

**STRICTURES ON A WORK  
ENTITLED "A VINDICATION," &C.  
IN A LETTER TO THE REVEREND  
CHARLES DAUBENEY, L.L.D.  
ARCHDEACON OF SARUM**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649280452

Strictures on a work entitled "A vindication," &c. in a letter to the Reverend Charles Daubeney, L.L.D. Archdeacon of sarum by J. H. Browne

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)

**J. H. BROWNE**

**STRICTURES ON A WORK  
ENTITLED "A VINDICATION," &C.  
IN A LETTER TO THE REVEREND  
CHARLES DAUBENEY, L.L.D.  
ARCHDEACON OF SARUM**



**STRICTURES,**

*&c. &c.*

96

J. H. BROWNE

# STRICTURES

ON A WORK ENTITLED

"A VINDICATION," &c.

IN A

## LETTER

TO THE REVEREND CHARLES DAUBENEY, LL.D.

ARCHDEACON OF SARUM.

---

BY THE REV. J. H. BROWNE, A.M.

ARCHDEACON OF ELY.

---

*Nullius in verba jurare in verba magistr.*

Hos.

LONDON:

JOHN HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY;

DEIGHTON AND SONS, CAMBRIDGE;

AND

BARNETT, NOTTINGHAM.

1827,  
406.

A  
LETTER,

&c.

---

REV. SIR,

IT is with feelings of extreme reluctance and regret that I find myself again dragged into controversy: but, perceiving that I am implicated in charges, one of which involves no small degree of moral turpitude, I am apprehensive lest, by forbearing to notice them, I should seem to acquiesce in their truth and justice. You have distinctly accused me of "*gross misrepresentation*;" you have broadly insinuated the imputation of "*heresy*;" and you have called upon me either to retract what I have advanced concerning Bishop Bull, or to acknowledge that I have been guilty of "*a most unfounded, and consequently unwarrantable libel*." Under these circumstances, in pure self-defence, I must try to rebut your accusations, and to vindicate my own character. In doing

B

so, it will be my most solicitous endeavour to avoid all acrimony of expression, and to abstain from every thing which wears the appearance of a spirit of recrimination. Engaged, moreover, as I am in the constant interchange of parochial and domestic duties, it will be my aim to compress what I have to bring forward in my own defence within the narrowest possible limits.

Before, however, I enter upon the general subject of this letter, I would first beg leave to suggest to you a doubt whether any person of calm and dispassionate judgment would deem the title of your publication quite consistent with candour and fairness. It is styled, "A Vindication of the Character of the pious and learned Bishop Bull, from the unqualified accusations brought against it by the Archdeacon of Ely." Now, the first and most natural impression which this title appears to me calculated to make, is that I had been guilty of the baseness and temerity of assailing the moral character of Bishop Bull. As such an unpardonable procedure never entered into my thoughts, it would be superfluous in me to disclaim any intention of the kind. Had you entitled your work, "Animadversions upon the Archdeacon of Ely's Charge, together with a Vindication of Bishop Bull's *Harmonica Apostolica* from the Objections brought against it in the Appendix to the said



Charge," you would, as it appears to me, have adopted a more appropriate designation, and one less liable to be misconstrued.

May I be permitted to add one more preliminary observation? It is this.—You remark, at page 9, that the first idea which was excited in your mind, upon the perusal of the Charge in question, was, that such a lengthened exposition of what you denominate the "first rudiments of Christianity," tended to cast an oblique reflection upon the clergy to whom it was addressed. Most deeply should I deplore the circumstance, if a similar impression had been made upon the mind of a single individual who heard me. But I am willing to believe that any attempt (however feeble it might have been) to unfold the doctrine of Justification, and to illustrate it by a reference to the formularies of the Church of England, might be considered as advancing one step at least beyond the elementary principles of the Christian religion. Be this, however, as it may, so long as these "first rudiments" are, in my estimation, liable to be misunderstood; so long as a writer can be found who maintains that "the merits of canonized saints," and "virtually all human works of a similar kind," were "principally" intended by our reformers to be excluded from the office of justifying; so long as this is the case, an in-

vestigation of these rudiments cannot be regarded as an unfit or an unseasonable address to the clergy.

I come now to the main subject of the following pages. This will naturally divide itself into two branches: the first, containing a reply to the objections which you have adduced against my views of the doctrine of Justification; and the second, furnishing a refutation of the serious charge of having grossly misrepresented the character of Bishop Bull.

In commencing your attack, you deliver it as your opinion, that no "competent divine will go through the Charge with attention, without discovering a strong taint of Calvinian heresy more or less pervading the whole of it." (P. 10.) You then cite a passage which, according to your judgment, exhibits a "striking proof" in confirmation of this opinion. But, before I enter upon an examination of the evidence which you have presented to your readers, I must beg leave to remark, that whatever may have been the doctrinal errors of Calvin, I was not aware that any one was authorized in denouncing him as a heretic. If he really merited such an appellation, the *judicious* Hooker acted most *injudiciously* in giving some degree of sanction to his heretical dogmas, by representing him as "incomparably the wisest man the French church

did enjoy since the hour it enjoyed him," and by subjoining the following eulogium: "Divine knowledge he gathered not by hearing or reading, so much as by teaching others. For though thousands were debtors to him, as touching knowledge in that kind, yet he to none, but only to God, the Author of that most blessed fountain, *the Book of Life*, and of the admirable dexterity of wit, together with the helps of other learning, which were his guides." (Pref. to Eccl. vol. 5. ii.) As however I have upon no occasion undertaken the defence of Calvin's peculiar tenets, that task may be left to those who feel more concern in maintaining them than is felt by me. My object is to endeavour to wipe off the stain of heresy from my own character.

With this view I shall now proceed to scrutinize the first "striking proof" that you have alleged, in order to corroborate the vehement suspicion which you entertain of my heretical bias. It is contained in the following passage, which you quote from the Charge: "Of those who have been admitted into the Christian church by baptism, we have deep cause to lament that too many are Christians only in name; destitute perhaps even of the form, still more of the power of godliness; and, as to all practical purposes, *without hope, and without God in the world.*" You then exclaim, "This appears to