

1. Faith in the Trinity
 2. Of the Word of God, made very man
 3. Of the going down of Christ into Hell
 4. Of the Resurrection of Christ
 5. Of the Holy Ghost
 6. Holy Scripture
 7. Old Testament
 8. Original Sin
 9. Free Will
 10. Justification
 { 11. Of the Church
 12. Purgatory
 13. Baptism
 14. The Lord's supper (30) Both kinds
 15. The one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross
- God must
suffer for unregener-
ated - self
desirous

Article I. The Holy Trinity 1571. same
as now

"There is but one living and true God and he
is everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of
infinite power, wisdom & goodness, the Maker
and Preserver of all things both visible & invisible
and in unity of this Godhead there be three persons
of one substance, power & eternity, the Father, the Son
and the Holy Ghost.

*without
limitation
of time & space
A.T.*

A" Cdo e^g Co V^r ▷ 1L0P' Fe CV. P4L8D^o,
6P9 Fe 6P9 ▷ Δ" C', ▷ 6 ▷ ΔΔ·ΔΔ·, without parts
6 PC P ee 5" PΔ", ▷ 6 PC P 9·n PnD', (see Grifell.
Thomas p. 15) imperfables, ▷ 6 PC P nVPI-8, 96: e^g-
PC r 6 o P- ΔΔ·Δ· i.e. without passions (G. Thomas p. 15-
Pb PC P Δ" U<ΔP ΔΔ·Δ PΔ (re power adequate to all
possible requirements). ▷ 6 ▷ PPA<ΔP- ▷ T<"6 A-
(Pnq·CjD.) Fe ♫ ▷ 6 PC TPK<ΔP- ▷ TΔ·n PΔ- , 6 P
ΔrC' Fe 6 ALPC' 6·P70 96·7 6 o b o P Fe ▷ 6 6
e 6 "P Fe ♫ ~~V76~~ V76 ·x DL P4L8D^o Δ^o
~~6~~ Δ^o C·PΔ·Δ^o 16. V76 ·x 96: ▷ Δ" P ΔPbC^o,
(V76 ·x) 16n PΔ- Fe 6P9 Δ" CΔ·Δ, Δ" CΔ·Δ, DDP4L0
Fe 6 b 6n P' 8" 6x

Existence of God. - Main truths ① Unit. ② Trinity

At first all held the same beliefs without putting
them into words but later when heresy set in, it
was up to the church to find words to explain & it
was difficult & now difficult to put out free
God. from Indo-Germanic GHU. & not mean "good"

Origin of idea of God - St Paul says Acts 17 28
an altar to the unknown God. 28. as certain of us
own facts said In we are also their offspring - that
is believe in a God is born in every man - even if the
Idea is imperfect & incomplete. Idea of God came
not from the Bible - Bible gives us true idea.

Belief universal. Bible does not try to prove
existence of God but assumes it. The fool saith in
his heart there is no God Ps. 19. 1 P. 6.
Δειλος Δηποτεπανα πυλος η εγενερη
δικαιος λεοντα πονηρα Ps 19. 1

God Cosmological - every effect has its adequate cause
Universe an effect. "that has its ad. cause Gen 1.1
Every thing in universe must have cause - Since
God is cause then He exists - matter created,
motion - impetus life its Life Giver
Teleological. From design - gills of fish in sea to
water - wings, teeth shows presence of mind
a watch cannot make se. must be a maker
Everything with its parts harmonize & implies
one mind. What else then than God

Anthropological man's mental & spiritual natures
demand God as their Creator - Human free will \rightarrow a
greater will Conscience \rightarrow a Law Giver - This is
diff from lower animals - Personality in man
forests etc
4 things facts in Nature. Thought & Provider, Law giver
 \rightarrow a Shaker, A Provider, Law Giver Life Giver

¹⁷⁻¹⁸⁻¹⁹⁻²⁰
"Evolution" - the God the people know is not the Father
of our Lord J.C.

Christological - Incarnation ~~form~~ demands a belief in
God X revealed God because natural revelation
was inadequate - God's character as true. object?

— 3 ^{in the} And in the Godhead there be 3 persons ~~reality~~

Thus most people know there is a God
of some sort. the doc. of the Trinity rests
entirely on H.S. — Islamism in O.T. — without
revelation men wd never have found 3 in One.
when disclosed to man he finds it not &
reason, & fits in with his thoughts of God's nature

O.T. In midst of idolatry Hear O Israel the Lord
our God is one Lord Deut 6:4 — Israel to be rel.
established before A. in case of Poly Theism —

yet bless — Gen 1: 26 Let us make man

Again Behold ~~the~~ ^{the} man is become one of us. For 22
Isa 6: 8. I heard the voice of the Lord say who will

go for us? — Repetition 3 fold in Num 6: 24-26
The Lord bless thee — keep thee the Lord make his
face to shine upon thee + be gracious unto thee
the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee
~~a~~ bless thee give thee peace — Hof Hof Holy
is the Lord of Hosts Isa 6: 3

bless
bless
bless

65-47 Dec

Foreshadowings of 65-47 Dec
Logos. the Word. or ~~Person~~^{65-47 Dec} Gen 111. 8. Adam
hears the word of the Lord in the garden & the
Lord protects Noah by His word when he enters ark,
and at Sinai Moses brings forth the people
to meet the Word of God. VII. 16 - ~~This is the~~
~~word of God, representing His personal action + preparing~~
~~the way for incarnation idea~~ - God is often
disclosed as acting in man by means of His
Holy Spirit. - a power proceeding from Him, not yet
revealed as a distinct person In O.T. the
Sp^t of God. or Sp^t of Jehovah + giving natural +
intellectual gifts. Sp^t of ^{inspiring} Sanctifier Isa. 11. 25
Sanctification (Ps. 51. 10-12) 2 places referred
to as God's H.S. as in N.T. But the
rebels + greed His H.S. etc
Angel + God's H.S. for shadowy distinctions
within the Godhead

Revelation of mystery in N.T. No one statement
in N.T. where JX expressly reveals the doctrine
but in gradual intercourse with disciples they
came to recognize the Father, Son + HG.

1st almost Baptism of JX in Jordan
Voice of Father
testifying to the Son. Matt III 13. 17
upon whom the H.S. descended -

From then on gradual disclosure of the truth
in our Lord's teaching - He taught his disciples
~~that~~ to regard His relationship as unique
my Father my Son Father

This worship was peculiar diff from worship of ^{ah}
the Council claim his language implied that
it's personally distinct from the Father, He was yet one
with them & so himself divine - so with increasing
clearness at ^{the} end of his ministry he spoke much
of the H.S. in terms which can only be satisfied
if the S be a divine Person - Upper chamber
~~John 13:16~~ full rev. of Person & work of the H.G.

Full doctrine summed up & handed to the Ch.
Go ye & make disciples of all nations baptizing
them in the name of the F. & of the S. & the H.G.
St Matt 28:19 - In this connection if the
first 2 are personal then the 3rd must be

In this test. are mosaics

1. Unity of God
2. Divinity of the Son & the H.S
3. their distinct personality

These 3 truths make up the doc. of the A.
in Unity

See closing benediction of 2 Cor. 13:14 The grace of
our Lord JX & the love of C. & the Communism of the G.
be with you all

Rom XV. 3 I beseech you brethren for the Lord JX's
sake, & for the love of the Spirit that ye ^{since} come together
with me in your prayers to God for me.
(and Eph. 4:4) + distinctions in divine head
personal, ^{of its spirit-love, fellowship can}
be applied only to a person ^{but} of only divine
persons

It is: in unity of the Godhead there be 3 Persons
of one substance, power & intent the F, the S & the H.G.
See pages of Augustine Art. 1. pg. 101 - Edgar Faber,
Doctrine in the Scripture. its revelation from God &
must be recd - Love requires an object, lover
and loved. so the Word (Hes Son) in the beginning
with them & was god

at first p103 often the Ch believed but no
constraint to write - nor technical conts 1, 3 Persons
Keneses - Thaddeus & Antonius taught X was
a mere man became necessary to prove He
is divine. Proclus: "X is personally one with
God" but therefore it was actually the Father
who suffered on the Cross - Denial that the
distinctions are personal

Ch Had to be precise - enlarge her terminology
what is meant by that the F. S & H.G. are ^{three} three
persons & Ch shrank from answering "no
human term could adequately express except what
she understood the S. to teach. - Schulleus uses
Personae: began more hypotheses than one in
the Godhead - 2 kins of hypotheses however
1. n.a essential & substantial & tres personal

The explanation of the doctrine "substance
3 persons"

Danger ^{i.} exaggerating distinctions & separating
~~the~~ Persons ^{ii.} explaining away the distinctions

so ultimately deny their reality Augustine. The Father is not the Son & vice versa is A.G. (qsp-H2) is neither the Father or Son, certainly they are three "I and the Father are one) what are the 3? Human language fails 3 persons - word can not be employed with intellectual caution - not 3 separate existences like 3 men - but 3 eternal distinctions in One nature

Gibson

P. 154

I distinguish all eternal John 1.1 - Then in John 17.5. The gl^{ory} wh I had with Thee before the world was. Scripture shows that the distinct they are not separate "I and my Father are One"

"I" (not the son) "the Father" (not my father) are (not am) - an eternal fact in divine nature. The Son was a distinct person before creation of He then possessed a gl^{ory} of His own with the Father. The distinct they are not separate "I and my Father are one" have to be same (essence) to be equal in power

Proof of the Father, not of time, but of order.

*Per se propria
conveniens*

Parents & orders Father → Son → H.G. So the

X referred "The Father is greater than I" (John 14.28)

Sons say this of his incarnation Athenian Crees

Equal to the Father is surely His Godhead, + inferior

to Him and touching His manhood - lack of

derivation he is subordinate hinc X worships (coherens)

re the mutual inhabiting of the 3 Persons I am in the Father & the Father in me. (St. John 14.10)

St Paul 1 Cor Ch 11

Prentheses & consciousness the union
of wh one thing exists in another by it certain
things, however much they may be mutually
distinguished without each other without being
separated exist in each other without confusion,
& as it were flow into each other.

Op.
Pearson p 116. ^{As the living Father hath life in Himself,}
^{so hath He given to the Son to have life in Him,}
^{I live of the Father}

Article 11. The Son, wh is the Word of
the father, begotten from everlasting of the Father,
the very & eternal God - one substance with the
Father, took man's nature in the womb of
the blessed Virgin, of her substance so that
two whole & perfect natures, that is to say,
the Godhead in manhood, were joined together
in one person, never to be divided, whereof is
one Christ, very God & very man, who truly
suffered, was crucified, dead & buried to
remain in this Father to us, and to be a
sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but
also for actual sins of men

D&P/Lo □ A.J □ D' □ P.D.o □ "C.A.Lo □

D"p' bP9 Te bP9 D" C.A.L.D.x. se Q.V.

Te bP9 P.Y.L.D.o VY6.9 96: D A.Y.D.m G.d.t

C17D - D" C.A.Lo P" D.Nec D' D.P □ H.A.T.Po

D.Y.Y.P.S. & C.P' b hD.P.C.S.P' D.O.P.P.y.g.t

D' AR 470.5 (of his substance) A.P. 57
ΓΥΛ.5 P. Γε ΔΛΓΩΔ. 85 P. AR 470.2, 105
Δ.5.2 DA Γε ΔΔΓΩΔ.Δ.2 Δ P. Δ.7.4 C.2
VS. Δ.7.4 P. Δ.6. PC. 225° C.2, DC
6 Δ.11 P. VS. X., CV. PYLOD. Γε CV. Δ.7.4
CV. Δ P. 66.CPC, Δ P. Δ.7.4 P. Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4
PC. 6.5. Γε Δ.7.4 L.5. Δ.7.4 C.2.5, Γε PC. Δ.7
PC. L.5. Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4
Δ.7.4 L.6 Γε Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4
Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4 Δ.7.4

Articles aimed at the Anabaptists who were accused
on the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, reviving the
Arian heresy⁴ other heretical notions, of meanness,
others rejected the doctrine of the Atonement denying
X is the messiah or Saviour. + saying actually He is
a mischievous fellow + deceiver of the world

In 1585 14 Anabaptists were burnt saying
that "in X is not 2 natures, God & man + that He
took not flesh + blood of Mary + Matt. Hamann
1579 saying "X is not God nor the Saviour of the world
but a mere man, a sinful man + an abominable
idol".

Show views
John 1.1
3 things considered in the article The Son wh is
the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting
of the Father, the very + eternal God, of one substance
with the Father.

4. Pearson The Son 4 subordinate sense in wh the title is
given to Em. He is Son
(a) As born of H. S. of Virgin Mary St-Luk, 35 The HS
shall come upn thee, + the power of the most High
Shall overshadow thee where that wh is to be
born shall be called Hol. the Son of God

(b) Mission as designed by God's will & His high
office John 10: 34-36 "Is not written in your law, 'I said unto you, ye are gods'? If ye call them gods
of them whom the word of God came in His Son, cannot He break through?" said Jesus the Saviour

(c) As raised by God from the dead Rom 1:4 declared

to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead

(d) As appointed heir of all things Heb 1: 2-3
His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things
having become by so much better than the angels
as he hath inherited a more excellent
name than they'

But tho' by these he may be less said than
title Son belongs to Him, they are inferior +
improper names but He is son because He
has the divine essence communicated to Him
by the Father from all Eternity - In this sense He
is God's Son & God is His Father. John v. 18
Jesus tried to kill Him because He said God was
His Father

Before Creation, prior to birth He had been God's
Son in this sense - Derives His dignity from His
Father - the only unoriginate, son proceeding
which is the Word of God

Also given to 3rd Person only

In John 1: 1. 14 The Word of God also Rev 19: 13
So X is eternal & can't. shut off God as & day to
Son & Word supplement - Both guard the truth
in the Son - If Son used alone suggests
together no mistake is possible

(Thought or reason)

The Son who is the Word must be eternal
The Word who is the Son, must be a distinct person

6 DINDI DICAY TIG DINDI

Begetten from everlasting - If He is the Son from all eternit - the Son, he is begetten from everlasting

Eternal generation is word used to denote eternal divine essence communicated by the Father to Son not something which took place once. It is an eternal & unchangeable fact in the divine nature

origin "The Savor is ever, begetten ^{DINDI} ~~longus~~". The Father is ever begetting the Son & the Son is ever being born

"one begotten" used several times by St. John i. 14. 18
St. Paul First-born of all creation

The Only & Eternal God. because of Arius who said He is not eternal nor eternal God in Greek terms He is they God of Very God.

^{homoousion} of one substance with the Father, distinctive symbol.

q. Xian Faith > Arians. - Of the same substance
> Of like Substance The Nicene fathers divines put into a new language the belief of the 1st fathers of the faith. - Did not enlarge - simply holding what they had received. Asked by whom they believed & they said it - Holy new in Greek breed only said it more exactly. Homoousion = of one substance (Left out here "objective" p. 126)

^{belong} - but this reading is for the main X

Scriptural evidence of the Deity of the Son

X's claims such that it was impossible to think of Him except as one who is God, but understood at first by disciples etc but in quest "on then "greater than Jonah" "greater than Solomon" "greater than the temple" "to give rest to the weary heavy laden" - aspect of a knowledge of the Father possessed by none other St Matt 11. 27-30
He wd. come again "in his glory & glory of the Angels" "set on the throne of judgment"

Qd? Saw His miracles heal sick, cast out devils in his own name heal sick - devils depart. St Mark q. 25. They had sick arise in His Name. "Eneas, I make thee whole" Acts q. 34

Thou deaf & dumb spirit I command thee come out of him St Mark q. 25 (man brought - em)

He accepted worship by whosoever offered

St Matt 8. ²⁵ 25 (the leper) ix. 18 (the ruler of the synagogue) the worship was the prerogative of God alone (any fool must be rejected by men. Acts X. 26, even by angels Rev. 19:10)

when he spoke of relation to his Father He asserted His union with Him "I and my Father are one" St John 10:38 In John V. Jews sought to kill Him "he not only break the Sabbath but also called Himself Father, making himself equal with God" His opponents understood Him to claim Deomf.

His disciples heard & knew & gradually saw that X was not only a prophet, but that He was the Messiah, that He was the Son of God

Peter

After spoke for all when he said Then came the X.
the Son of the living God Matt 16. 16 - soon short
of absolute. bulk cause Jews were perhaps not
looking for a divine Messiah (Ryle & fans on side of Sd.)
But when the crowning proof of Resurrection
from the dead came, there was absolute conviction
Thomas "My Lord & my God John 20. 28

Aim of X's revelation was to lead men to
see God in him. In John 20. 28 Thomas doth as
his words.

Summary Great dogmatical passages in Pauline Epistles
Phil. 1. 12-6-8 See of X who being in the form
of God - equal with God but emptied Himself
taking the form of a servant - humbled self, obedient
unto death, yea, death of the Cross

Brain subject of this is Incarnation. Apostle
states who he was born - in the form of God but very
so humble did not consider as equal a thing to
be grasped at but emptied self. John 1. 14 reward-
realij of his human nature. Thus he who was
incarnate in Time existed before the worlds in the
eternal Godhead

Col. 1. 15-18 See 6 dy. D. 52 d P A 20 50 P 6
6-20 P. P 420 7A. 6 57C 5" G D P 1 6P 50
D P 62 29L 5.7 D" P 6P 50 96. P D P 60
45 D 9P 6. 6. 45P T 6 45 P C 16 P .. 45 D 6-06P
T 6 P 6 6-6. P. P 7A. P 15 P D P L 5.1 A. C. 5" 3
M 7 P 9A. 2 5" D P L 5.1 A. C. 5" 3
6P 50 96. 2 T 6 5.7 D 4P P D P 60 7. T 6 5.7 4Q
D 22 5.7 060 062 6P 50 96. 2. T 6 5.7 6 5" P
A 4C 6 5" P 5.7 16. 6 D 20 6-06X T 50, 45 P D 6F
DA. 5. P P L 5.7 6 45. 6 5" T 50, 45 P D 6F
D 5"

178. BY PC SP 5. 97 i + p.

X Apostle here claims absolute supremacy
in relation to universe and the church &
his relation to God "image"

attributed to him the works of creation of
all things seen & not seen, "He was before
all things". Such claims must be made
for one who is himself God

Heb. 1. 2. creation attributed to Son

¶ p. 24 PL. PC - AV TCT - p. 6970 q6.

¶ a. v. 1. d. o. A. II P. b. p. T. C. I. 409

Contrasted with angels Ps. 45. 7. as quoted
by St Paul in the writer of the Epistle!

Ps. 102. 25 no experience & knoweth
but Jehovah yet writer of Epistle applies it
to X - how ready they assume almost qd
other passages in O.T. also mention Jehovah
in the N.T. cited as referring to X

e.g. Isa. vi. saw the glory of Jehovah. So John
after speaking of X "These things said
Isa when he saw his (Xis) glory & spoke of
Him. Jech. XIII. 10. quoted by St John 19. 37

of Xis crucifixion but on turning to the prophet
we see that Jehovah is the Speaker who says
"They shall look upon me, whom they have
pierced"

X Passages where X is directly termed God

St John 1. In the beginning was the Word and the
Word was God

the Word was made flesh
and dwelt among us

~~The incarnation~~ = ~~abide~~ which was God
further down. No man hath seen God at any time
~~the self begotten Son~~, wh is in the bosom of the Father
He hath declared Him Acts "The church of
God, wh He purchased with His blood".

~~Jesus~~ Our great God & Savior for
applying title God & Saviour Peter 1. 1. our
God & Saviour for

In incidental witness of passing statements in which
divine attributes & actions are ascribed to X
& prayers & doxologies

Act 7. 53 Stephen abnes "Lord Jesus
take my spirit!" 2 Cor 1. 10

Eph 1. 19. 20 6 p AF 16 C. X4. 4 NK 4

S. G. 62. 6 P > A. O. D. R.
R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R. R.

67 27. A. 2. Fe 1. 6. 6. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7.

6. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9. 9.

L6 Pa 55 L 56 6 57. R. R. 6. 6 P 50

96. 6. 6 P 45. 45. 45. 45. 45. 45. 45. 45. 45. 45. 45.

Fe 7 P 7

A. A.

6. 6.

~~X~~ The Incarnation

The Son took man's nature in the womb of
the Blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that 2
whole & perfect natures, that is to say the
Godhead & the Manhood, were joined together

on one person, never to be divided whereof
is one X, very God + very man.

If Christ be God
heresies 1. Arian: denying the true Aum & X
like + not

2. Apollinaris earliest (Bishop of Laodicea)
after Arius condemned at the Council of
Constantinople 381. - body, soul + spirit
- no soul. spirit place supplied by the
divine Logos. - so X could not be perfect man
so affects redemptive work - man of
imperfect, redemption and be incomplete. Had
to be man

Hesychius Patriarch of Constantinople was
condemned at 3rd Council of Constantinople
Ephesus. - 2 persons in X Virgin could
not properly be termed Mother of God for she
gave birth only to a human being who
was conjoined to the divine essence of God
God assumed him + is for this reason called
God - Redemption spirit. If X be 2 persons
it was only a man who died on the cross
+ not a divine person. - but X died +

Chalcedon 4th gen Synod ad. Chalcedon
451 + a monk of Constantinople - One on
nature in Him human nature absorbed
by the divine + no longer distinct elements
2 whole + perfect natures - no redempt.
because he who died not qualified to
represent man as being not human

2nd Discourse

This is why the Article was formulated to prevent the Son's from all Eternity. — at ~~incarnation~~ no new person came into being but the Son took on his nature in the womb of Mary of her substance, & has since existed as God & as man in whole & perfect natures, Godhead & manhood. → one personality. This is hypostatic union, a single self. This is plain taught in St. John 3:13. "The Ch. of God will be purchased with His own blood" Acts 20:28 thus ~~replicates~~ the Blood of God — X rays of Jesus "the Son of Man" who is in Heaven. John 2:13 St Paul "Crucified the Lord of Glory" 1 Cor. 2:8 etc. St Luke 27:47 says of Jesus "thy Father & No. Mother" a St. Mary said to him "Thy Father" (psalm) it is clear from St. Paul that he had no human Father St. Paul's made of a woman.

Human — real. He hungered & thirst Matt 21:18. He was weary. Job 4:6. He slept. He was grieved Mark 3:5. He wept, increased in wisdom groaned wth effort — Commended his Rpt. to God ~~but~~ must be man yet at times he acts with powers beyond ordinary man. — walked on sea — water & wine multiplied loaves & fishes, heal the sick, read the disciples' hearts — "Knows the Father as the Father knows him. St. John 10:15 — Jesus had a human body enabled by his gift to walk on water. This is contrary to man's gift. in ordinary matters he accepted limitations common to men. Did not know the day or the hour of judgment.

"out of the Father" — He implied Himself
"spoketh also" — not of God dead but
exercise of divine prerogatives

3. The Atonement

who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and
buried; to reconcile His Father to us, & to be a
sacrifice, not only for original guilt but
also for all actual sins of men

(a) who truly suffered — truly arose from
the dead — > Docetic heresy: "that X's
body was like ours only in appearance, not
in reality." — > Denys of SS. Anabaptists
who denied it took flesh in the womb of M.
& thus denied the reality of His passion
& resurrection. Hence word true

To reconcile His Father to us, sometimes
said to be unscriptural but over and above
with all that — Jesus — Sacrament of E.
that the need for reconciliation works on man's
side & no need for it to reconcile Father to us

Language is justifiable however — removal of
enmity

not only for original guilt but also for all actual sins of men - specification between the two is remarkable - again mentioned in Article 31.

R.C's X suffered for original sin. the sacrifice of the altar was daily offered for actual sin.
~~at all actual sins~~ ^{Calvin's} ~~Calvin's~~ doctrine of not

~~all~~ ^{for} ~~but~~ only for the elect - page 149. Given
Atonement - (a) X suffered to be a sacrifice for sin. 1 Cor. 1. 7 X our Passover as sacrifice
for us. Let us keep the feast.

Eph. 1. 2 Walk in love, even as X also loved
you & gave Himself for us, an offering and a
sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell.

(a) ^{766 CP UNCL 91} ~~Calvin's~~ character of His suffering

St Matt. 20. 28 The Son of man came to give
His life a ransom for many

St John 11. 13 I lay down my life for the sheep
John 2. 6 X who gave Himself a ransom
for all. Other places as an offering for sin

(b) Universal character of redemption & it was
for all men that X died see John 3. 16

~~Calvin~~ Breadth of this makes small the various
theories that would limit the saving work
of X to ~~the elect~~

So in John 3. 2. He is the propitiation
for our sins, and not for ours only,
but also for the whole world - St Paul
"We gave Himself for all" 1 Tim 2.6

Preachers sometimes say God is vengeful
while the Son is all mercy & tenderness. yet
^{John 3.16} God so loved the world -

Rom 8. 32 God spared not His own
Son, but delivered Him up for us all.

We read of the "wrath" of God, we also
read of the "wrath of the Lamb".

Some views have been advanced ^{times} but
not sanctioned by the church. (1) by the
fall, Satan gained a "right" over man
& that man can be released by a
satisfaction of Satan's just claim. According
to this the death of Christ was the price or ransom
paid to Satan to satisfy his claim. Jerome then
argued 1000 years held still rejected. (St Anselm
Cardeus home)

To few the works, ransom &
purchase did not have suggested such that
but it did to Greek & Latin writers - The
exodus from Egypt - redeemed from Egypt,
purchased them, ransomed them, they were
used to do in any of cases (Ex 15. 13-16)

Egypt delivered first the idea of redemption.

X's sacrifice was efficacious - it would have been the same if God had part Pharaoh but not - other O.T. speaks of redemption delivered - the idea of payment till the idea came from a meseneptia & every interplay of ideas i.e. discussion ransom paid + Satan. Now in what way it had its efficacy the scripture has not explained. (By Butler) 18th century

Article III Of the going down of X into hell

[As X died for us + was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell.]

Article of 1553. longer. Longer as Cranmer drew it. He said same as above but went on "For the body lay in the sepulchre + resurrection but His ghost departing from Him was with the ghosts in prison or in hell, + did preach to the same, as the place of St Peter doth testify." Revision in Elizabeth's reign St Peter's clause struck out. - Caused agitation - many theses. Some say that the infernal pangs of death when He died Father, why has thou forsaken me? (wh. is meant.)

Article as published in 1553

As Christ died & was buried for us, so also it is
to be believed that He went down into Hell
for the body lay in the sepulchre until the
resurrection, but His glor. departure from them
was with the ghosts that were in prison after
hell. & did preach to the same, as the place
of St Peter doth testify.

Teramer signed by 6 Royal chaplains
in 1553

Elizabeth's reign shows almost nothing
with the past exalted - due much
perhaps to the appeal of the Pd & Exiles
3 subjects require our attention

① The meaning of the word Hell

Latin word Tene infero also in Alhambra
Cred. - Heb. Sheol. & Greek Hades.

What was the belief of the Heb. re the
invisible world? Sheol occurs over 60 times
in the OT. = (Hades in LXX) - the meeting
place for all living & the underworld
or state of the departed in general
the "meeting place for all living" Job 33:29
where were the souls of the righteous
Jacob Samuel David Lyons King
of Babylon Isa 13:9

As Jewish belief developed & the
& future life became clearer it was

realized that there was a difference in the condition of the souls of the departed in the underworld - fainted traces in OT can be seen Book of Enoch, 5th 2nd C BC - Sees beautiful place, Garden of Eden is & nearly abode of bad people in great affliction until the day of judgment. Later shown place for those who will be cleansed eternally, the valley of Hinnom - Gehenna.

Sheol (few below) is where the departed await final judgment in 2 parts - faithful in pieces, and porous thus she - he (she being ahead informed) north him paradise not in Gehenna

Homes & Lazarus. Abraham's bosom, others in Hades & in torments due to 22 23

To Sheol or Hades = Eng word Hell in the article - no (a neuter word) indication of blessedness or the reverse. The Gr. & Latin words Hades & Infer are free from the associations wh have grown around our Eng word Hell owing to unfortunate translation that it has been adopted as Gehenna (see esp Subm 165 p) as well as Hades & thus denotes definitely the place of torment as well as the intermediate state

2. Scriptural grounds for the doctrine of the object of the descent

4 passages on descent

(a) St Luke 23. 43 (b) Acts 2. 26-31

(c) Eph 4.9. (d) 1 Peter 3.18

(a) St Luke 23. 43. Verily I say unto you, Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise.

W^ods assume as another the current belief that Paradise or Garden of Eden is the part-called Sheol, the abode of faithful departed. Thus our Lord w^od depart after His death, & the souls of dead souls w^od descend into Hell. Some hold that there is a diff. between Paradise & Sheol & Hades.

Iustiller + gave expression that X went to a place where were the souls of the faithful of the Old Covenant, told them the accomplished & Redemption & then transferred them to Paradise -

(b) Acts II. 24. 31 St Peter quotes the language of David in Ps. 16. I beheld the Lord always before my face, for he is on my rt. hand that I shd not be moved. Therefore my heart was glad, my tongue rejoiced: because thou w^oll not leave my soul in Hades (Hell) neither

would Thou give thy Hol one to see corruption
Thou madest known unto me the ways of
life -

St Peter said these words did not apply
to David "He both died & was buried, & his
tomb is with this body" The fulfilment of these
fulfilled in the person of the Messiah,
His ~~ref~~ to descent into Hades is just as
clear ~~but~~ say not of object of descent, or
of the nature of the region visited

c. Eph 4:9

Now that He is Descended, what is it
but that He also descended unto the lower
parts of the Earth. He that descended is the
same also that ascended far above all the
heavens, that He might fill all things
Cruhur

* This may mean descent heaven above
to earth beneath, (fact of incarnation)

(d) If it were not for Peter's words (1 Peter 3. 18 -

If so there would be no grounds for looking for anything further than this that X might fulfil the conditions of death & truf as of life.

If Hell & Hades same no meaning then our Lord's human soul should pass into the world of spk. & "descended into hell - We will be where He has been - bore our nature living, bore it dead

but will the words of Petz compel us to consider.

Art. IX

Original Sin standeth not in the following
of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it
is the fault + corruption of the nature of every
man, that naturally is engendered in the offspring
of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from
original righteousness, and is, of his own nature
inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth
always contrary to the spirit, + therefore in
every person born into the world, it deserveth
Gods wrath + damnation, and this infection of
nature doth remain, yea in them that are
regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called
in Greek φόρητος σύκος, which some do
esplain the wisdom, some sensuality, some the
affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not
subject to the law of God. An altho there is no
condemnation for them that believe + are baptised,
yet the apostle doth confess that conceit
a lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

Object of this Art. ¹⁵⁵³ shown in words which
followed up to Pelagians - these words follow
"which also the Anabaptists do now a days
renew" These omitted review of 1569 -
Designed to meet revival of the Pel. error

(a)

They amount to denying that the fall of Adam had affected his descendants & b) practically a denial of the need of God's assisting grace in order that man may do true service to God —

Well, admit that man fell & God's grace at once becomes a necessity, Deny the fall, & you might be able to do without grace; a human nature without Supernatural assistance may be equal to conflict with sin

Universal depravity must be explained why is sin found every where? Pelagius answered Adam's example. Adam's fall had no effect on the nature of his descendants

This view revives by Anabaptists 16th C & was condemned original sin Standell not in the following of Adam, as the Pds say

The meaning of the Eng phrase - ~~the way~~ ^{phrase} is made clear by a ref. to the Latin "standell not" = does not consist w/ "the following of Adam" = the imitation of Adam or sinning after his example.

Original sin does not consist in imputation
of Adam or of sinning after his example,
as the Pelagians do very talk see

Rom 5: 12 - 15 — — — nevertheless death

reigned from Adam ~~until~~ Moses, even over them
that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's
transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come.

Universal depravity recognized throughout OT.
but no explanation of it is offered. Two possible
ones:

i. Either all men (Pelagius) follow Adam's
example & "sin" after the likeness of his transgression
or there is a fault in the inherited nature
which makes sinning easy & natural.

Jewish writers (outside the Canon) show that tho'
the Jews had no consistent doctrine among Jews,
yet some were seeking their way to position
laid down by St Paul & to believe that the
Fall had permanently affected his descendants.

Teaching on this in N.T is clear.

From passage cited is discussing as to Paul's
views & > Pelagian Theory, & first chapter of
Romans tend to establish the fact that
Adam's sin has a far reaching effect on
mankind that thro' it sin → world & that
all his descendants inherit a tendency to sin.

The conclusion that has come to me by way
as an inference from the SS is that there is
a stain in the nature of every man,
(from Adam) — (secular philosophers & such
as formulated by modern science under the
name of heredity)

Original righteousness

O.S. is "the fault + corruption of the
nature of every man that naturally is engendered
of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very
far gone from original righteousness"

Indications from Scripture (ancient writers,
have described it as part natural + part supernatural
natural in that it proceeded from free will or
power of choice (Pc 1.20 & 2.1), supernatural in
that there were certain special gifts, &c from
God to help. Adam could not have had
concupiscence or lust — i.e. direct inclination
to evil, wh is now the incentive to sin
in our nature, for he was made "in the image
of God" + was "very good" — Still there must have
been in him wh sin could take hold of
— a starting point for temptation.

To protect him from yielding he must have been given a disposition to find pleasure in well doing - & this w^t preserve him in obedience without the need of express effort. This natural pleasure in goodness, virtue implanted in character - i.e. supernatural idea bias \rightarrow good, so that man wd have a tendency to do right. First sin was \rightarrow this & made it so humorous distinction between it & others later committed.

There is nothing in SS to make us think that in his un fallen state was perfect. He was innocent - it is true - but that is all nor do we learn from SS that he was virtuous & intellectually great - some fathers deny Adam was made perfect.

The effect of the fall

If this was the condition of man before his fall, what was the effect of the Fall?

Different views held

1. Great Fathers & Earliest Litur had no great views on the Fall - just this, involved the loss of the supernatural bias \rightarrow good

2. Augustine &c dealt fully with the subject - drew out more the teaching of SS showing that the Fall involved ^{the} loss of man with loss of supernatural gifts, & left man with a corrupt nature - a bias \rightarrow evil

Anger

Hargley says the Fall was disabled by the Fall
power of choice gone. Man was "prive to
the operation of grace, in a state of necessity
on the side of evil, a slave to the & to his
immediate lusts."

3. Later^{16c.} an inclination to regard OS
in a milder light - Council of Trent regarded
as a loss of holiness & righteousness & Bellarmino
"It is the result of the withdrawal of supernatural
gift."

4. But Lutherans & Calvinists "an entire
depravation of human nature so that man
is only inclined to evil." Since the Fall,
the image of God is wholly obliterated & the
nature of man no better than that of
the evil spirit. Looked upon O.S.
as much more serious. So deep a corruption
of nature, that nothing healthy or meritorious in
a man's soul or body, or mind, or outward
powers is left.

So what do we Anglicans incline?

• Harder view that Trent & Guests - & it
falls short of the Westminster Confession &
of Calvinists in general - total loss?
"very far gone" inadequate

So we can hold to very far gone from "original
righteousness". So much as clearly taught
in SS. Not too much stress. Psalms. I was
shapen in iniquity & in sin did my mother
conceive me? Ps 51. 5. & Job's who can
bring a clean thing out of an unclean
Job 14. 4. The imagination of man's heart
is evil from his youth. Gen 8. 21. Every
imagination of the thoughts of ~~the~~ his heart is
only evil continually v1. 5. The heart is
deceitful above all things & desperately
~~wicked~~ ~~sick~~ Jer 17. 9. The mind of the
flesh is enmity to God, for it is not subject
to the law of God, neither ^{indeed} can it be,
they that are in the flesh cannot please God

On the other hand — Passages indicate despite
depravation the "image of God" still remains
since the Fall, & is not wholly depraved
the of his original righteousness (Gen 1. 26)
Whoso sheddest man's blood by man shall have
blood be shed. is based that in the image of
God made He man) 1 Cor 11. 7. St Paul
Speaks of "the image & glory of God" which St Jas.
3. 9 says men are "made after the likeness
of God". So we in the main follow St
Augustine the same things he was led to

*as d.
not giving
opium
concrete*

in controversy with Pelagians to wh. we need
not subscribe. e.g. he said that as a fact
infants etc dying unbaptized meet with
the punishment of death. we say " O.S.
deserves God's wrath & damnation. This
falls short of Augustinian. - At end of
Baptismal service. It is certain to teach
and that children wh are baptized dying
before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly
saved. - Nothing is said of unbaptized
children. - By time of 8d v. Leedy
American Divines had come to see that
while sal. grat. must be denied to those
who despise or reject baptism, yet in the
case of children (of clean parents at least) dying
unbaptized ~~two~~ as fault of their own, there
is room for good hope *Reformatio Legum*
Ecclesiasticae

~~The effect of Baptism in the removal of sin.~~

In considering the effect of H.B. in
the removal of O.S. we must remember
that there are 2 evils attaching to all sin
the guilt. wh needs pardon & forgiveness.

and the Power wh needs overcoming & driving out. In our view that which we call OS. is more than losing higher goodness. It is a germ of real evil. true of all other sin. It has its guilt, wh makes us "children of wrath" & it has its power wh is the form of concupiscence draws us in direction of evil. In baptism the guilt is pardoned. There is no condemnation to them that believe & are baptized - See Acts 2:38 Peter said Repent & be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus X for the remission of sins & ye shall receive the gift of the H.G. xxii:16 And now why tarryest thou? Arise & be baptized a wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

Adults "The infection of nature doth remain yea, in them that are regenerate whereby the lust of the flesh Phoenicia ^{subros} which some do expand wisdom, sensually, affectual desire of the flesh is not subject to the law of God." Proof of universal depravity needs no script- proof - The old nature we all know exists after baptism & reception of all some grace

The phrase "lust of the flesh" is based on
Rom 8. 6. 7

Philip spoke to the people in Samaria
unclean spirit crying with a loud voice
came out of many that were possessed
with them. Many taken with palsies
& that were lame were healed.

For to be carnally minded is death
but to be spiritually minded is life & peace
Because the carnal mind is enmity
> God, for it is not subject to the mind
of God neither indeed can be

For the mind of the flesh phenomena works
is death but the mind of the spirit is life &
peace. "the mind of the flesh is enmity
> God for it is not subject to the law
of God neither indeed can be

The Character of Concupiscence

What is the character of concupiscence wh
remains even in regenerates? Is it
& to be regarded as sin before it breaks out?
or not. Keenly debated in 16 century
Rome & Calvin opposed.

Roman view given at Council of Trent
1546. ^{some} years before ours was drawn up

The R. C.

- ① In baptism the guilt of OS is remitted & all other sin of true & proper nature is taken away
2. There remains concupiscence, or an inclination to sin wh. is left for us to strive against but cannot injure those who consent not
3. This concupiscence ~~or an inclination to sin~~ which the Apostle sometimes calls sin the R. C. has never understood to be sin on being real true & proper sin in the regenerate but ~~it is of sin + inclines to sin~~ the at clear + definite concupiscence: then it often leads to sin & not have a proper sin.

Calvin deplorable. Concupiscence is true & proper sin - We affirm that this fault is true sin even after baptism & tried to introduce it into 39 articles - Our milder position. Somewhat ambiguous a wanting in the precision of the others

The Apostle doth confess that Concupiscence
a lust hath of itself the nature of
sin.

Hard to know just what this means
Our article leaves our minds unsettled
as to whether we call concupisence sin or not.
Ambiguity probably designed nor do we
regret that we are not called upon to
give a more concise statement.

It is enough to know its closest affinity
Connected with sin & if unchecked
at issues in sin. There it was left.

The Apostle saying that Concupiscence
hath of itself the nature of sin.

To what passage is alluded. St Paul
evidently he uses whole direct terms
concupiscence sin (Trent maintains he does)

Iver Wayne Burns

Ross n

Born 22nd May 55

Riley + Mrs. n the father

Sydney

Born 23rd May 55

Solomon Head, Sarah ann is the father