, value, merit in it, for the purposes intended; and it shews further, how rational and how proper our Eucharistical service is, as commemorating the same sacrifice here below, which our Lord himself commemorates above.

So Waterland conceives the purpose behind the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice to be: a suing for pardon on our behalf, being encouraged to come as we have need by the reassuring knowledge of Christ's continual intercession; an acknowledging of our need of mercy; and a confessing all our other

2. Loc. cit.
righteousness as nothing without it. There is combined in it a service of thanksgiving and of self-humiliation.

After thus clearly stating his own understanding of the memorial aspect, Waterland proceeded to deal with some of the standard objections to the position. It was asked, "Why does God need a reminder?" but the ready reply was that we need to show forth to God our Lord's death even as we need to tell Him our needs in prayer, though He knows all about both. Again, it was implied that if the Eucharist is a commemoration then we cannot receive present benefits, but Waterland shows that the error grew out of the misunderstanding of the word "remembrance". It need not always refer to something past or absent as it obviously does not in the case of, "Remember thy Creator" or "Remember the Sabbath day". The word means "call to mind" and certainly we can call to mind present benefits. Beside this, if the word in question be translated "commemoration" which may properly be done, it strongly suggests the presence of the thing commemorated. A similar answer was given to those who contended that Christ must be absent if He is to be "remembered" in this service.

Waterland felt that it was not justifiable to argue that Christ was absent because we are told to continue the Eucharist "until He come". The text does not say "till
His body appears" but "till He come": that is, till He comes to put an end to this sacramental service, this probationary duty, making the antithesis between present service and future glory rather than between present and absent body. Of course he agreed that the memorial of a thing could not be the thing signified, but he still saw in the proper understanding of the word "sacrament" that there were inward and invisible graces as well as outward visible signs. In our remembering the price of our redemption through the prescribed means of the Eucharistical elements the memory was given a sacramental quality through the operation of the Holy Spirit within the communicant.

V. THE EUCHARIST AS A COVENANT

The federal nature of the Sacraments involved a mutual covenanting between God and man at God's invitation. The advantage of a covenant over a naked precept was that it produced a stronger tie, a closer relationship, and defined our privileges. God's grace appears in this arrangement when it is recalled that, though the obligations are mutual, the benefits are not, because the benefits all go to one party. Waterland considered that there was a direct relationship between Baptism and Communion in that there was no new covenant established in the Eucharist, but rather a
covenanting anew which confirmed or renewed the stipulations indicated by Baptism.

God's transactions in covenants in the past. In the legal covenant, made at Sinai, between God and the Israelites, the chief characteristic was the temporal nature of the promises. It may be referred to as an external covenant although it pre-figured the spiritual covenant and was a shadow of good things to come. It apparently required frequent renewal and as new generations came up, a re-granting or renewing was necessary. In this, God established a precedent for occasional renewal in the new covenant.

In the early eighteenth century, there was general agreement that Circumcision was federal in nature. It was a formal stipulation between God and man which carried with it mutual engagements of blessings and service. The "uncircumcised shall be cut off" as having "broken my covenant".¹ The Passover was a proper sacrifice which pointed, through its typology, to Christ and His sufferings. Whether the Passover was truly a federal rite had been challenged and Waterland referred to a number of recognized theologians to prove that his view was supported.

¹. Genesis XVII, 1-14.
They agreed that it was a sign and a memorial implying the people's engaging to keep the law of God, and God's engaging to be their God, which mutual obligation suggests a covenant.

The Christian sacraments are much clearer in significance. Baptism was a federal rite according to I Pet. III, 21, which states that it is "the stipulation of a good conscience to Godward". The Fathers frequently wrote as though Baptism were a covenanting rite, and that it succeeded in the room of Circumcision. The Eucharist is a federal service because it implies a real and vital communion between God and every worthy receiver and it also involves mutual stipulations which can be considered the renewal of Baptismal relationships. Waterland felt that Christ's statement, "my blood of the new covenant" was the unanswerable proof of the federal nature of the rite.

In comparing the institution of the various covenants it would appear logical that Christ, realizing that He was addressing Jews who had been accustomed to such federal phrases, would intend His words of institution to be understood in that sense. There is the element of communion, or participation, in which God readmits the communicant into covenant and in which the communicant re-accepts the covenanting terms. Every worthy receiver, as often as he
sacramentally receives the Blood and Body of Christ, revives his interest in our Lord's passion and in the covenant thereupon founded and thus renews his baptismal covenant. This is plainly more than remembrance.

A quotation from Archbishop Potter is brought in to strengthen Waterland's analogy of participation drawn from the sacrifices of the ancient peoples, Jew and Gentile:

... in the ancient sacrifices ... one part of the victim was offered upon the altar, and another reserved to be eaten of those persons in whose name the sacrifice was made; this was accounted a sort of partaking of God's table, and was a federal rite ... the Lord's Supper was always believed to succeed in the place of sacrifices.

The death of Christ, being the price of our redemption and the valuable consideration whereupon the covenant was founded, needed no repetition and in this it is seen to be far more than a federal rite. Even as the sacrifices and sacraments of the Hebrews are properly regarded as federal, so are the Christian Sacraments because they are more than a profession of our being in covenant with God: they are covenanting rites in which our stipulation with God either commences (as in baptism) or is renewed (as in the Eucharist).

The binding effect of the legal sacrifice applies in the Eucharist. Throughout Waterland's presentation of the covenanting aspect of the Sacrament he made use of the

similarity of the legal sacrifices to the New Testament ordinances. The legal sacrifices were federal rites that involved a set of laws directly and foreshadowed the evangelical stipulations indirectly. Likewise the Gospel Sacraments bear an analogy to those legal sacrifices and do bind, in a manner that suits the Gospel state and thus directly ratify evangelical stipulations. They are properly federal rites of the Gospel state, as the other were federal rites of the legal economy.

This relationship between the economies, obviously intended of God, was Waterland's answer to those who saw no importance in the observance of the Sacrament. Verbal professions or repeated acknowledgments can never equal the renewal of a covenant as prescribed in the Sacrament. Verbal expression has nothing to do with a covenant having mutual obligations, nor does it involve a communion of Christ's body, nor participation of His sacrifice, nor the ratification of the new covenant in Christ's blood, nor the drinking into one spirit, nor pledges of our union in one body, as does the partaking of one loaf and one cup.

For the same reason repentance alone is not the best means of renewing our covenant. Repentance is a qualification for renewing, not a form of renewal. The terms of covenanting must be distinguished from acts of covenanting, repentance is the renewal of the man, but the renewal of a covenant is another thing.
Waterland believed that most efforts to dispense with the Sacraments or to lower their significance were, primarily an effort to discountenance God's part in the affairs of men. It is clear in all his teaching that God's part in the Eucharist was such that if it were not included, the rite would not be federal and thus it would not be a sacrament.

VI. PRACTICAL MATTERS RELATING TO THE OBSERVANCE OF THE SACRAMENT

Waterland's exhaustive treatment of the theoretical phases of the subject and his appreciation of its vast significance never lessened his interest in such practical matters as: the suitable preparation for communicating, and the frequency of communication. His concern about the moral aspects of communing may be a reflection of his realization that the Deists, with their underscoring of the practical and social aspects of Christianity, might serve as a contrast to both the Churchmen and the Puritans who often forgot that practice was of equal importance with orthodoxy.

The tendency of Waterland's Arminianism, with its note of human responsibility, seen so clearly in his doctrine of Justification, shows itself in his rather stringent requirements for participation in the Eucharist. In the face of
considerable modern day opinion regarding as 'anathema' any thought of being worthy to partake, and thus tending to minimize preparation, these suggestions will seem legalistic but there could be a value in reconsidering them.

Proper preparation for Holy Communion. The sacredness of the institution requires an observance that is characterized by joy, thankfulness, and godly fear and this demands some preparation of both heart and mind. If it is agreed that the Eucharist is a renewal of a covenant then obviously the covenant must first be established at Baptism, and this is then the first step of preparation and absolutely necessary. Confirmation is also highly expedient, but Waterland recognises that there is not the same Scriptural obligation for this as for Baptism.

Paul's admonition that a communicant must "examine himself"\(^1\) and be able to "discern the Lord's body" indicates that a competent knowledge of the meaning and requirements of the ordinance should inevitably precede the reception. This can scarcely be done without a knowledge of the main substance of the Christian religion and so adequate preparation must include a sound and right faith.

\(^1\) I Cor. XI, 28-29.
Waterland is certain that the Fathers agree as to the necessity of a sincere repentance without which our covenanting with God must be hypocritical. Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Cyprian, are all cited to show the concern of the early Church that repentance and newness of life should be understood to be included in all "worthy receiving". John Locke objected to this understanding of "worthy receiving", feeling it to be too stringent, and pleaded that this phrase related only to irreverent behaviour at the table rather than to some preparatory qualification. Waterland's reply was that, apart from Scripture, plain reason would suggest that the receiving of the Communion with dispositions repugnant to the end and use of it, is receiving unworthily, and offering an affront to its Author. He also points out that Paul has been dealing with the ill spirit, unchristian temper, animosities and parties, in the context of the passage relating to "worthy receiving". This circumstance, along with the admonition advising everyone to "examine himself" gives the passage

2. Locke on I Cor. XI, 28; Arthur Bury's Constant Communicant (1681) is also referred to in the F.N. in Works, VII, 396.
3. Ibid., VII, 396.
a sufficiently general character to be of standing use for
the Church for all time. One further convincing argument
is drawn from the Corinthian letter. Paul forbids the
Christians to eat with certain people, speaks of "partakers
of the table of devils", and describes others as making one
body with harlots.¹ If the people in these conditions
could not receive worthily, then I Co. XI must include more
than disorder in the term "unworthy" and if such people could
receive worthily, then the persons who are not fit to eat
with Christians, who are communicants of devils, or who are
incapable of being living members of Christ, are still
capable of worthily receiving the symbolical body and blood
of Christ which is appointed to strengthen our union with
Him and which assumes men to be living members of His body
when they communicate.

In emphasizing the importance of repentance, Waterland
defines it generally as being possessed of a new heart, of
making a serious resolution to amend what is found amiss,
or of having a deliberate intention to live a life of holiness,
and then he goes on to make four additional qualifications of real repentance: (1) Restitution must be made to
any who have been wronged in matters of person, estate, or

¹. I. Cor. V, 11; X, 20-21; VI, 15-16.
good name and it is essential that moral honesty regulate the amendment. For public wrongs, public satisfaction is best and for secret wrongs, the more secret the reparations, the better. In such cases it is the offender who must sue for reconcilement and when degrees of guilt are involved, the proportion of guilt must govern the reparation. (2) A readiness to forgive any offences committed against us as was taught by Christ and was made an express condition of our own forgiveness. The Master regarded this rule of such importance that it was included in the Lord's Prayer. Again Christ taught that we are to forgive a man as often as he repents and even when he does not repent, vengeance is still God's sole right. So the forgiveness that is limited to the repentance of the offending party has to do only with the receiving of that person into the degree of friendship that existed before, a thing not safe, nor reasonable, unless he is sorry and gives evidence of an intention not to repeat the act. Waterland goes on in this very sane and balanced conception of what he calls "Gospel forgiveness", to discuss in some detail the various cases that can arise. His principle is that forgiveness is always required,

2. Deuteronomy XXXII, 35, Romans, XII, 19, Hebrews, X, 30.
3. See Works, VII, 405 f.
and even prayer for the offender except in some rare cases such as the one mentioned by John, "There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it".¹ (3) A due regard for Church unity and public peace in opposition to schism because the Eucharist is a symbol of peace, a feast in love, and a proper discernment of the Lord's body will inevitably cement the union. (4) Mercy and charity toward the poor are self-evident duties among brethren who gather about the Communion Table.

In setting this standard, Waterland is careful to show the Scriptural basis for it and he brings to bear on any controversial point the testimony of the Fathers. Yet he recognizes the danger of discouraging any who sincerely desire to partake worthily in spite of weakness and he makes definite allowance for sins of infirmity, such as are "ordinarily consistent with the prevailing love of God and love of our neighbour".² These sins of daily incursion must not be looked upon as a bar to our receiving, but rather as a proof of our need for fresh grace. He provides plenty of room at the chancel rail for needy souls, requiring only repentant hearts of them, in such encouraging statements as the following:

1. I John V, 16.
2. Works, VII, 408.
And though we ought to take care to come properly qualified to the holy Communion, yet we come not to declare how rich we were before, but to deplore our poverty, and to beg fresh and new supplies from above.

The length of time needed for making adequate preparation for Communion is to be governed entirely by the moral life of the communicant. When a man has competently adjusted his accounts with God, he is fit to come, and not until then. In this is seen the advantage of living a consistently good life which is an habitual preparation but because of the ability to deceive oneself, it is wise and usually necessary to go beyond this in a more specific preparation. Waterland was not opposed to the use of the treatises of weekly preparation, since they were not rules but helps, and thought that the number and variety was no disadvantage. He also suggested, not unkindly, that those who found most fault with them were often not the ones who needed them least.

A final word on the value of preparatory fasting was that those who saw in it an expression of Christian humility and reverence and a help to devotion, would do well to make use of it, but no one should allow themselves to be in bondage to the practice. The significance of fasting as it was seen

1. Works, VII, 207.
in the early Church was that it related entirely to personal preparation and had nothing to do with any corporal presence. As evidence, Waterland pointed to the fact that fasting was just as customary in preparation for baptism.¹

The frequency of communicating. A phrase that Waterland uses in discussing this point is "bare communicating".² He agrees that a man cannot too often commemorate Christ and His passion, nor too often return devout thanks for God's merciful provision, nor too often make resolutions of amendment, nor too often receive pardon of sins and he believes that all of these things will be experienced in a worthy communication, but when they are not experienced, the communication is "bare". His previous stress on worthiness is employed here as the main consideration in determining how often one should come to the Table. The trend in the eighteenth century was toward less frequent participation and Waterland favoured this if the trend was the result of greater concern about the requirements of preparation. Those who agreed with Waterland that the disposition of the communicants governed the effectiveness

¹. Martene De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus (1736-37) tom i, p. 25. There is evidence that the same rule applied to Confirmation on p. 237, 239: cited in Works IV, 779.
². "Of the Obligation to frequent Communion", Works, VII, 411.
of the Sacrament, apparently concluded that God would more readily forgive the lack of the Sacrament than the lack of the qualifications proper for it.

Those who avoided the celebration of the Eucharist because of the high standards of preparation, were to be reminded that God set similar standards for the observance of the Passover, but did not for that reason permit the Jews to avoid it. Such avoidance was a great sin and amounted to their disowning of God's covenant. It appears that Waterland preferred that Communion should be available to the people often enough to insure that they did not forget the significance and obligations of their covenant, but not so often that, in the resulting undue familiarity, they might neglect thorough preparation. His main concern is apparent in the following:

. . . the sacramental memorial is a memorial of Christ Godman, who died a willing sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and that it is not a bare memorial, or representation of something once done and suffered, but a real and present exhibition of the graces, comforts, or blessing accruing therefrom, to every worthy receiver; that therefore proper acknowledgments and engagements are expected from us and those require suitable preparations and qualifications, and a deportment thereto corresponding, in a word, self-examination and self-approbation beforehand, serious resolutions of amendment at the time, and a conscientious care afterwards to persevere in well-doing to our lives end.

There is no evidence that these stringent requirements changed the prevailing attitude of apathy toward the Sacrament but Waterland's object undoubtedly was the increasing of the importance of it inasmuch as it had, in many instances, degenerated into a perfunctory formality for those who participated.

VII. CONCLUSION

In concluding this chapter on Waterland's doctrine of the Eucharist, the claim of consistency can be made for him in spite of the fact that he had an appreciation for nearly all of the different schools of thought relating to the primary significance of the Communion service. It might be charged that he has attempted to embrace the viewpoints of all the major schools of thought in an effort to create a syncretism that will please everyone and therefore has not expounded one particular phase of the doctrine. A fairer judgment is that he was of such temperament, of such wide acquaintance with prevailing concepts and of such profound scholarship, that he could see in each of the theories a gleam of truth that needed to be appreciated.

Brilioth, in commenting on the sacrificial ideas associated with the Eucharist, obviously favours inclusiveness and sees real danger in anything less than a full appreciation
of the various facets of eucharistic truth:

"The eucharist is menaced at every point, not at this point only, by the danger of degradation to a pagan level; and the danger becomes serious whenever any of the aspects of the eucharist is held in isolation from the rest. The effective defence is therefore the maintenance of all the aspects in their completeness and harmony."

One aspect that seems to have been overlooked in Waterland's treatment of the subject is communion, with its accent on the Church universal and the oneness of the Body. This is of interest because the rediscovery of the idea of communion was one of the most significant contributions of the Reformation to the meaning of the Eucharist. Luther and Calvin put the act of communion back as the centre of the worship service, and the corporate character of the service was restored by the introduction of congregational singing and of common prayer made by the priest and the people together. The celebration of the Eucharist soon lost its place as the central act of Divine worship in the post-Reformation Church and in England, although there was an attempt in the Prayer Book of 1549 to restore it, there was no corresponding development of the liturgy and the impetus was lost. The Anglican Communion service became steadily more individualistic in tone with kneeling at the chancel

1. Yngve Brilioth, The Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic, 1930, p.48.)
rail taking the place of the communicating around a table. The spirit of sectarianism gained force within the Church as a whole and the Church of England, being somewhat isolated from her sister protestant groups on the Continent, may have been more strongly affected. Doubtless the roots of this matter extend much further and involve many other things and it could be argued that communion has been implicitly, if not explicitly, retained within the meaning of the Anglican Eucharist, but Waterland's failure to include it in his exhaustive survey of the subject is surely of significance when it is realized that his views are conceded to be typically Anglican.

J.B. Phillips's recent little book on the Eucharist contains a chapter entitled "The Nature of the Fellowship" in which he writes warmly of the importance of communion. He takes the idea of appreciating all possible facets of eucharistic truth somewhat further than Waterland in the following:

1. In the reissue of Waterland's *Review*, 1868, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Bishop Jackson says in the preface that the work was, "a safe and perspicuous guide to the tenets on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which, as a matter of fact, have been held by the great majority of the ablest and most learned theologians of the Reformed Church of England."
All of us need, from time to time, to shake ourselves free from the particular form of thinking which our branch of the Church has almost imperceptibly formed around us. So far as is humanly possible we ought to observe and, if conscience and circumstances permit, take part in, the usages of other branches of the Church. Only in this way can we gain some little insight into what is the intention of the Spirit who makes almost all Christians value this Service so highly.

He apparently recognizes some lack of the spirit of communion, when he asks:

If I, an Anglican Vicar, deny my Free Church brother access to the Lord's Table set up in my Church, what am I in fact suggesting? Do I really mean that he is in some way a defective Christian, so defective that I must not allow him to approach our common Lord through the Anglican rite? . . . Holy Communion is intended surely for all those who love our Lord and Saviour in sincerity and truth. This Mystery cannot be 'cornered' by any denomination and reserved exclusively for the use of its own members.

2. In the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922 the following appears on p. 164: "All the main types of Anglican tradition, however, agree in regarding communion as a central and essential element in the Eucharist. The very fact that controversy is not raised upon this point has tended to diminish the stress laid upon it in doctrinal statement, and clear thinking about its nature and implications is often neglected, simply because it is not a subject of dispute." This is a tacit admission that communion has been insufficiently stressed, at least doctrinally, and it would be difficult to prove that Waterland only expounded those phases of Eucharistic truth that were subjects of dispute.
3. op. cit. p. 74 f.
Brilioth did not only have this phase of the communion idea in mind in the reference cited above in which he comments on the failure of the Anglican communion to recover the unity of communion and Eucharist but there could be a relationship between his thought, Phillips' remarks, and Waterland's omission.

It is freely granted that Waterland's times and temperament, as well as the uncertain state of his Church, would have made it very difficult for him to fully appreciate the significance of communion in its inter-confessional implications but it may be a legitimate conclusion that his failure to stress a vital meaning of the central act of worship can be associated with a persistent trait of individualism in the Anglican Church today. Van Mildert, in the nineteenth century, used Waterland's authority to support an obviously prejudiced view of the Methodists, as a case in point.

1. See Works, I, pp. 287, 180 f. In speaking of the 'soli-fidian' doctrine Van Mildert continues: "This doctrine was revived by the new sect of Methodists, particularly by Whitefield; and it was a notion calculated to spread rapidly among corrupt and ignorant minds to the great prejudice of sound morals and pure religion".
Waterland upheld the spiritual nature of the Supper throughout and revealed great consistency as he applied his principle to the Eucharist considered as a Sacrament, as a sacrifice, as a memorial and as a covenant. In the case of the sacramental significance of the meal, he taught that there was a spiritual manducation, in other words, an inner reception of the benefits of the death of Christ by means of the appointed material symbols. Considered as a sacrifice, the Eucharist could only be regarded a spiritual offering because Christ had already completed the atoning sacrifice. The spiritual value of such a sacred memorial can be seen immediately, but to limit the significance of the Eucharist to this commemorative aspect, is to ignore the scripturally based teaching of the sacramental efficacy. The spirituality of solemnly renewing one's personal covenant with God in the manner prescribed by Him could not be denied, but again, this valuable experience does not eliminate the need for a New Testament sacrifice. In explaining these different aspects Waterland faithfully follows the Biblical precedent of progression from the Old to the New Testament, from the type to the reality, from the natural to the spiritual, and never goes outside Scripture for the real grounding of his doctrine. When it is a case of interpretation, he invariably chooses the Fathers for his guide.
The one other element that appears everywhere in his Eucharistic pronouncements is the steadfast grounding of all theory and all doctrine upon practical considerations that sought for moral influence and expression in every doctrinal concept. The chapter begins with an insistence that the separation of a positive institution from its moral undergirding is an entirely false dichotomy completely foreign to the purpose of the Originator of the institution. The chapter ends with a thoroughly practical and understandable description of the kind of preparation that makes for worthy reception.

A question as yet unanswered is: was Waterland a Virtualist or a Receptionist? Although these terms were not then in use it is possible with them to make some classification of the men of that day. The majority of eighteenth century Anglican theologians were Receptionists, holding that there is no change whatever in the material elements, but that there is, in their reception, a figurative but none the less real reception of the Body and Blood of Christ, providing that the communicant makes his communion as an act of faith. This is, in effect, a denial of the Real Presence since the presence is real only in the heart of the recipient.¹

¹ See O.C. Quick, Christian Sacraments, (1932) p. 205 f.
The elements are a means of inner communion of the soul with its Lord but this communion is dependent upon the significance conveyed by those means.

Waterland states his view of the Real Presence precisely: The body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not substantially, not corporally, but verily and indeed, that is effectually. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent; but the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is of his passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is all the REAL presence our Church teaches.

Virtualism is the mediating position between Transubstantiation and Receptionism. This view regards the consecrated elements, being set apart for a new and holy use and thus changed in as much as the possibilities of utilization are increased, as having the "virtue" of Christ's Body and Blood. Waterland uses the word "virtue" in his description above and makes it clear that the value of partaking is not found only in the symbolic expressiveness of the elements but that they are actually the instrumentality by which the virtue of Christ's Body and Blood are transmitted to the communicant. This benefit takes place regardless of the particular state of his spiritual comprehension at any given time of communicating. The Holy Spirit is the effective Instrument in this event:

1. Works, V, 421.
... though there is no corporal presence, yet there
is a spiritual one, exhibitive of Divine blessings and
graces; and though we eat not Christ's natural glorified
body in the Sacrament, or out of it, yet our mystical
union with that very body is strengthened and perfected
in and through the Sacrament ... by the operation of
the Holy Spirit.¹

A further passage makes it abundantly plain that Waterland
held a Virtualism involving the instrumentality of the ele-
ments based upon Divine promise:

If God hath been pleased so to order that these outward
elements, in the due use of the Eucharist, shall be
imputed to us, and accepted by him, as pledges of the
natural body of our Lord, and that this constructional
intermingling his body and blood with ours, shall be
the same thing in effect with our adhering inseparably,
to him, as members or parcels of him; then those outward
symbols are, though not literally, yet interpretatively,
and to all saving purposes, that very body and blood which
they so represent with effect; they are appointed instead
of them.²

The comprehensive and competent survey of so many of the
issues facing the Church in his day has made Waterland's
works a source of reference for succeeding generations. Van
Mildert, the last Prince-Bishop of Durham, and eminent High
Churchman, found enough in Waterland's writings to painsta-
kingly gather and edit them for the use of the whole Church.
And an Evangelical like N. Dimock in his Papers on the
Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic

¹ Works, VII, p. 194.
² Ibid., VII, 149 f.
Presence, quotes Waterland repeatedly to substantiate his views. This only points to the fact that the different schools of thought never drifted very far from Cranmer and it is to Waterland's credit that he was one of those who so successfully expounded and undergirded the balanced truth of Cranmer's views that the Anglican Church, although loosely knit, is definitely a unity. It goes without saying that there are real differences today between the eucharistic interpretations of the Anglo-Catholic and the Evangelical schools but that they are within the same communion, using the same Cranmerian Prayer Book is due to the careful, devoted labours of men like Waterland.
CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

An age that prided itself on its reasonableness must inevitably have come to grips with that doctrinal statement that has always seemed most unreasonable; that three Persons can exist in one God. It is not surprising that those inside the Church, as well as those outside it, should have struggled with the problem at the beginning of the eighteenth century, because the nature of the Godhead had caused, directly or indirectly, practically all the divisions that rent the Church in the first four centuries. The eighteenth century Trinitarian Controversy introduced very little new material, but there were some new combinations of that older material that generated a fresh appeal for mature theological disquisition. The four main schools of thought represented were: Unitarian, Sabellian, Arian, and Athanasian; this last name being given to the defenders of what was generally agreed to be the orthodox position.
The background of the controversy. In 1660, a considerable number of anti-trinitarians migrated into England from Poland having been banished by an Order of Council. Most of these people had been influenced by Faustus Socinus who came to Poland in 1580, joined with other like-minded Italian exiles, and took up the work begun by his uncle, Lelio. Faustus made his life work the establishment of a strong and independent antitrinitarian church with a formulated system of belief and a properly organized form of religious life and worship. The humanist tradition with its exaltation of the power of reason was a fundamental influence in his life, and he commenced a thorough-going assault upon Catholic dogma, including a polemic against the doctrine of the Trinity. He began his case by setting forth the unreasonableness of the doctrine, and proceeded from there to insist that it was absurd to make so abstruse a teaching, with no practical significance for the Christian life essential to man's salvation. It should be noted, as McLachlan suggests,

"... that Socinus, whilst holding the Unitarian view of God, did not actually make this the centre of his system. In his opinion, there were more important issues at stake that that of the nature of the Divine Personality."

He actually opposed the Arians of his day who would not acknowledge the rightness of invocation or prayer to Christ, and he claimed that divine honours should be paid to Him as Ruler of God's Church and of the world.

The academy at Rakow became the centre for the Socinians and attracted such a following that the Roman Church became concerned and in 1660, at the instigation of the Jesuits, the academy was destroyed, the press abolished, and the Socinians exiled. Many of them went to Holland where Christopher Osterodt and Andrew Wojdowski had already gained a foothold for Socinianism. In the course of the freedom of commerce between Holland and England, it was inevitable that there should be a steady infiltration into England of Socinian ideas.

The first important controversial treatise relating to the Trinity, published in England, appeared in 1685. It was Bull's Defensio Fidei Nicaenae, and it was chiefly an account of an historical investigation into the trinitarian views of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Sherlock wrote a more metaphysical Vindication of the Trinity in 1690 that approached dangerously close to Tritheism, and in opposing his position both Wallis and South wrote articles that savoured of Sabellianism.
It is difficult to find substantiation for some charges made against certain writings of this period because the disputants often exaggerated the objectionable feature of their opponents' arguments in the course of attempting to disprove them. Burnett and Tillotson suffered from misrepresentation at the hands of Charles Leslie who declared that they made the three persons of God only three manifestations, that the same Person of God was only considered under three different qualifications and respects as the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. The spirit in which the criticism was made is evident in his concluding remarks:

... though the sword of justice be (at present) otherwise employed then to animadvert upon these blasphemers, and though the chief and father of them all is advanced to the throne of Canterbury, and thence infuses his deadly poison through the nation ... in order to resist such doctrine we ... ought to separate from the Church communion of these heretical bishops.¹

This was said of Burnet who, in speaking of the worship of Christ, affirmed that, "... it was so plainly set forth in the New Testament that not even the opposers of His divinity deny it; yet nothing is so much condemned in Scripture as worshipping a creature." And further on,

he concludes that "We may well and safely determine that
the Christ was truly both God and Man." It cannot be proved that Tillotson taught specific heresy although his individualism in expressing his views might provide material for anyone seeking an excuse for criticism.

The chief discussion of the trinitarian question was taking place within the Church and was generally limited to explanations of the mode of God's existence. It is to be distinguished from the Deistic controversy which involved the whole conception of God and many of the disputants, such as Lord Herbert of Chenbury, professed no loyalty to established Church doctrine. It should also be recognized that the trinitarian controversy was of considerable scope involving many recognized Church leaders but Church historians are agreed that Clarke was the foremost representative of the Arian position and that Waterland most effectively defended the orthodox position against Clarke's attack.

In 1708 the eccentric but learned William Whiston, who had succeeded to the chair of mathematics at Cambridge in 1702, was gathering a group of promising young clergymen around him, and teaching them that Athanasianism was heresy. Among other things, he advocated Eusebianism

1. Four Discourses, pp. 122, 127.
2. Since God is sovereign Christ must be subject and subordinate to Him, and must have a separate existence.
which was plainly a form of Arianism and two young men in particular, Hoadly and Clarke, evidently found it to their liking because Clarke came to be regarded by the majority of Anglican clergymen as the reviver of modern Arianism in England,¹ and Hoadly expressed his approval, at least, in his known friendship for Clarke and his willingness to collect and edit his works. The fact that Whiston was banished from the university in 1710, for his heretical teaching, does not seem to have deterred them from a similar theological direction. It was Hoadley's *Preservation against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors both in Church and State*, appearing in 1716 with its solid defence of the Erastianism which was so marked a feature of the Broad Church, and making creeds, orders or discipline unnecessary, that precipitated the Bangorian controversy and closed the Convocations for many years. And it was Clarke's writings, along with Whiston's, that so unsettled the minds of even the Nonconformist bodies regarding the doctrine of the Trinity that, in the case of the Presbyterians, their ranks were split between the Subscribers and the Non-subscribers at the famous Salters' Hall conference² in 1719. The issue

¹ See Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 204.
dividing these two parties was the resolution, made at the conference, that the Synod should testify its own orthodoxy by subscribing to the first Article of the Church of England (on the Trinity), with the fifth and sixth Answers of the Westminster Assembly's Catechism.

The series of charges, denials, and counter-charges make it extremely difficult to ascertain the true position of a disputant of this period. Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* seems to affirm, as its general conclusion, that the Father alone is the one supreme God and the Son is a Divine Being as far as the divinity is communicable by this supreme God. The Holy Spirit is inferior to both, in order, dominion, and authority. The accuracy of this will be further considered in the next section but whether this was the exact thesis of Clarke or not, at least it was this theory that called forth strong reaction in a number of prominent writers, and Waterland plainly indicates that he so interpreted Clarke's meaning. Thus the title of Waterland's first trinitarian treatise is *A Vindication of Christ's Divinity: Being a Defence of Some Queries Relating to Dr. Clark's Scheme of the Holy Trinity*. 
The basic importance of the Trinity to the whole structure of Christian thought, the important place that the trinitarian controversy occupied in the theological moulding of the early eighteenth century, and the lack of any comprehensive work that attempts to evaluate Waterland's contribution to the controversy should provide a justification for this chapter. There is little that may be considered original in his treatment, but the same qualities that appeared in his Eucharistic writings must make his efforts in this field of value. Indeed, Edward Churton, writing in 1868, contends that his trinitarian writings were his greatest:

... the great merit and service of Waterland lies, not in what he wrote on the Eucharist, but in his faithful and constant vindications of our Lord's Divine Nature, the patient solid reasoning and sound learning with which he stood forth almost alone to encounter the swarming Arians and misbelievers of his day.

I. THE ARIANISM OF CLARKE

Since most of Waterland's discussion of this subject is written, either directly or indirectly, in reference to Clarke's so-called Arianism and since Clarke repudiated the term, it is important to reach some conclusion on the matter at the outset of this presentation. A fundamental tenet of

Arianism, according to Gwatkin, is that there can be no Divine emanation or χρωσθή from the abstractly perfect and infinite God, "... the unity of God excludes not only distinctions inside the Divine nature, but also contact with the world."

So the Son, although pre-existent, is begotten because anything else would make the Father composite and divisible and if the Son had a beginning He must be a kind of creature. From this beginning descend all of the supporting arguments that are needed to account for a Being that is somewhere between God and an ordinary creature. Clarke made no direct admission of Arianism but he was definitely seeking some middle ground and he labours throughout his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* to show that the term "God" can be used in a sense other than "supreme God".

He then attempts to apply the subordinate conception of God to Christ. The idea is worked out in great detail and defended against volumes of criticism, so that, to pursue the argument through the available material in the hope of arriving at a final conclusion that he was, or was not an Arian, is a task of too great proportions for this work.

---

2. See *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 296.
This much can be said for certain: that a number of the recognized leaders in the Church of England specifically state that they consider Clarke's work to be an indirect revival of the Arian heresy,¹ and in 1714 the Lower House of Convocation made an application to the Upper House to notice the heretical opinions of Clarke on the subject of the Trinity. Clarke's explanation to the bishops amounted to a partial recantation, and it apparently satisfied them in spite of the fact that the Lower House resolved:

... that the paper subscribed by Dr. Clarke and communicated by the bishops to the Lower House doth not contain in it any recantation of the heretical assertions ... nor doth give such satisfaction for the great scandal occasioned by the said books as ought to put a stop to further examination thereof;²

Again, Clarke was taken to task by his diocesan, the Bishop of London, for altering the doxology in an Arian direction. With this evidence it can at least be postulated that Waterland was maintaining a fairly well established conclusion in his dealing with Clarke as a propagator of Arianism.

2. See article on Clarke, Dictionary of National Biography (1885), X, 444.
The use of early writings. It is difficult to account for Clarke's depreciation of patristic evidence in the trinitarian issue because he displayed a considerable knowledge of the works of the Fathers and regarded them as authoritative in other doctrinal matters. Though he virtually disclaims their authority saying that he would use their statements "as illustrations only"¹ and not proofs, yet he does not hesitate to declare that the "generality of writers before the Council of Nice, were, in the whole, clearly on my side".² It is quite possible that Bull's thorough coverage of the teaching of the ante-Nicene fathers in Defensio Fidei Nicaenae was responsible for Clarke's unwillingness to accept their authority. Certainly Whitby was sensible of the power of Bull's work because he wrote Disquisitiones modestae to show that the controversies which then agitated men on the subject of the Trinity could not be decided by the writings of the Fathers and that Bull, in defending the Nicene Faith, had misrepresented their teaching.

As has been shown previously, Waterland's attitude was that the Fathers provided positive proof of the Church's

¹ Scripture Doctrine, Introduction, p. xvii.
² Answer to Dr. Wells, p. 28.
doctrine in their own age, and if it could be further shown that this doctrine had the support of the plain teaching of Scripture, there would seem to be little room for innovation. No article of faith should ever be built upon the Fathers alone, but if the sense of Scripture were disputed, then the concurring sentiments of the Fathers would generally be the safest interpretation. For these reasons, Waterland drew heavily on patristic authority, and contested Clarke's use of it in several of the original Queries.¹ Stromberg's recent book Religious-Liberalism in Eighteenth Century England, (1954), while very informative and well-documented, fails to be convincing in his assertion that Clarke was justified in his criticism of Waterland's case being based primarily upon Scholastic metaphysics. As proof that Clarke's foes were "... forced in the end to appeal to the authority of tradition".² he cites Waterland's Queries XXVIII and XXIX but does not recognize that more than half of the thirty-one Queries deal directly with the interpretation of Scripture and many of the others, relating to God's attributes, were issues already raised by Clarke in the course of his expounding Scripture.

¹ Waterland's first contribution to the controversy was his thirty-one Queries, to which Jackson responded.
² p. 46.
It should also be noted that there is considerable difference between the metaphysical arguments of the Schoolmen and the consistent testimony of the early Church Fathers upon whom Waterland draws continually for confirmatory evidence. Stromberg points out that Clarke "... used the testimony of the early Fathers much, but only as witnesses whose evidence had a good deal of value on Scriptural interpretations because they were close to the subject"; but this is precisely the argument of Waterland, repeatedly stated and scrupulously observed in his treatises. It must be proved that Waterland put any less emphasis upon the evidence of Scripture than Clarke and it is surely saying too much to conclude that "... Clarke was unanswerable on the basis of the Bible as strictly interpreted".

It will be noted that Waterland relies on the same battery of Scripture that the early Church used in its defence against Arianism and he is confronted with the same problem. Any attempt to describe the mode of existence of the Deity must always strain human language and thus almost any given

2. See Works, V, p.262; VIII, p.70.
text, necessarily indefinite because of the subject, can be wrested to suit immediate purposes. This accounts for Waterland's somewhat lame appeal to tradition at times. This difficulty applies, of course, to both sides but the handicap rested most heavily upon orthodoxy because English Arianism, like the earlier brand, was a philosophical religion masquerading as biblical. Clarke quotes Scripture extensively but primarily because he knows that his only hope of gaining a hearing is to do so. He was not called "the first of English metaphysicians" without reason. In their methods Waterland and Clarke differed; Waterland chose the most cogent texts he could find, and interpreted them according to their generally received and obvious meaning, while Clarke explained the passages by what he called the maxims of right reasoning. Waterland obviously had the advantage in any appeal to the Fathers inasmuch as the majority were clearly opposed to Arianism.

In the twenty-sixth Query, Waterland challenges Clarke's claim to ante-Nicene support by showing that it vindicated him only in the matter of a certain subordination of Christ that was necessitated by His coming to earth, but that in the issues of the eternity and the consubstantiability of Christ, which were the real issues in the discussion,
the Fathers were clearly against him. Waterland gives eleven examples of the difference between the teaching of the Arians and that of the Fathers. 1

In the twenty-seventh Query, Waterland justly complains of Clarke's manner of reference to the Fathers. In the introduction to Scripture Doctrine Clarke says that he:

"did not cite places out of these authors so much to shew what was the opinion of the writers themselves, as to shew how naturally truth sometime prevails by its own native clearness and evidence, even against the strongest and most settled prejudices." 2

and then, in the body of the discourse, having taken great pains to determine the exact meaning of the Fathers he gives every appearance of having considered their word authoritative. The large number of quotations from the Ancients appearing continually in the course of the development of Clarke's argument, cast considerable doubt upon the accuracy of his introductory remarks.

Clarke and the issue of Arian Subscription. In trying to reconcile his views with the formularies of the Church of England, Clarke agreed that there was apparent inconsistency, but he said he was ready to subscribe any test containing

2. P. xviii.
nothing more than is comprised in the XXXIX Articles, indicating that he reserved the right to interpret the Articles as he saw fit. In the introduction to the first edition of the Scripture Doctrine, as was previously mentioned, he had maintained that "every person may reasonably agree to such forms whenever he can, in any sense at all, reconcile them with Scripture". The words were omitted in the second edition, but there is no evidence that he revised his views. Clarke's plea for latitude drew widespread reaction because of his apparent intention of forcing an Arian construction upon the Articles, even though it was quite obviously not consistent with the intention of those who drafted or imposed the Articles.

Waterland favoured freedom of private interpretation, but in the case of the XXXIX Articles he was convinced: (1) that they had originally been soundly based on a plain Scriptural foundation; (2) that the purpose of subscription was the declaration of one's personal convictions. In his Case of Arian Subscription he said that "the Church requires subscription to her own interpretation of Scripture so the subscriber is bound ... to that and that only". If he

---

1. Pp. XX, f.
was not willing to be bound, he should refuse to subscribe. Waterland shows how the public laws and canons affirm that the purpose of subscription is "that pastors may be sound in the faith", and this purpose is plainly defeated if the subscriber is free to decide in what sense he will subscribe.

After answering the various pleas of the Arian subscribers in his first work on the subject, Waterland wrote a Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription to show that the articles referring to the Trinity are not indefinite and undeterminate. The entire work is devoted to demonstrating the vast difference between Clarke's view of the Trinity and the clearly expressed belief of the Church of England as found in her articles. In order to reveal the real significance of subscribing to the Articles while holding the beliefs expressed by Clarke and others, Waterland wrote their true sentiments in the language and form of the Articles. The following is a portion:

My faith is, that the three Persons are three Beings, and three substances; two of them differing from the first, as finite and infinite; yet I profess with Article the 1st, that they are of one substance, (eiusdem essentiae), because the words of one substance may either signify I know not what, (see the Case, p. 40), or may be interpreted as Eusebius did the ὅμοοςεσιαν to signify that the Son and Holy Ghost have no likeness at all to the things which are made, (therefore not made) but are like the Father in every

respect, (see the Case, p. 17) therefore not differing infinitely, or as finite from infinite.

My faith is, that the Father only, in opposition to all other persons whatever, is the very and eternal God; and consequently, that the Son is not the very and eternal God: yet I make no scruple to profess, with Article the 2nd, that the Son is the very and eternal God: not the same God, but another God; two very and eternal Gods, the divinity of the latter being derived from the former.

I believe that the Holy Ghost is nowhere set forth in Scripture as God, and that he is not included in the one infinite substance, but finite of course: yet I readily profess with Article the 5th, that the Holy Ghost is of one substance, majesty and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God: not the same God, but another; in all, three very and eternal Gods, by ineffable communication of divine powers and dignity from one to the other two.

My faith is, that to say, 'God is three Persons', is the direct contradictory to the doctrine of St. Paul. Nevertheless, it may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture, that the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, and they are not three Gods, but one God. This I scruple not to profess, because I can understand there are not, when I read they are not.

My faith is, that the Creed called Athanasian, composed in a very dark and ignorant age, has affirmed more than is necessary, and more than is true, see Scrip. Doct. p. 418, 1st edition, according to the compiler's sense; yet I willingly subscribe to Article the 8th, asserting that it ought thoroughly to be received and believed, and may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture; because I hope, some way or other, to wrest it to a meaning suitable to my own hypothesis.

I do not believe it at all necessary to salvation, to worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity; or to profess perfect God and perfect man united in one Person; yet I readily acknowledge, with Article the 8th, that it may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture, that whosoever does not keep this faith whole and undefiled, shall, without doubt, perish everlastingly.

So Waterland was engaged in defending the orthodox conception of the Trinity against a learned man, nor group of men, who professed loyalty to the Bible, who questioned the validity of patristic evidence, but continued to argue from the pronouncements of the Fathers, and who felt at liberty to subscribe to church Articles in a private sense that, at the least, differed from the understanding usually derived from the words employed and thus differed from the intention of those who formulated the Articles.

II. THE TRUE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

Waterland's primary concern in the trinitarian question was that Christ should be given His rightful place as a Divine Person, co-equal and co-eternal with God the Father. In the first of His Eight Sermons on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, he wrote a paraphrase of John I, 1, giving his understanding of each school of thought in the controversy, and thus by comparison sought to show the advantage of the orthodox position.

The Sabellians' denial that the "Logos" was any real or substantial Being and their affirmation of His being an entity separate from the person of God the Father, led to their classifying Him as an attribute, power, or operation that
was inherent and permanent in the Father. They understood "the Word" to mean some manifestation quite apart from the Speaker of that Word and not as real. Waterland responded by showing that "Logos" can refer to inward thought or outward speech, and then pointed out that the early interpretation of this name was that the relation between Father and Son resembled the relation between thought or speech and the mind. Thus the Son is the interpreter and revealer of the unknown God to the world.

Le Clerc had been the chief advocate of something very like Sabellianism in the early part of the eighteenth century and he was substituting "reason" for "word", thus making the verse to read:

In the beginning was Reason, and Reason was in God, and reason was God himself. It was in God from the beginning, before the world was: for whatever is in nature was made with highest Reason, neither is there that single thing that was made without reason.

But Waterland points out that the word is not θεός divine, but θεός God, thereby strongly denoting a real Person.

"A man's word, or thought, is not called man; nor would the Word or Wisdom of God be called God, if a mere attribute or

1. See his comment on John I, 1 in Le Nouveau Testament.
operation only was intended, and not a real Person." And if "only-begotten" of verse 14 refers to God's attribute rather than a person, it must mean that this is God's only attribute. Again, in verse 11, how can "reason" come to His own and His own receive Him not? A final proof that the Sabellian interpretation must be incorrect was that John in Revelation XIX, 13 reveals that Christ Himself was termed "The Word of God" in the first century.

The Socinian interpretation of John I, 1 would be:

In the beginning of the Gospel was the man Christ Jesus, otherwise called the Word. He was with God, having been taken up into heaven before he entered on his ministry. And he was God, having the office, honour, and title of a God conferred upon him, after his resurrection. The same was in the beginning of the Gospel with God. All things belonging to the Gospel-state were reformed and renewed by him: and without him was there not any thing reformed or renewed.

Waterland felt the fallacy of the Socinian rendering to be so apparent that he did not carry the argument further.

By applying the Arian conception of Christ to the passage, it must read something like the following:

"In the beginning of all things, before ever the earth or the world was made, there existed a very glorious and excellent creature, (since called the Word) the Oracle of God, and Revealer

1. Loc. cit.
2. Works, II, 8.
of his will. That excellent Person, the first whom God of his own good pleasure and free choice gave being to, was with God the Father; and he was God, another God, an inferior God, infinitely inferior; but yet truly God, as being truly partaker of divine glory then, and foreordained to have true dominion and authority in God's own time. God employed him as an instrument, or under agent, in framing and fashioning the world of inferior creatures; and approved of his services so well, as to do nothing without him.\(^1\)

The Arians labour under a handicap that not even the Socinians must suffer in that the Arian Logos cannot be understood by categories relating to either God or man, but must be described in some intermediate state.

The Catholic and truly primitive construction of John I, 1 would be, in Waterland's judgment:

In the beginning, before there was any creature, (consequently from all eternity), the Word existed; and the Word was no distant separate power, estranged from God, or unacquainted with him; but he was with God, and himself also very God; not another God, but another Person only, of the same nature, substance, and Godhead.\(^2\)

That this alone is the sense in which the Word can be called "God"\(^3\) and that it is borne out by other Scripture, as well as the Fathers, is demonstrated in two steps. The first is

---

2. Ibid., II, 10.
that the Old Testament gives, as proper qualification for a Person that is truly God, power and might irresistible, perfect knowledge and consummate wisdom, eternity, immutability, omnipresence, creative powers, supremacy, independence, and necessary existence. Obviously these attributes must have a subject and a subject must have substance. Therefore, the Scripture-notion of God is that of an eternal, immutable, omni-present, omniscient, almighty substance, and any Being conceived to be God that does not possess the attribute of supremacy is not truly God. That this understanding prevailed in the early Church is seen in the statements of the very earliest of the Fathers. Irenaeus observes that no Person that has any superior can justly be called God; nor any thing that has been created, or ever began to exist. Tertullian maintains that the word "God" does not, like "Lord" signify dominion or power only, but substance; that none but the eternal uncreated substance can justly be called God; that an inferior God is a contradiction in terms.

1. Works, II, p. 11.
The second step, worked out in considerable detail, is that John, knowing the Old Testament concept of God, surely would have qualified it before applying it so boldly to the Word if there had been any thought of difference in his mind. He plainly intimates that the Word existed before anything was created, was God before anything existed. If the Word was created, John could not have said "all things were made by Him" but rather, "all other things". That John considered Christ to be true Jehovah is demonstrated in the twelfth chapter of his Gospel, verse forty-one, where he states that it was Christ's glory that Isaiah describes in the sixth chapter of his prophecy. When John says that the Word is God, he means no nominal Deity.

In proving Christ's true divinity from His co-equality with the Father, Waterland seeks to show that Phillipians II, 5-11 cannot be interpreted, in the Arian sense, which was that Christ was only impersonating God, or acting as His representative. After a thorough exegesis of the text and review of the ancient commentaries, Waterland seems to settle upon the correct understanding of ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ as his principal argument. Paul is seeking to magnify the great condescension of God the Son and this is more effectively done in speaking of this One who was God from

1, Works, II, pp. 90, 94.
the beginning, maker of the world, and who willingly took
the form of a servant, than it is in a mere reference to
an impersonating of God which any angel might have done.
In Waterland's concluding paraphrase of Phillipians II,
3-11 he emphasizes the extent of the self-emptying which
is the mark and the glory of the true divinity of Christ.

Christ as Creator. This phase of the discussion was
introduced by John Jackson in the course of his first
response to Waterland's Queries. Much of his argument
bears the marks of Clarke's influence. Jackson had little
opportunity to confuse the issue of whether Christ's
creatorship had bearing upon His true Divinity, because
Waterland carefully avoided the marginal issues and pinned
his adversary down to the real question. Jackson had
admitted that Christ was Creator in a certain sense and
Waterland, in his twelfth Query, presses for the admission
that the Creator must be uncreated. Jackson actually ad-
mits this but attempts to prove that the "Scripture-sense" of "creature" or "created" differs from the ordinarily
accepted sense. After defining "creature" as: "the visible

2. John Jackson, Answer to the Queries (12th) p. 60,
and invisible worlds brought into being by the power of
the Logos, or Son of God, in subordination to the will and
power of the Father"\(^1\) he qualifies the act of creation by
stating that the word expresses both the creation itself and
the Person by whom it was wrought. Waterland asks at this
point if, to say that Noah built the ark in the Scriptural-
sense, would mean anything else than that Noah built it.

The Scripture, said Waterland, without exception makes
a distinction between Creator and creature, and never speaks
of any creature of the Father's which is not a creature of
the Son's also. If Christ was a creation of the Father then
John is plainly mistaken when he says "without Him was not
anything made that was made".

In showing that the Ante-Nicene writers did implicitly
and consequentially declare the Son to be uncreated, Waterland
gives a list of references\(^2\) and then proceeds to analyze the
statements of Origen and Athanasius more particularly.

Clarke had endeavoured to prove from Origen's words,
\(\kappaρεπράζων . . . \kappaάντων τῶν \deltaημιούργμάτων\)\(^3\) that Origen
expressly reckoned the Son among the \(\deltaημιούργματα\)\(^4\) arguing

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. \textit{Works}, I. 140.
purely from the force of ἀρεσβύτατον as a superlative. Waterland illustrates how the superlative may sometimes be given a comparative sense and shows where Clarke admits that Bishop Bull's translation of this passage might be correct. Bull rendered it "ancienter than all creatures". The whole tenor of Origen's opinion favours the comparative sense.

The same point is argued from an early passage in Athanasius: τὸν καὶ τῆς κτίσεως κύριον, καὶ πάσης ἀποστάσεως ἰημερώμον in which Clarke claims to find a "contradistinction" between τῆς κτίσεως κύριον and πάσης ἀποστάσεως ἰημερώμον, his conclusion being that ἰημερώρης may thus be given the larger sense and may be applied to God the Father, making Christ, the Creator, of lesser importance. In response to this, Waterland says that this might easily be a varying of phrase for emphasis and, if contradistinction were really intended, would it not apply to κύριον and ἰημερώμον making God the Father greater as ἰημερώρης than as κύριος. In this case at least the Son would have no Lord over Him.

Again, in the context of the passage cited, Athanasius very

2. Loc. cit.
clearly exempts the Son from being ranked with any derivative beings, regarding Him as "maker of all the invisible powers", and speaking of Him as δημιουργὸς τοῦ κατοίκου which is as high in significance as the original quotation from Athanasius, δημιουργὸς κύριου θεοστάσεως. The consequence of Waterland's defence of Christ's Creatorship, being Himself uncreated, and in no sense unequal to His Father because of His creating activity, is that He is divine in the same sense as the Father.

Waterland approached the problem from another side, choosing John I, 3 as his starting point for proving Christ's Divinity from the evidence of His actual creating activity. After considering the interpretation of John I, 3 by other schools of thought he proceeds with his own arguments in three steps. He shows, first, that the text teaches Christ to be a Person distinct from the Father and to be strictly and properly the efficient Cause and Creator of all things. This is substantiated by both the Old and the New Testament and by the primitive Church. In the second step the same sources are used to demonstrate that Christ is Creator of every conceivable class of created beings. The third step

1. Works, I, p. 43.
2. Ibid., p. 29.
is devoted to reflections and observations based on the evidence that Christ is essentially God. If He was created, as taught by the Arians, why did God cease His creative activity at this point? The difficulty is easily resolved from the catholic point of view in that the Son is of the same nature and substance as the Father, so allied, so united that nothing could be the work of one without being the work of the other.¹

The greater consistency of the catholic doctrine is revealed in the quotation from Eusebius whose conception of the absolute sovereignty of God made it necessary for Jesus to take a subordinate position, and quite easily assumed Arian proportions. In his oration² before the Emperor Constantine he describes God the Son in the most endearing and magnificent terms and, in fact, he seems to leave only a kind of nominal greatness and majesty to the Father. He is left sitting on His throne, looking on, while God the Son performs everything. Is it not illogical to allow so much to God the Son, as Eusebius did, and not allow him everything which Athanasius and the Church in general has always done?

¹. John, V, 17, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work".
². See De Laudibus Constantini, pp. 504, ff, cited in Works, II, 64.
Obviously the only thing preventing Busebius and those of his persuasion from so doing, was their determination to reserve the place of supreme glory for the Father which, in their thinking, required that Christ have a self-existence. This pre-supposed a beginning and made Christ a creature.

A final observation that indicates Waterland's balance in this question is his care to specify that, though Christ is Creator, He is the Son; second only, not the first Person of the Trinity. The Father is primarily the Creator, He creates by the Son and is correctly referred to as "Maker of heaven and earth". The constant language of antiquity is in keeping with the observance of the proper order, but it also maintains the essential divinity of the whole of the Trinity. To detract from either emphasis will lead inevitably to Tritheism or Sabellianism.

The Worship of Christ. Clarke, Whitby, Sykes and Jackson all were agreed that the worship of Christ could only be that which was due to the Mediator and could not possibly be the same as the worship due to the Supreme God, or the Father. Clarke, in particular, based the worship of Christ upon some powers given Him after His resurrection, and differed in this point from the Arians who founded it upon those creative acts antecedent to His Incarnation.
In the absence of specific scriptural instruction to worship the Holy Spirit, these writers concluded that He was not to be worshipped.

Waterland objected that to pay divine honours to Christ, as these men were willing to do, but to deny that He is very God, was polytheism. No scriptural authority could be produced for such a distinction between sovereign and inferior worship and, in fact, said Waterland, it was impossible for Scripture and antiquity to countenance an inferior worship, because the writers knew nothing of an inferior God. The term "mediatorial worship" was originally borrowed from pagans, handed on by Arians, and brought down to the eighteenth century by Papists. From these premises Waterland proceeded with his apology for a worship of Christ that in no sense differed from the worship of the Father.

Although the Arians had, without exception, denied that their assertions led to the worship of two Gods, Waterland showed that there were grounds for charging them with such heresy. In Query sixteen, he began by taking the first commandment, and Matthew IV, 10 to indicate that worship could be directed to only one Being. If Christ is very God,

1. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve".
He should be worshipped, if a creature He ought not.

Waterland forced the conclusion upon his opponents:

... though the Arians or Socinians, or other such Polytheists, do not believe in two supreme Gods, and so, in that respect, are not speculative Tritheists, or Ditheists; yet by paying worship, religious worship (the incommunicable honour due to the supreme God only) to two Gods, they do by construction and implication, though not in intention, make two supreme Gods; and consequently are practical Ditheists.¹

The real crux of the question was; whether or not there are different kinds of worship. The author of an anonymous pamphlet stated that there was no sufficient warrant for appropriating all kinds and degrees of religious or divine worship to the true God only.² He makes this more explicit later in the article³ by saying that worship should not be offered to other Gods; any further than our worshipping of them is really a worshipping of Him, or redounding to His glory. Waterland asks, "who can assure us that any worship of the creature is really worshipping of God; or that it does or can redound to God's glory?"⁴ In defending Clarke, Jackson maintained that "Absolute supreme honour is plainly appropriated to the person of the Father only as the absolute

---

¹ Works, II, xxviii.
² The Unity of God not inconsistent with the Divinity of Christ, p. 35, cited in Works, II, xxiii.
³ Ibid., p. 52.
⁴ Ibid., xxxiii.
supreme Being or the one God”, referring that relative inferior worship might be paid to lesser creatures and overlooking the plain Scripture referring to the worship of Christ which Waterland had submitted. But there is nothing relative about the command to worship God only, and there is no record of God ever having appointed another type of worship.

If all worship is to be devoted to God the Father, then the worship of Christ creates a dilemma. The solution offered by the Arians lay in their insistence that "Lord" and "God" admitted of a higher and lower sense. Another solution, that seemed more likely to Waterland, was to suppose that the exclusive terms of "one" and "only" might admit of some latitude of construction so long as full intent and meaning of unity is preserved. Such verses as "The lord our God is one Lord" were not intended to prevent such construction but to exclude all rival or anti-gods set up in opposition to God, the Father. The Father and Son are one Creator, Saviour, Lord, Judge, and God because their operations, attributes, powers and perfections are one.

1. Answer to the Queries, p. 94.
3. Mark, XII, 29.
If Christ is truly worthy of any kind of worship, as seems to have been agreed, and if there is authority for it, then this is incontestable evidence that He is the one God, for God alone is to be worshipped. It is granted that God the Father has a certain priority but this does not result in two kinds of worship being offered. The fundamental error in the modern Arian conception was that a distinction of persons was thought to make a difference in nature. Waterland shows in extensive quotations from them that eight of the Fathers, either directly or by consequence, state that Christ is to be worshipped.

Clarke had taught that the Father claims a unique worship because He is Governor of the Universe, but Colossians I, 16, claiming that Christ is creator of things "that are in heaven", would entitle Him to the same worship. Jackson could not accept this in his defence of Clarke, because he conceived this creation to be no act of dominion. Christ had acted only in a ministerial capacity. Waterland, using Hebrews I, 3, and John I, 1, maintains that "Creator" "Preserver" and "Sustainer" all imply dominion, and the title "Creator" in particular is a characteristic of true

1. See Query XVII in Works, I, 179.
2. See Works, I, pp. 181, ff.
God throughout Scripture.¹

Clarke had founded the worship of Christ upon the fact that the Father had committed all judgment to the Son, in John V, 23, but saw no significance in the fact that Christ did the same things as the Father with the same power and authority.² Waterland gave as his interpretation of John, V, 23:

... that the Father, (whose honour had been sufficiently secured under the Jewish dispensation, and could not but be so under the Christian also) being as much concerned for the honour of his Son, had been pleased to commit all judgment to him, for this very end and purpose, that men might thereby see and know that the Son, as well as the Father, was judge of all the earth, and might from thence be convinced how reasonable it was, and highly it concerned them, to pay all the same honour to the Son, which many had hitherto believed to belong to the Father only.³

Jackson assumed that for God to have delegated authority to Christ was an evidence of inequality⁴ but he is asked if this means that for one person to delegate authority to another means that they are unequal in nature making it impossible for one man to be delegate to another man.⁵

Particularly, is there no inferiority of nature implied?

¹ See Query XVIII in Works, I, 189.
² Waterland develops this in Query IX, Works, I, 117.
³ Works, I, 198.
⁵ See Works, I, 204.
if the charge given be such that no inferior nature could possibly accomplish it.

A very important distinction to be seen in this discussion, and one which will be noted again, is Waterland's frank acknowledgment of a supremacy of order in the Trinity. The Father, as the Father, is supreme and is always to be recognized as the First Person of the Godhead, but this does not imply a difference in nature or essence. Several of the Fathers are cited to show that the nature is "undivided".

In answer to the many texts cited by Clarke to prove that the Father was the only true God, Waterland replied that this was only saying that He is so emphatically, or unoriginately, and the Son may be true God and necessarily existing, notwithstanding.

Though there be gods many, and lords many, yet there is but one God and Lord to be honoured with religious worship: now Christ is God and Lord, in such a sense as to be honoured with religious worship: therefore Christ is the one God.

One other issue relating to the worship of Christ is raised in Clarke's Exposition of the Church Catechism. He says that we are to worship "... Him alone who created the world by his power, who redeemed mankind by his Son,

1. Works, I, 206.
3. Loc.cit.
and who sanctifies all good persons by his Holy Spirit"\(^1\), and since the Son is only God's instrument we should never pray to the Son but through Him. In proof of this he cites the Lord's prayer, and indicates that all prayers were similarly addressed to the Father throughout the first three centuries.

Waterland did not question that the normal addressing of prayer was as Clarke suggested, but inasmuch as the argument was being used to prove that Christ was therefore inferior to the Father, he pointed out that prayer was not restricted to this order. Stephen prayed to Christ in his dying agony. Paul prayed thrice that Christ might deliver him from the "thorn in the flesh", and John prayed for grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and "from the Lord Jesus Christ"\(^2\). When Clarke argued from the liturgies of the fourth century, Waterland retaliated with the statement that there was never a public liturgy that directed all prayers to the Father only, or that did not offer up worship to Father, Son and Holy Ghost. It was true that the third Council of Carthage decreed that the priest at the altar should direct his prayer always to the Father but the very stipulation showed that the other parts

---

1. P. 25.
2. II John III, also Rev. I, 5.
of the service were not so restricted. Furthermore, it was unlikely that this Council, in which Augustine played such an important part, should really militate against praying to Christ. Augustine understood the manner of praying through Christ, but never thought of it as any obstruction to praying also directly to Christ for he said of this matter: "We pray to him, through him, in him". 1

After advancing other similar arguments, Clarke sums up his case by saying that direction of prayer to the Father through Christ "is undoubtedly upon all hypotheses, right and sufficient in practice, ..." 2 but Waterland objects that it can never be right to withhold worship from the Son and the Holy Spirit because the three persons are equal and are One God. If worship of the Son and prayer to Him is wrong, then many martyrs were wrong, and so were Paul and John. Even Christ commanded us to honour the Son as we honour the Father. 3

The significance of Christ's titles. The detailed discussion of fourteen divine titles 4 ascribed to the Son in the Bible, found in the Eight Sermons, as well as the

4. God, God with us, Lord God, true God, great God, mighty God, God over all blessed for evermore, Jehovah, Almighty, Lord of Glory, King of kings, and Lord of lords, Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last.
lengthy treatment of the same matter in some of the Queries, makes it impossible to include the whole of the argument in this section but perhaps the consideration of a few of the titles will demonstrate Waterland's line of reasoning. He, of course, was endeavouring to show how the titles prove the supreme divinity of Christ.

Clarke had acknowledged that the Scriptures referred to Christ as "God" but this was not "so much on account of his metaphysical substance - as of his relative attributes and divine authority". This was not proved to Waterland's satisfaction and he chose rather to say that the Son was substantially or essentially God in that He was no precarious being, depending on the will and choice of another, but truly divine and necessarily-existing. What the Ancients meant by the name "God" as applied to the Son is revealed in their worship of Him and in their abhorrence of inferior deities; in their constant consideration of Him as a Son of the same nature with His Father; and in the divine titles, attributes, and perfections, which they ascribed to Him.

In John X, 34-36 where Christ used the plural "gods" in maintaining His right to call Himself the Son of God, Clarke assumed that this was an admission of subordination.

Waterland's explanation of this verse was that Christ only insinuated that He was truly God at this particular time because of the reaction of the mob. He was appealing to their own Law to show that it is not always blasphemy to make one's self God, or to apply the title of God even to mortal man. They could not convict Him of more than His claiming that He was God in the lesser sense of Psalm LXXXII, 6.

A further consideration of John I, 1 is relevant to the discussion of the term "God" as it applied to Christ or "The Word". The question was whether the term was used in a proper or improper sense inasmuch as Waterland had agreed that there were instances of a figurative use in the Scripture. He argued that since the term is very proper as it applies to the Father which was not doubted, and since it refers to both Father and Son in this same verse, it must be proper in both cases.

Jackson pointed out, in his defence of Clarke's interpretation of the first chapter of John that the article did not always precede ὢς ὁ and that the lack of it suggested that the term is to be understood in a restricted sense. He does not explain the lack of the

1. See Works, I, 40.
article in verses 6, 12, 13 and 18, where Θεός certainly refers to the Father. Jackson attempts to use three of the Ante-Nicene Greek Fathers, Clement, Origen and Eusebius, to substantiate his understanding of this matter, but he is unable to show that these men believed the Son to be God only in an improper or limited sense.

Waterland considered that the term Θεός was generally reserved for the Father as the distinguishing personal characteristic of the first Person of the Holy Trinity which amounts simply to the Father's prerogative as Father, but the term can apply to the Son without violating rules of interpretation. The Father is styled Θεός as the fountain of all; the Son, Θεός meaning in effect, God of God. That the lack of the article cannot possibly infer subordination, is convincingly demonstrated by the introduction of Old Testament texts which have Θεός with the article but which are directly referred to Christ in the New Testament.

Another title given to the Son in Titus II, 13 is "great God". Waterland insisted that "great God" and "Saviour" were both applied to Christ and Clarke agreed

1. See Works, I, 49.
2. Numbers XXI, 5-7 and I Corinthians X, 9, Isaiah XLV, 22-23 and Romans XIV, 11, Phillipians II, 10.
that the passage could agree grammatically with this construction but insisted nevertheless that "great God" was descriptive only of the Father. Logic would favour Waterland's conclusion that since "the appearing" throughout the New Testament is manifestly ascribed to the Son alone, and never to the Father, that Clarke's interpretation is most unlikely. If it should be argued that the text says only that the Father's "glory" shall appear, Waterland was ready with a Greek rendering of the phrase ἡ ἡγεσία τῆς δοξῆς which could properly signify the "glorious appearance". That "great God" generally refers to the Father in other passages does not prove that the term may not, in this place, be the character of the Son too, and there is nothing to distinguish who is meant in the Old Testament use of the term. Revelation XIX, 17, where mention is made of the supper of the great God, is often understood to speak of the Father, but if it is agreed that "King of kings and Lord of lords" relates to Christ, in verse 16, then the hermeneutical law of the context would favour the opinion that verse 17, was similarly related. Basil, Gregory of Nysse, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Augustine are all cited as having so interpreted the

---

It will be advantageous to proceed immediately to the next section without summarizing the argument from Christ's titles, because Waterland bases his conclusions on the evidence drawn from the combined titles and attributes.

The significance of Christ's attributes. If it could be successfully proved that the same divine attributes might be ascribed to the first and second Persons of the Trinity, this would virtually be conceding the truth of Waterland's doctrine of the Trinity because, as Clarke revealed by his consistent objection, a Christ who was equal in such attributes as eternity must be equal to and one with the Father, or else there would most certainly be two Gods.

Waterland first acknowledges that the ambiguity of the Hebrew or Greek phrases used to denote eternity will make the proof of any assertions, whether they relate to the Father or to the Son, difficult and uncertain. Nevertheless, an effective argument is developed from the several names ascribed to Christ in Scripture: such as Word, Power, Light, Truth, and Life. The Ancients believed that

2. See Ibid., II, 146 f.
Christ's eternity was insinuated in those names and that the Father could no more be without the Son, than without thought, or power or light or truth or life. Clarke had objected that this argument would make the Son nothing but an attribute of the Father, but if that is the consequence of the argument then Tertullian, Origen, and others equally capable were guilty of the Sabellianism which they opposed. A more just accounting of their teaching is that these primitive writers supposed that since the Son had names given him that corresponded to God's attributes, there must be meaning in those names. The meaning was that the Son was as near to the Father as His own attributes; inseparable from Him and co-eternal with Him. Though this construction may be novel, it should be duly considered for the following reasons: the proximity of these men to apostolic times, their unanimity in these sentiments, the agreement of their sentiments with other high things said in the Scripture of Christ, the complete absence in Scripture of the like names being given to any other creature, and the persistence of the interpretation found in the works of many reputable writers.

2. See f.n. in *Works*, II, 148.
In presenting the scriptural authority for attributing immutability to Christ, Waterland chose Hebrews I, 10-12 as his principal evidence because it clearly refers to Christ, and is a quotation from the Psalms which, in that place, is used to describe the unchangeable nature of the only true eternal God. In Hebrews XIII, 8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day and for ever" the intention of the writer is apparent. The phrase "διά τὸν θεόν" translated "the same" is again applied to Christ as it was in Hebrews I, 12, indicating that both texts may be understood to teach identical truth. Clarke explained the meaning of XIII, 8 as being that "the doctrine of Christ, once taught by the Apostles, ought to be preserved unchanged," although there seems to be a difference in the signification of the verse preceding and the verse following the text in question, Waterland seeks, by paraphrase of the verses, to show how they agree. When in verse 7, speaking of the pastors, it says "considering the end of their conversation" it means:

Imitate your pastors, considering how great and how divine a Person you thereby adhere to; one who is no created or mutable Being, capable of failing in his own person, or of disappointing you in your just expectations; but one that is eternally and unchangeably the same; whom therefore you may infallibly depend on, in the final result of things.

2. Works, II, 152.
And in verse 9, "be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines", the understanding may rightly be:

Do not ye change, for Jesus Christ never changes, being immutably and essentially the same: endeavour to copy after as far as your imperfect natures will permit.

If it is true that, unless there is need for a figurative construction the literal is preferable, Waterland's interpretation has an advantage over Clarke's.

Waterland felt that the Son's omniscience could be established on His creative powers, His being Preserver of the Universe, His being called "Wisdom" and "Truth" in the Scriptures, and on His intimate union with, and knowledge of God the Father, but he confined his discussion to certain texts that had been previously debated with Clarke. Clarke had said that in Colossians II, 3, "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge", it was impossible to be certain to whom it referred. Waterland agreed that \( \text{ἐνὶ} \) might be properly rendered "in which", but if rendered "in whom", which was generally the case, then it must be speaking of the nearest antecedent, Christ. That Paul was engaged in this epistle, and especially in the first chapter, in setting forth the excellency and dignity of Christ, is apparent in the verses

15 to 19 and in the 9th verse, claiming that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily". Clarke answered this verse with John XIV, 10 "The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works". What Clarke understood by this verse was of concern to Waterland; if he meant that the Father's nature and Godhead so dwells and resides in Christ, as to make a full and entire communion of substance and of all perfections, making the Son very God of very God, then he was well supported in antiquity, but if he understood the Father's indwelling in any lower sense, then he was supporting the Socinian interpretation of the fulness of the Godhead, that it was the Father dwelling in the man Christ Jesus. This interpretation seemed opposed to the magnificent height of the rest of the chapter which gave detail to the meaning of the "fulness of the Godhead" and surely included omniscience among the "treasures of wisdom and knowledge".

Waterland's defence of the omniscience of Christ in the light of Mark XIII, 32, where Christ appears to profess ignorance of the time of the last day, is of interest. He draws a distinction between the Son of God and the Son of man. It was as the Son of man that He suffered such limitations and the context in Mark XIII, 26, 34, speaks

definitely of Him as the Son of man. In an earlier period, Crellius had insisted that it could not be truthfully said that He was ignorant of the day if He knew it in any capacity, but Waterland answered this by an illustration: it could be truly said of the body of a man that it was not immortal, even if the soul was. To demonstrate the difference that Christ's particular capacity made, Waterland showed how He said in Matt. XXVI, 11 "me ye have not always" which could only be understood of His human nature and bodily presence. In Matt. XXVIII, 20 He comforts His disciples with "Lo, I am with you always" referring to His glorified state. It was in respect of this same human nature that He is said to have "increased in wisdom". 1

In summarizing the combined evidence of Christ's titles and attributes, Waterland submits that it must be of sufficient force to outweigh any subtle evasion or doubtful construction of some isolated text. The Jewish Church had been trained up to a sense of the true God by those very characters which were applied to Christ. After having so formed their idea of the Divine Being they would have thought it blasphemy to ascribe that idea, though by way of figure only, to any creature. But from the time of the early Church to the present, there is undeniable evidence that by far the largest proportion of believers

have unhesitatingly ascribed full divinity to Christ, and it should be remembered that among these were the wisest and most eminent lights of the Christian Church. It is granted that there are some titles in Scripture which are not attributed to the Son but on the other hand there are of those that are attributed to Him, more than sufficient to prove that He is no creature. A principal argument of Clarke against the evidence of titles and attributes is that they must be understood in a higher and more eminent sense when applied to the Father. Waterland asks what degrees there are in eternity, or in the attributes of omniscience and omnipresence. But if it is meant that the titles or attributes are ascribed in a more emphatic and eminent manner to the Father, as First Person, but that they are applied to the Son in the same sense and to the same extent, then this may be admitted. This is confusing but Waterland's position was, until it could be proved that it is impossible for God to have had a Son of the same nature, co-equal and co-eternal with Him, evidence of Scripture seemed to favour the possibility.

The evidence of the Baptismal formula. That Christ should have specified that the converts in all nations should be baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"\(^1\) was of immense significance for Waterland. The first thing that God evidently wanted the nations to know was their obligation to three Persons. Christ seems to say, in effect, that this is the sum of Christianity, the foundation upon which the Apostles were to build the Church. A proper appreciation of the reasons behind this final command of Christ must be of great importance.

It is true that the book of Acts does not include the use of the three Names in any of its baptismal accounts, but Waterland accepted the explanation that the Apostles baptized all, both Jews and Gentiles, according to Christ's command, and when they are said to have baptized in the name of Christ Jesus only, the meaning is that they baptized into the faith and religion of Christ Jesus. There may also have been need for the explicit declaration that this was Christ's not John's baptism.

1. Matthew, XXVIII, 19.
In giving the significance of this baptismal formula, Waterland is convinced that nothing could be more unreasonable or unnatural than to suppose that God and two creatures are here joined together in this most solemn rite of initiation into the service of the living God. The implication of the formula must certainly be that men are required to have faith in, and offer worship to, all three.

In giving the stated opinions of the Fathers regarding baptism, Waterland begins with Justin Martyr because he is the oldest writer that mentions the baptismal commission. In answering the charge of atheism, brought against the Christians by their heathen persecutors, he says:

... in respect of such reputed gods, we are Atheists; but not in respect of the most true God, untainted with evil, the Father of righteousness, and soberness, and of other virtues. Him, and his Son that came from him, ... and the Prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore, honouring them in spirit (in reason) and in truth.  

He opposes the worship of the three to the worship of the gods, and in doing so must recognize baptism as an entering into covenant with all three, not as three Gods, or as one God and two creatures, for this would contradict his

repeated denunciation of creature-worship.¹

After considering a number of ancient testimonies² and comparing the teaching of the oldest creeds, Waterland claims to have proof that the primitive Church consistently followed Christ's instruction in their practice of baptism and that they never understood the trinitarian formula to teach that the Father only was God. Thus Christ's inclusion in the original instruction relating to this key ordinance of the Church was tantamount to declaring His full divinity.

III. THE INTER-RELATION WITHIN THE TRINITY

Waterland has, in his defence of Christ's full divinity, already intimated many of the theological problems arising out of the ever-difficult concept of Trinity in Unity but he found it necessary to give them more detailed treatment, because Clarke found this type of problem advantageous to his style of argument. Clarke argued, in general, that three persons, or intelligent agents, in the same individual, identical substance was a self-evident contradiction. Thus, the real difficulty in the conception of the Trinity was

2. Works, II, 179 ff.
not how three Persons can be one God, because the Scripture did not express the doctrine in those words, but how, and in what sense, consistently with everything that is affirmed in Scripture about Father, Son and Holy Ghost, it is still infallibly true that to us there is but "one God the Father". In answering this point, Waterland maintains that the union of three persons makes them one substance, but does not make them one person because union of substance is one thing, unity of person is another. There can be no consequence from one to another except on the supposition that person and acting substance are equivalent and reciprocal.

Clarke would not allow that the Holy Spirit should be worshipped on an equality with the Father because there was no instance in Scripture of any direct act of adoration or invocation being paid Him, and neither did the Scripture define the metaphysical nature of the Holy Spirit, so Clarke apparently felt at liberty to argue from the silence because he states that neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost are self-existent. He means by this that they

1. 1 Corinthians VIII, 6.
2. Exposition of the Church Catechism, p. 113, also Scripture Doctrine, p. 290, cited in Works, V, 405.
3. Scripture Doctrine, Prop. 12, 19, also Modest Plea p. 6, cited in Works, loc. cit.
have no necessary existence and must therefore be contingent, precarious, or in a word, created. The same thought is advanced in his objection to the worship of either the Son or the Holy Spirit. In answer to the argument that Christ, being "conceived of the Holy Ghost", was therefore rightly called the Son of God, Clarke said:

Whatsoever God does of this kind, from the beginning to the end of the whole dispensation, the Scripture generally represents as being done by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; and because what God does thus by his Holy Spirit, is an event the same as if he had done it immediately by himself, in his own Person, hence the same individual works are frequently ascribed both to God himself, even to the God and Father of all, who works them by his Spirit, and at the same time they are ascribed also to the spirit by which God works them.

Waterland, of course, did not deny that the Father worked in and through the Holy Spirit, but did not each occurrence of such working make it less likely that the Spirit should be a creature? Although the Father has at times worked through men and angels, such verses as Psalms CXLIII, 7, 12 indicate that wherever He is present He is present by His Spirit. It is admitted that, in the Scriptural representations of the matter,

... the first and most natural thought a man might have is, that God and the Spirit of God are only different names or phrases for the same Persons... but then there are some very express

and uncontestable texts to prove the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit.¹

An example of such texts is II Corinthians III, 7 where Paul calls the Holy Spirit, "Lord", and that "Lord" is "Jehovah", according to Exodus XXXIV, 34² and is also Lord of hosts.

In a question of such minute distinctions, it is possible for endless discussion to result from any tendency to quibble about details and from any avoidance of the real issues. That Waterland had just cause for complaint on this score is seen in the following examples of Jackson's evasiveness in answering Waterland's queries. Waterland's first query was: "Whether all other Beings besides the one Supreme God be not excluded by the texts of Isaiah and, consequently, whether Christ can be God at all, unless He be the same with the Supreme God". In his response to this query, Jackson simply assumes that the texts cited relate to one person only, and that the Father is that one person - that when it says "There is no God besides me" the meaning is, there is no supreme God besides me, and Christ cannot be the one Supreme God because He is not the same Person as the Father. The real question remains

unanswered. The second query was: "Whether the texts in the New Testament do not show that He (Christ) is not excluded and therefore must be the same God". Here Jackson makes an arbitrary distinction between the uses of the word "God" in the supreme sense and in the subordinate sense, applying the latter to Christ and leaving the main point, whether Christ must not be the same God, having not been excluded by the texts, untouched. This evasiveness makes it difficult to follow the main course of the discussion, and to trace the really significant arguments but the following seem to have been the primary issues.

The Mysterious Nature of the Doctrine. Waterland's willingness to recognize and to grapple with the difficulties of the catholic doctrine is commendable. He believed that our knowledge of the nature of God was far too limited to allow us to dogmatize from our own reason, but God had not left us without guidance in the understanding of the essentials. Since it is impossible to fix any certain principles of individuation it cannot be proved that three real persons are not one numerical or individual essence. No one knows precisely what makes

1. Waterland refers to John I, 1, Hebrews I, 8, Romans XIX, 5, Philippians, II, 6, Hebrews I, 3.
2. See Jackson's Answers to the Queries, second Query.
one being, or one essence, or one substance. Omnipresence, Incarnation, Self-existence, and Eternity all are mysteries, and the Trinity is no more perplexing than they. The tremendous Deity is mysterious; if not, He would not be divine, and to reject truth about Him because of incomprehension must result in atheism. Waterland deprecated all presumptuous prying into the secret nature of God, and regretted the introduction of philosophical niceties by such as the Arians, which made the attempt at definition necessary, but he felt that they must be met, and answered on their own grounds. In Query twenty-one Waterland blames Clarke for making it necessary to use remote inferences, and points out the main strength of Clarke's case as lying in his giving a Sabellian or Tritheistic turn to the Catholic doctrine and then charging it with confusion of Persons, polytheism, or contradiction. Waterland's retort to the charge of too much metaphysical disquisition was that his opponents certainly did not gain from the Bible their ideas that two divine Persons cannot be one God, or that the Father and Son must have a separate existence.

Since there was general admission that the subject of the Trinity was of a high and mysterious character, Waterland makes a pertinent suggestion in Query thirty:

Whether, supposing the case doubtful it be not a wise man's part to take the safer side, rather to think too highly than too meanly of our blessed Saviour; rather to pay a modest deference to the judgment of the ancient and modern Church than to lean to one's own understanding.¹

The question of absolute versus relative Deity. In this question, Waterland insists throughout the discussion that there is, in the Scripture, no ambiguity in the term "God". Though there may be a subordination of the Son to the Father, in a sense that is clearly shown from many texts, yet there are none disproving His eternality, or His consubstantiality with the Father.

In Clarke's The Modest Plea continued, he is chiefly occupied with the determination of whether Christ is God or not. He speaks of the "real divinity" of the Son, inserts "supreme" before every use of the term "God" when it indicates the Father and "dependent" or "subordinate" where it refers to the Son. He assumes further that when the term "God" is used absolutely, denoting the essence or being of the Deity, the personal pronouns "I" and "Me", "He" and "Him" prove that it relates exclusively to the Father. In this he

¹. Works, I, 336.
is assuming the very points in question. When Waterland charges him specifically with holding two Gods, one supreme, the other inferior, the only answer given is the counter charge that it is Waterland who asserts two supreme Gods.

It was precisely this weakness in Clarke’s philosophy that Waterland was exploiting in his first three Queries. In the first,¹ he showed that Christ must be Supreme God or nothing, using verses from Isaiah, such as XLV, 5 “I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me”. Clarke understands this to mean “there is no Supreme God besides me” but there is no textual support for this and this interpretation would make it necessary to grant that Baal or Ashtaroth were inferior deities. Since there never was any real danger of either Jew or Gentile falling into the belief of many Supreme Gods, the verses in Isaiah must have been intended as a guard against inferior deities. All such verses in the Old Testament declare that there is absolutely no other God, therefore Christ must be included in that one God or entirely excluded. Waterland, in this argument, acknowledges his debt to Augustine with a concluding quotation from him:

Repeat it ever so often, that the Father is greater the Son less. We shall answer you as often that the greater and the less make two. And it is not said, Thy greater Lord God is one Lord; but the words are The Lord thy God is one Lord; nor is it said, There is none other equal to me; but the words are, There is none other besides me. Either therefore acknowledge that Father and Son are one Lord God; or in plain terms deny that Christ is Lord God at all.¹

The next step requiring proof was that Christ was not excluded from the Supreme God spoken of in Isaiah, and must therefore be the same God. New Testament texts, such as John I, 1;² were used to forward this point in Query two. If Christ was God before the world was, God over all, blessed for ever, Maker of the world, and worshipped by angels, then certainly He was not excluded among the nominal gods whom to worship was idolatry. Then if all are excluded from worship except the Supreme God, Christ must be one with the Supreme God. As a final proof that literally dozens of Old Testament texts speaking of God, might be legitimately applied to the Son, Waterland listed them along with the statements of the Fathers who so understood the texts.³ So when Christ appeared to the Patriarchs and claimed their obedience and adoration, He did not do it under the name and character which He has since assumed.

¹ Operum...lib. ii, cap. 23, p. 727; Waterland's translation, cited in Works, I, 4.
² Also Hebrews I, 8, Romans, IX, 5, Philippians II, 6, Hebrews I, 3.
³ Works, I, 20 f.
but under another which is also His in common with the Father, namely that of "Lord God", or "God Almighty". Since He is not the Father Himself, but the Son and not unoriginated but God of God, all that He did must be referred back to the Father, the Head and Fountain of all, whose authority He exercised, whose Person, Character, or Office He (in some sense) represented. It was this that He meant when He referred all that He did to the authority of the Father, and the admission in no way conflicts with the New Testament texts that call Him God.

Clarke's willingness to grant that Christ is "by nature truly God, as truly as man is by nature truly man" is discussed in Query twenty-four, and Waterland tries to relate this admission to the fact that there is one Supreme God in order to establish his point that Christ is God. To avoid that conclusion Clarke says that the word "God" in Scripture always implies a conception of His attributes relative to humanity, which he does not prove, but which is necessary to his theory because if the metaphysical sense is ever intended when the word "God" is spoken of the Father, then there is no reason why it may not, in the same sense, be spoken of the Son. Jackson in defence of Clarke, says

---
2. Scripture Doctrine, p. 296, cited in Works, I, 266.
3. See Answers to the Queries, Query 24.
that the metaphysical definition of one self-existent, un-
derived, independent supreme Being, would exclude the Son
if He is in any sense derived, but this definition was
widely accepted by men who believed in a Trinity of divine
Persons but who drew no such conclusion from it.

Throughout Clarke's discussion of the word "God" he
assumes that it can be used in two senses, and in which
sense appears only after it is known whether it refers to
Father or Son. In John I, 1, for example, where it applies
to both in the same verse, this assumption seemed unlikely
to Waterland and he supplies evidence in Query three to
show that the Scripture notion of one who is truly God
includes infinite wisdom, power invincible, all-sufficiency,
and these result in a dominion that is absolute and supreme.
Any lesser degrees of dominion cannot satisfy the Scriptural
conception of God; but is only called God by way of figure.
This emphasis was in reaction to Clarke's statements attempting
to prove that the main import of the word "God", in
Scripture, was dominion and since there were degrees of
dominion the term must be a relative one.¹

From Query four to Query ten, Waterland follows out
his primary objection to Christ being made in any sense a

lesser Deity by demonstrating that in any phase of divine attributes or activities, authorship of the universe, authority, omniscience, or eternity, a lesser God will result in two Gods. If the attributes are communicated from Father to Son, which could not be denied on Scriptural evidence, there must have been a communication of the divine essence for it is inseparable from the attributes. If the attributes are only a resemblance, when possessed by the Son, then they must be finite as distinct from infinite but how such powers of infinite perfection can be communicated to a finite being who had a beginning that the Father did not have, is not explained to Waterland's satisfaction. This is precisely the quandary that Jackson faced because he stated that there could be but one "... intelligent being absolutely infinite in all respects".\(^1\) and he expressed agreement with Clarke's statement that "... all divine powers except absolute supremacy and independency",\(^2\) were communicated to the Son. The point most clearly seen in the course of these Queries is that any attempt to explain the inter-relation of the Trinity in terms of degrees of divine powers will involve the solution of endless problems.

1. Answers to the Queries, p. 55, cited in Works, I, 125.
2. Scripture Doctrine, p. 298.
In the twenty-third Query, Waterland summarizes the difficulties of Clarke's doctrine of the Trinity and shows how the orthodox doctrine ought to be preferred because of its greater clarity. Clarke did not deny that each of the three Persons singly was God, nor did he deny that God was one, and he says that the same authority exercised by all, makes them one. With this understanding he cannot show how three distinct Beings can be individually one God. If one God signifies but one Person, the consequence is, either the Father is that one Person, which is Sabellianism, or the three Persons are three Gods. Since he cannot countenance Tritheism, he is driven to the former conclusion which is equivalent to saying that the Son and the Holy Spirit are neither one God in the Scriptural sense and must therefore have attributes of their own, and their own divinity which makes them distinct from the Father, or they have no attributes but those inseparable from the Father's essence, and that reduces them to names only. The question then is: is not a communication of divine powers and attributes, without the substance or essence, as hard to conceive or harder, than a communication of both together which is essentially the sum of the catholic doctrine? The church has always professed one substance, one
eternal, immutable, uncreated substance and this they understood to be God, but notwithstanding, they believed the Son and the Holy Spirit to be substantially God. Relative deity is a thing unknown to scriptural theology.

The meaning of subordination. Both Waterland and his opponents agreed that there was a kind of subordination of one Person in the Godhead to the other, but whether it affected the divinity of the subordinated Beings was a matter of disagreement and constituted the real core of the entire discussion. Waterland did not scruple to call the Son supreme God and he meant by this that Christ knew no superior God, no divine nature greater, higher, or more excellent than His own. The Father was superior in order but was not of superior Godhead because supremacy of order is not the same as supremacy of nature. If the Son's necessary existence is secured, and if it is acknowledged that He does not exist precariously or contingently, that He is consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father, that in His creative powers, and His infinite perfections, He is one God with the Father, then the supremacy of the Father is not to be questioned. ¹

¹ See A Further Vindication of Christ's Divinity in Works IV, 10.
In the Observations, probably written by Jackson with the help of Clarke, the author complains that:

"A co-ordination or subordination of mere order, without relation to time, place, power, dominion, authority, or the like, is exactly the same manner of speaking and thinking, as if a man should say, a co-equality or inequality of equality."

Waterland first points out that "co-ordination and subordination" most certainly do apply to order, as much as "contemporary" relates to time or age. That his use of the word "subordination" might be clarified he makes it "order of conception" or "order of existence", as the Son exists of and from the Father. He illustrates his meaning with the following:

While we consider the scale of persons from God the Father down to man, or ascending from man to God the Father, he is the first in the scale from whom all things descend; and he is the last, in the way of ascent, in whom all things terminate. The Father by the Son and Holy Ghost conveys all his blessings to his creatures; and his creatures in the Holy Ghost and by the Son ascend up to the Father. Such is the scale of existences, such the order of things: and this, I hope, is intelligible enough.

To account for an equality that also has an order in it is to define the nature of God and needs not an explanation in order to be believed. It is the catholic doctrine, and the primitive records consistently acknowledge the order and

reference of the Son and Holy Ghost up to the Father, and at the same time assert their consubstantiality, co-eternity, necessary existence, equality of nature and unity of Godhead.

Although Clarke cited three hundred texts¹ to prove that the Son was in some sense subordinate to the Father, he failed to produce evidence against Christ's eternity or consubstantiality which he must do in order to sustain his understanding of subordination. When Waterland alleges that there may be a subordination without any inferiority of nature, Clarke, instead of disproving the statement, complains that "nature" and "essence" are obscure metaphysical notions,² despite the fact that logical and metaphysical subtleties are the chief strength of the Arian argument making Christ subordinate in nature as well as in order. Waterland, in final confirmation of his point claims the ancients to be solidly opposed to the notion of a supreme and a subordinate God:

They condemned it implicitly, in their disputes with the Pagans all along, and no sooner was it started in the Church, but the Catholics were alarmed at it; and immediately condemned it as reviving of creature-worship, and restoring Gentilism, and Pagen Polytheism. Two Gods, a greater and a less, a supreme and an inferior, no Scripture, no sound reason, no good Catholic

¹ Reply to Nelson, p. 7.
² Reply to Nelson, pp. 17, 19, 21, cited in Works, I. 212.
ever taught; no church would have endured. A separate God from the Supreme, an inferior created God, would not only have been looked upon as Polytheism and contradiction, considered in itself; but as heresy and blasphemy, if understood of God and Christ.  

IV. CONCLUSION

In order best to summarize Waterland's doctrine of the Trinity, it will be of benefit to consider in order: a positive statement of his declared belief; the doctrinal vulnerability of his opponents, since most of his work was done with reference to their views; the main strength of his arguments; and his personal valuation of the doctrine.

At the end of Waterland's Second Defence of Some Queries in proposing the most natural order of inquiry for this subject he declares his understanding of the doctrine is:

1. That the Father is God (in the strict sense of necessarily existing, as opposed to precarious existence) and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, in the same sense of the word God.

2. That the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, nor the Holy Ghost either Father or Son: they are distinct so that one is not the other; that is, as we now term it, they are three distinct Persons, and two of them eternally referred up to one.

3. These three, however distinct enough to be three Persons are yet united enough to be one God.  

---

2. Ibid, III, 478.
It must be admitted that Clarke's replies to each of the Queries are ingenious, subtle, and acute, but the great (and it seems) insuperable difficulty with which he had to contend was that of allowing to our Lord the title of God in any legitimate understanding of the term. He found it necessary to add to the text some expository word or phrase such as "supreme" when it applied to the Father and "dependent" or "subordinate" when it spoke of the Son. When the term "God" was used absolutely, denoting the essence or being of the Deity, he said that the personal pronouns, used with the word, were proof that it related individually and exclusively to the Father, but in this he was assuming the point in question.

Clarke, and his associates, would never call the Son a creature and it was only under pressure that they would admit by inference that He was not necessarily existing. They were not opposing the divinity of the Son so much as contending for the honour of the Father, but their understanding of such terms as "supreme and absolute Lord of all" could result only in a subjection of the Son. When this "alone Supremacy" is denied they attempt to make of this that their opponents have gone to the other extreme of denying any kind of authority as peculiar to the Father.

that He has no natural supremacy or dominion at all.

There was justification for Waterland's complaint that both Clarke and Jackson inevitably brought the problem back to fine metaphysical distinctions in an attempt to circumvent the plain statement of Scripture. They continually quoted the Bible but their premise often forced them to reject the obvious meaning in favour of some more philosophical understanding. Waterland was willing to meet them on this ground but was convinced that the subject was truly divine, and that it provided no intrinsic but only extrinsic evidence, or divine revelation, and to philosophize in the face of this was to reject the only clear light on the subject.

In Query thirty-one Waterland lists five things that must be proved or done before any innovation in the doctrine of the Trinity could be received in place of the generally accepted belief:

1. Prove, either that the Son is not Creator, or that there are two Creators, and one of them a creature.
2. Show either that the Son is not to be worshipped at all or that there are two objects of worship, and one of them a creature.
3. Prove, either that the Son is not God, or that there are two Gods, one a creature.
4. Show that your hypothesis is high enough to take in all the high titles and attributes ascribed to Christ in the Scripture and at the same time low enough to account for his "increasing in wisdom", not knowing the day of judgment and being sorrowful.
5. Prove the doctrine with such force and evidence that it may bear up against the stream of antiquity, full and strong against it, or else show that antiquity has been much misunderstood, and not full and strong against it.

Clarke, of course, did not limit himself to the alternatives proposed by Waterland but in consequence of his position he should have advanced the latter proposition in the first three of Waterland's five points because it was the logical alternative to his insistence that the Son was a Creator, was to be worshipped, and was God, but still was not equal to the Father. As for the fourth point, Clarke attempted to comply by minimizing the significance of the titles and attributes, to some extent, and partially justified his doing so on the grounds of Christ's human limitations. In the fifth point, as has been shown, Clarke began by professing disdain for any real authority that might be found in the doctrinal pronouncements of the Fathers, and went on to maintain that his understanding of their teaching was to be preferred over the sense that had been adopted by the Church Catholic for at least sixteen centuries.

In considering the strong points of Waterland's presentation it must first be granted that he had an advantage over his opponents in that theirs was the burden of proving

what was generally a novel construction as opposed to the widely believed orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. This is true in spite of the fact that Clarke and Jackson both claim to be expounding the original meaning of the doctrine. By a process of eliminating other alternatives, Waterland feels that he can legitimately charge his opponents with Arianism in as far as this heresy involves the tendency to make of Christ an intermediate Being.

Waterland's most effective arguments in this controversy are those devoted to the maintenance of Christ's true divinity. The paraphrasing of the first chapter of John, according to the various schools of thought, is accurately done in that he exposes the real error in each case, and when he presents the Athanasian interpretation he increases the effectiveness of the contrast by pointing out the scriptural definition of God Almighty and then, showing how John, without any qualification, applies it to Christ. Waterland's most telling use of the fact of Christ's creating activity is in the demonstration that both Scripture and antiquity agree that Christ was uncreated and therefore He must be of equal eternity with the Father. The many problems that arise in adopting the Arian explanation for Christ's Creatorship, such as: why God ceased creating after bringing Christ into existence, are used by Waterland to prove that
the Catholic doctrine, which holds that Christ is as eternal as the Father, is superior because of its simple solution for such problems.

A powerful refutation of Clarke's attempted distinction in kinds of worship is produced through Waterland's insistence that this must result in polytheism and that there is no authority whatsoever for relative worship. That Christ was to be worshipped was agreed to by the Arians but Waterland shows that the Scriptures which restrict worship to one God cause an insolvable dilemma unless Christ is regarded as that one God. Distinction of Persons or the delegation of one Person by another in no way implies a difference in nature. On Waterland's premises, to admit that worship is due to Christ is incontestable evidence that He is God in the fullest sense.

After showing from Scripture Christ's rightful claim to the most exalted titles and attributes, Waterland concludes that this unhesitating affirmation by the Jewish Church of the first century, of Christ's full divinity, schooled as they were in the sense of the one true God, is clear proof of His proper entitlement. The early Church would have thought it blasphemy to ascribe this supreme conception of God to any creature.
In dealing with the inter-relation within the Trinity, Waterland devotes most of his polemic to proving that one cannot proceed from unity of substance to unity of person and although he agrees with his adversaries that these matters must of necessity be of a mysterious nature, he asks, with telling effect, if it is not then better, as a general principle, to think too highly of Christ than too meanly, since the mystery calls for latitude of judgment.

In contesting Clarke's views on relative Deity, Waterland will not grant that there is any ambiguity in the term "God" and strikes a hard blow at the foundation of Clarke's argument when he contends, with good logic, that Clarke's interpretation of those Old Testament verses that speak of the oneness of God would make it necessary to grant that Baal and Ashtareth were inferior Deities. This, and other serious complications resulting from the attempt to explain the inter-relation within the Trinity in terms of degrees, is, for Waterland, a plea for the catholic interpretation. Any understanding of the Divine nature is difficult but the communication of divine powers and attributes, without the substance or essence is as hard to conceive as a communication of both together, which is the catholic doctrine.
The question of the Son's subordination to the Father was largely obscured by an inability to define terms. Clarke's 300 texts which he devoted to proving that Christ was subordinate to the Father, proved only a subordination of order which Waterland acknowledged from the beginning, but the texts supplied no evidence against Christ's eternity or consubstantiality. Waterland admits that the catholic conception involves an equality that has order in it, which is as far beyond human understanding as is the Divine nature itself, but he believes that this conception involves far less difficulty than any unorthodox explanation.

As in his dealing with the Eucharist, Waterland never lost sight of the practical value of doctrinal truth. He stressed that the doctrine of the Trinity was not only speculative but closely interwoven with the principles of the Christian life. If God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost there are duties corresponding to each of the distinct offices and personalities, beside the duties common to all, considered as one God, and worship was seen as a practical duty of the highest importance. If the doctrine is true, it is sacrilege and impiety to refuse to worship any of the three Persons; if it is false, it is polytheism and idolatry to worship any but the Father only. Certainly,
the doctrine provides motives for Christian practice. The love of God the Father in sending His Son to redeem us, and the love of God the Son in condescending to take this office upon Him, appear in much stronger light upon trinitarian, than upon anti-trinitarian principles. The all-sufficiency of the satisfaction or propitiation made for the sins of the world, is obviously dependent upon the doctrine. The same may be said of the reliance upon the divine grace conferred by the Holy Ghost; concerning whose universal presence and assistance no satisfactory conception can be formed without ascribing to Him those attributes of infinity, which belong essentially to God, and to God only. Thus inseparably is the doctrine of the Trinity interwoven with the very frame and texture of the Christian religion.

If Scripture has clearly revealed this doctrine, its necessity and importance follows as a direct consequence. If it is intimately connected with the whole economy of man's redemption and worship and supplies the most powerful motives to faith, love and obedience men "... need not be expressly told that such a doctrine is important and weighty, and worth the contending for: let but Scripture once ascertain its truth, and every man's common sense will supply the rest". ¹

¹. Works, V, p. 62.
In accounting for his energetic denunciation of those who minimized the doctrine, Waterland summarizes his appreciation and understanding of it and the statement serves to bring this chapter to a fitting close:

... the received doctrine of the Trinity is both clear and practical, and sufficiently inculcated in Scripture to be esteemed an article of high importance, an essential of Christianity, a fundamental doctrine of the gospel, diffusing itself through the whole of our religion, and being, as it were, the very life and spirit of it ...

1. Works, V, 75.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In drawing final conclusions as to the quality of Waterland's theology, the significance of his Arminianism is important to an adequate understanding. In the seventeenth century orthodox theologians were calling their opponents "Socinian" and "Arminian" without troubling to distinguish between them. McLachlan has endeavoured to prove from the writings of such men as Anthony Wotton, George Walker, and the Arminian, John Goodwin, that,

Arminianism and Socinianism had close affinities and were born of a similar tendency of mind. The difference between them was more one of emphasis than radical departure. Arminianism was rather the dictate of moral sentiment, Socinianism a product of reason. The opponents of one system found themselves at loggerheads also with the other and did not often discriminate between them.

It should be recognized that this "similar tendency of mind" may indicate nothing more than the liberalizing trend of the eighteenth century which had its effect on all schools of thought but the obvious affinities nevertheless suggest some such paradoxical question as: "How liberal was orthodoxy?"

Although Hooker, who played such a prominent part in the formation of early Anglican theology, was eminently conservative, even he argued that religious beliefs rested ultimately on reason and conscience.\footnote{1} The best example of liberal tendencies being buried in the very heart of Anglican orthodoxy is seen in William Laud. High churchman and innovator though he was, his Arminianism and his decidedly rationalistic theology\footnote{2} serve to show that orthodoxy understood in terms of loyalty to fundamental doctrines and conservative church polity could make room for the liberalizing of thought that took place in the seventeenth century.

Arminian orthodoxy and Socinian heterodoxy had apparently some things in common, but they could travel together only to a certain point, and Waterland seems to have been one of those eighteenth century divines who indicated a need for a parting of the ways. His concessions to natural religion his continual appeal to reason, his rejection of the scholastic method of inquiry, his references to men like John Locke and the latitudinarian

\footnote{1} See his Ecclesiastical Polity, Third Book.
\footnote{2} In his Conference with Fisher, he clearly states that the ultimate test of belief is reason. On p. 49, in speaking of the mysteries of faith he says, "I would have no man think they contradict reason or the Principles thereof. No sure. For Reason by her own light can discover how firmly the Principles of Religion are true". 
 bishops with no trace of serious criticism, his willingness to leave a heretic undisturbed so long as he did not publicly advocate his heresy, and his recognition of the need of textual improvement in the authorized version of the Bible, all point to a very definite willingness to come to terms with the discoveries of his age. His advocacy of the fundamental doctrines and his resistance to those thinkers of his time who saw in the new liberty a chance to dispense with all authority, were not the result of any obscurantism or mere reluctance to break with tradition, but rather of an exceptional insight as to the underlying issues involved.

If genius is primarily the ability to make careful distinctions, Waterland must have possessed it to some extent, for he saw in Arminianism the needed emphasis on man's part in redemption, saw in Locke's loyalty to Scripture the importance of textual study over the mere acceptance of the dictum of antiquity, and saw the value of the Latitudinarian effort to prove that a reasonable system of belief need not differ from the traditional faith; but his appreciation of these made him no less orthodox when he detected any attempt to minimize God's part in redemption, or to ignore the consensus of historical opinion, or to
make all tenets of the traditional faith amenable to the laws of logic. This balanced judgment is best seen in the fact that he makes reason second only to Scripture in ascertaining doctrinal truth, but devotes the major part of his writing to a defense of the Trinity, the least comprehensible of the Christian tenets, and to the importance of the Eucharist, the most insignificant of Christian duties from the standpoint of a purely rational evaluation of Christian truth. At the point where Arminianism led into Socinianism, a development which neither Hooker nor Laud in their earlier fostering of a kind of liberalism, nor even Locke, foresaw, stood Waterland, alert to that extreme to which all good things can be taken. That he had the courage to take a mediating position in opposition to the extremist trends of his times, must distinguish him as a gifted theologian as well as a great character.

Those items of belief in which Waterland differed from his more liberal contemporaries are all indicative of a conservatism which recognized the dangers of reaction, and a maturity of judgment that can be traced throughout his works. His refusal to forsake the teaching of the early church Fathers as the best commentary on the Scriptures was no mere traditionalism, but rather an insistence that the
values of history could not be dismissed even in the time of the "enlightenment". He admitted the limits of the human intellect with no embarrassment because he saw the dangers of human conceit and over-optimism, and because he had given much sober thought to the Person and attributes of God. It is to his credit that he should have seen the fallacy of human self-sufficiency at this particular time. Few men had greater appreciation of the practical aspects of the Christian life than he, as is evidenced by the keen moral sense of his printed sermons, but this did not blind him to the fact that Christianity, in order to maintain itself in the world, must have great, sure beliefs that make theological formulation a matter of importance and require a Bible containing more than moral precepts. He would have none of the eighteenth century syncretism that sought to make of religion a nebulous covering for a lowest common denominator sort of morality.

Waterland's views on creed subscription, and on the evidences for biblical inspiration, would probably be the aspects of his thought least acceptable to modern theology. The taint of rationalism seems to have pervaded his thinking in his expressed confidence that there was no room for

1. See the sermons in Works, Vol. IX.
debate on the articles of the Creed, because an unbiased investigator must inevitably reach the same conclusions as the originators of that Creed since reason could mislead no one. He was right in his conclusion that the passing of time would not make any appreciable change in the basic structure of the Faith, but he was wrong in his unwillingness to grant that creeds and doctrines were only approximations at best and should be subject to the re-thinking of every age for the better understanding of the credal propositions in terms of the times, if for nothing else. The eighteenth century assault upon the fundamental doctrines could be considered a justification for his extreme views on subscription, but it cannot be denied that he gives evidence of intolerance in this matter. It should be remembered, however, that he would not specify the exact number of primary doctrines, that he did not deny men the right to privately interpret those doctrines, and he did not forbid any addition to the doctrines but asked only that new understanding be presented as such.

Waterland's conception of biblical inspiration is weak but this is doubtless traceable to the fact that such questions had not been sufficiently raised to encourage any really mature consideration of the problem. He was obviously
hard pressed in his effort to defend the Bible against the charges Tindal made in Christianity as Old as the Creation and frequently resorted, in justifying obvious immorality, to the plea that the persons in question were acting under special injunctions of the Almighty. This reluctance to admit the human factor in revelation was related to the previously mentioned reluctance to examine the creeds. A line of defence had to be drawn, and it appeared that the safest place to draw it was in the confession that what God had spoken was fixed, and the reasonable interpretation of what He said was also fixed except where the issue went beyond human reason, and in this case refuge must be taken in His Reason. Waterland chose to say that God's Word was infallibly inspired and could be relied upon as being the quintessence of truth whether it was fully understood or not. He was trying to give reason its rightful place without making revelation dependent upon it for its authenticity.

Waterland's eucharistic teaching was remarkable for its avoidance of error. Between the pure symbolism of the Deists and the transubstantiation of the Roman Church, there were such extreme views as Johnson's insistence upon a material sacrifice and such untenable positions as that of
a High Churchman such as Charles Leslie, who believed in the "real presence" but who was at a loss to explain how it differed from the transubstantiation which he professed to abhor. Against Receptionism, with its contention that the communicant, by right of his faith, really received the body and blood of Christ together with the elements, he demonstrated that the true presence of Christ was objective and thus independent of the faith of the recipient although worthy communication determined the spiritual value of the partaking. Against the repudiation of any sacrifice he urged a spiritual sacrifice which was nonetheless real. Against any repetition of the original sacrifice he pleaded that the eucharistic sacrifice was the presentation of the same offering as the sacrifice of Calvary. In his effort to appraise the emphasis of each school of thought and avoid its error, he was continuing the line of truth that had been advanced by Cranmer, Ussher, Patrick and Bull. These may be considered as being of the mediating school, or the school of the Central Churchmen, although it is doubtful if any one of them so considered himself. In every age there are those who are fitted by temperament,

1. Both Laud and Andrewes rejected the doctrine of Transubstantiation as unknown to the primitive church and without scriptural support. See Andrewes in Library of Anglo-Catholic theology, Vol. V, p. 262 and Laud in Vol. II.
training, and capacity to conserve the truths that are to be found in the more extreme positions and to combine them into one comprehensive understanding. The evidence as seen particularly in Waterland's handling of the subject of the Eucharist would argue in favour of his being included with such men. That he had a fine theological balance, as well as a genuine appreciation for the practical aspects of the eucharistic doctrine, is without doubt the reason why the Archbishops of Canterbury and York requested the re-issue of the Review 128 years after his death.

Waterland's defence of the Athanasian interpretation of the doctrine of the Trinity against Sabellianism and Arianism constitutes some of the best writing in the Trinitarian controversy, if not the best. The quality does not appear so much in unique arguments as in his relentless attack upon the vulnerable parts of his opponent's logic or interpretation of Scripture. The Sabellian, with his assertion that the Trinity only involved forms or manifestations of the One God, but not eternal distinctions, was never allowed to forget that Scripture speaks of the Second Person of the Trinity as existing and acting before the birth of Christ. The Arian, in his attempt to prove
that the Father is the only Divine Being absolutely without beginning, and that the Son and the Holy Spirit were created out of nothing before the world was, thus making Christ next in rank to God and able to create only by God's endowment of divine power, was continually reminded by various arguments that any such conception of Christ, considered in the light of the scriptural statement of his attributes and of his right to worship, must result in a belief in two Gods or in idolatry.

It was inevitable that metaphysical questions regarding the Trinity should be raised in the eighteenth century, and Waterland never hesitated to carry the battle to the ground of his opponents even though he felt that the final word could only be found in revelation. His skill in this type of subject is seen in his straightforward treatment of it. He was willing to define terms, to dispense with marginal issues, to admit his own limitations of argument or source when necessary, and to acknowledge what he considered to be valid in the opposing arguments. This type of apology resulted in a clarity of expression, which, if it had lacked in argumentative strength, would nevertheless have been read and appreciated by numbers of people who might not have been interested otherwise. That Waterland wrote for the scholar
but could be understood by the layman speaks well for his own mastery of the subject.

The need of the Church in eighteenth century England was for men of insight who could conserve the values of the past and give them clear expression. Waterland's gifts and his cherished *via media* were well suited to this need. His steadfast adherence to Cranmerian principles doubtless contributed to the persisting influence of that noble and scholarly martyr in the Church today. One of the Reformers who influenced Cranmer most, was the Swiss theologian Bucer, and Bucer was another whose appreciations were broad and influences mediating. He devoted much time and energy in the attempt to bring Luther and Zwingli closer together and to harmonize their eucharistic teaching. He did not have great outward success, even as Cranmer's broad sympathies only led to a martyr's crown, and Waterland's fame as a theologian is probably less than it might have been because he used his gifts to conserve, to mediate and to explain, but with all the difficulties of the *via media* and its lack of popular appeal these men believed that most truth could be found there. Waterland was Arminian, but in a broad

---

sense, having reacted to the rigidity of Calvinism which, at this time, was associated with endless debates, political disloyalty, and dissent, but he evinces no trace of Socinianism which reacted similarly. He upheld the principal ideas and discoveries of his day but he was a staunch traditionalist. He represented a Laudian type churchmanship but without Laudian intransigence or the extreme views of the Eucharistic sacrifice that Laudians were developing. Having a very firm grasp of the fundamentals of the faith he betrays, nevertheless, a certain longing for the peace of the Church that would not require overmuch definition or too rigorous enforcement of the letter of the law; he could "distinguish things that differ", and appreciate the broader outlook.

It is true that Waterland's type of churchmanship was to die out almost completely in the coming age, as it was to some extent eclectic and thus rooted in its own times. The beginnings of the Evangelical Revival sound the cry of the masses who no longer could be reached with the virtues of moderation, having hearts that longed for some more radical and decisive solution for their problems. Wesley, sharing Waterland's Arminianism, much of his churchmanship and his high view of the Sacrament, apparently was able to get the attention of the people with his very realistic view
of the power of sin in the life of fallen man and the nature of faith. The Non-Jurors and their descendants were moving in a different direction but were also increasing in strength and influence, developing eucharistic doctrine in ways that Waterland only dimly appreciated and beginning a revolution in churchmanship and doctrine which would later become the Oxford Movement. Waterland embodies the sum of the elements common to Post-Restoration orthodox Anglican theology. But most Anglicans of a later time believed everything that Waterland did, and more besides.

When it is remembered that Waterland contended against some of the most subtle and imposing heresies that ever molested the Church, and that he faced indomitably some of the most advanced writers whose erudition was esteemed by the entire learned world, it must be agreed that his works are, from the standpoint of orthodoxy, among the most important of the early eighteenth century polemical writings. His gifts and temperament were suited to his task and even his opponents must have agreed with Overton who said: "But no one can ever complain that Dr Waterland is obscure. We may agree or disagree with his views, but we can never be in doubt what those views were".  

In presenting the theology of Daniel Waterland, one is reminded of that number of men who laboured faithfully and whose influence, if unrecognized, is none the less real, and exists down to this day, even if the modern man is content to leave their writings undusted in the archives. Although Joseph Clarke, a former student of Waterland, may have been wrong in his estimation of the appreciation of posterity, he was right in a sense:

... and his works will deliver him down with honour to posterity: he wants neither marbles or epitaphs to fence against oblivion: by his learned defences of Christianity, he hath raised himself a perpetual monument: and hath rendered it needless to have his character drawn by any other pen, from the reputation he hath acquired by his own.

---

1. Joseph Clarke, Preface to Waterland's sermons, in Works, IX, i.
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