

**A FEW WORDS ON  
THE HAMPDEN  
CONTROVERSY**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649226047

A few words on the Hampden controversy by Orlando Forester

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**ORLANDO FORESTER**

**A FEW WORDS ON  
THE HAMPDEN  
CONTROVERSY**



A FEW WORDS  
ON  
THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

A FEW WORDS

OR

THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

BY THE

HON. AND REV. ORLANDO FORESTER, M.A.,

RURAL DEAN, RECTOR OF BROSELEY, AND A PREBENDARY IN THE  
CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF MEREFORD.

SECOND EDITION.



SEELEYS, HANOVER-STREET, HANOVER-SQUARE,  
AND 54, FLEET-STREET, LONDON.

MDCCCXLVII.

## A FEW WORDS

OR

## THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

---

It would be presumptuous in one unlearned and unknown like me to seem to be stepping forward and undertaking the part of champion for Dr. Hampden, and not rather waiting to see others, more able and better fitted for such a duty, engage in it. And it is because I feel all this, that I am anxious to disclaim any intention *directly* to defend, by any words of my own, one who has been from time to time, through a series of years, so followed up by persecutions; otherwise than such defence may result from simply putting forth, for the benefit of every-day and common-place persons like myself, a representation of the case as it is, as a set-off against the misrepresentation of it.

By the majority of persons unconnected with Oxford, and the Oxford controversies of the day, when this controversy was at its height, all that is known and understood of the matter in agitation, is, that Dr. Hampden is about to be made the Bishop

of Hereford, and that he has been condemned in Oxford for writing a book, in which was something very like Socinianism, as Dr. Pusey was condemned for writing a sermon in which was something very like Romanism.\* By some part, who are too much occupied with what they shall eat, and what they shall drink, and wherewithal they shall be clothed, to read anything upon the subject, this is gathered from general rumour; and by others from reading letters in large type *in*, and so apparently sanctioned *by*, the leading journal of the country, containing very copious extracts from Dr. Hampden's writings, the object of which extracts is to prove this point.

Now my design, in the publication of these few pages, is not a laboured defence of the person accused, but just to supply ordinary persons like myself with an opportunity, as I have before stated, of seeing that which has been most unfairly garbled, as Dr. Hampden wrote it;—garbled, as it would appear, with no other view than increasing any prejudice which may already exist in men's minds, or creating it where it does not exist, against the recent appointment to the see of Hereford.

\* Remark, however, that the manner of proceeding in the two cases was widely different. In Dr. Hampden's case, a tumultuous vote, in the midst of much excitement, was come to, got up by a party in the University. In the case of Dr. Pusey, everything was done in due form, after a close examination into the matter objected to, by a regularly appointed Board of Heresy.



The conclusion, that the Bible teaches Atheism, would be as legitimately drawn from the first verse of the Fifty-third Psalm, quoted thus,—“There is no God,”—omitting what precedes and follows those words, as Dr. Hampden's heterodoxy may be inferred from the mis-quotations given on the right-hand side of the column below.

Let us compare the following extracts from the work itself as they are written, with the same passages as they are quoted in the “Times” of Nov. 27.

I give but the two first extracts as specimens:—

EXTRACT I. ON THE UNITY.—LECT. III., pp. 146, 7.

DR. HAMPDEN'S TEXT.

THE “TIMES” TEXT.

“The truth itself of the Trinitarian doctrine emerges from these mists of human speculation, like the bold naked land, on which an atmosphere of fog has for a while rested, and then been dispersed. No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation; and that no scheme of Unitarianism can solve the whole of the phenomena which the Scripture records. But I am also as fully sensible, that there is a mystery attached to the subject which is not a mystery of God.

“Take, for instance, the notion of the Divine unity. We are apt to conceive that the unity must be understood numerically, that we may reason from the notions of unity to the properties of the

“No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation. . . . But I am also as fully sensible, that there is a mystery attached to the subject which is not a mystery of God.

. . . . . We are apt to conceive that the unity must be understood numerically. . . .

Divine Being. But is this a just notion of the unity of God? Is it not rather a bare fact, a limit of speculation, instead of a point of outset? For was it revealed in that system, in which it was the great leading article of Divine instruction? When Moses called upon the people, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,' was it not a declaration, that Jehovah is not that host of heaven, that multiplicity of the objects of Divine worship, which Heathen idolatry has enshrined, but the God in heaven, in the earth, and in the sea; not the Teraphim of domestic worship, but the universal Governor, overshadowing all things with the ubiquarian tutelage of his providence? Surely the revelation of the Divine unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity, but practically to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought out. It was no other than the command, 'Thou shalt have no other gods but me.'

"Now, were this view of the revelation of the Divine unity strictly maintained, would it not greatly abate the repugnance often felt at the admission of a Trinity in unity? We should profess that we only knew God as the exclusive object of Divine worship, and should acknowledge that it was quite irrelevant to our scheme of reli-

But is this a just notion? . . . . .

Surely the revelation of the Divine unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity, but practically to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought out. . . . .

"Now, were this view of the revelation of the Divine unity strictly maintained . . . we should profess that we only knew God as the exclusive object of Divine worship, and should ac-

gion either to demonstrate or to refute any conclusion from the nature of unity concerning any further revelation of the Divine Being. To deny a Trinity would then be felt the same as to assert, that because Polytheism is false, therefore no new manifestation of God not resulting from the negation of Polytheism can be true."

knowledge that it was quite irrelevant to our scheme of religion, either to demonstrate or refute any conclusion from the nature of unity concerning any further revelation of the Divine Being."

EXTRACT II. ON THE TRINITY.—LECT. III., p. 128.

DR. HAMPDEN'S TEXT.

"Thus it was that the Arian connected an unity in thought and will and action; interpreting in their way the saying, '*I and the Father are one.*' He urged, again, the text, '*The Father is greater than I,*' as evidence against the unity of substance; taking substance in the sense of individual being, the *πρωτη ουσια* of the categories. The orthodox, consequently, had to show against the Arian, that such an unity as this was a severing of the Godhead, that it consisted with so great a distinction, between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as either to establish three Gods, or otherwise, one supreme God, and two subordinate Divine Beings.

"The various illustrations of the Trinity from natural objects, employed in the writings of the Fathers and schoolmen, are instances of the same dialectical spirit which laboured to establish the Divine unity amidst the Trinitarian distinctions."

THE "TIMES" TEXT.

"The dialectical spirit laboured to establish the Divine unity amidst the Trinitarian distinctions."