

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 19.—JULY, 1876.

Art. I.—THE FORMATION OF OUR STANDARDS.*

By J. B. BITTINGER, D.D., Sewickley, Pa.

“ON Saturday last, the Assembly of Divines began at Westminster, according to the ordinance of both the Houses of Parliament, where Dr. Twist of Newbery, in the County of Berks, their Prolocutor, preached on John xiv : 18—‘I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you,’ a text pertinent to these times of sorrow and anguish and misery, to raise up the drooping spirits of the people of God who lie under the pressure of popish wars and combustions.” In these simple and somewhat sad words, the parliamentary newspaper of the time records

* Minutes of the Sessions of the WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES while engaged in preparing their *Directory for Church Government, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms* (Nov. 1644 to March, 1649), from transcripts of the originals, procured by a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Edited by PROF. MITCHELL and REV. JOHN STRUTHERS. William Blackwood & Sons, London. [A noteworthy volume, and which, by its notes, preface, introduction, and index of names (there should be by all means, also, an index of topics), is made doubly valuable. I wish it might be reprinted, and so brought within the reach of every member of Pan-Presbyterianism.]

the beginning of an Assembly, whose name and fame have since passed round the world. Very different is the tone of the royalist paper, as witness: "It was advertised this day that the Synod, which, by the pretended ordinance of the two Houses, was to begin on the 1st of July, was put off till Thursday following—it being not yet revealed to my Lord Say, Master Pym, and others of their associates in the Committee of Religion, what gospel 'tis that must be preached and settled by these new evangelists, only it is reported that certain of the godly ministers did meet that day in the Abbey church to a sermon, and had some doctrines and uses, but what else done, and to what purpose that was done, we may hear hereafter." Such were the gibes and word-play with which the Cavaliers were entertained by the *Mercurius Aulicus*, under that day and date of July 7, 1643. But he laughs best who laughs last. The royalist reporter was a little out as to the details of the meeting. This may have been carelessness on his part, or indifference, or it may be that that day, which, in its maturity proved to be an epoch in history, was *dies non* in the court of human judgment.

According to the ordinance of Parliament, the Assembly met Saturday, July 1, 1643, but did not sit for business till the following Thursday. Their task was set them, and began with their first session. Of the four things mentioned in the Covenant, to which, by order of Parliament, under date of July 5, they were first to direct their attention, was the consideration of the first ten articles of the Church of England, "to free and vindicate the doctrine of them from all aspersions and false interpretations." To this work they at once commended themselves—a work full of difficulties, if not dangers. Mending would not suffice, and altering was not allowed. While employed on these ten, another order came for the next nine following. They had only got through repairing and amending fifteen, when a third order, that of Oct. 12, 1643, "required them to lay aside the remainder, and enter upon the work of Church Government," and afterward, by another order—for orders in those days were frequent and peremptory—"we were to employ us in framing a Confession of Faith for the three kingdoms, according to our solemn league and covenant."

The general order in which "the four things mentioned in the

Covenant" were discussed, was Church Government, Directory of Public Worship, Confession of Faith, and a Catechism. We say "general" order, because all of them were under consideration, if not discussion, simultaneously. The four-fold chord, which was to bind the three kingdoms in peace and uniformity, was not separately woven in its several strands, and then formed into one—it began as one. Our standards in their several parts grew side by side; some, indeed, outgrew others, and came to an earlier maturity, but whether in the blade, or in the bloom, or in the ripe fruit, there was one and the same life moving in all the parts all the time, and they are one organically and not mechanically. In the first days of the Minutes with which we are now concerned, it is ordered "to report the preface to the Directory and concerning the Sabbath-day." The discussion on the Directory continued till Dec. 30, 1644, when it was ordered that "the appendix be sent up to-morrow." But from the Scottish Lord Chancellor's speech, we gather that the draught of Church Government would and ought to be presented at the coming January meeting of the General Assembly of Scotland. At the same session, the Committee on the Catechism was increased, with a view to hasten its completion. The draught of Government was ordered to be transcribed (Dec. 9, 1644), and was sent up to both Houses of Parliament, and so reported two days after; but in the beginning of the following year a note of trouble is heard from Uxbridge, where Parliament is treating with the King, and the Lords command the Earl of Manchester "to desire to hasten what is behind of Church Government, because it makes some stop in the business there." Next day comes an order "to send up what is remaining in Government," but not till July 4, 1645, was "the humble advice of the Assembly to both Houses of Parliament" carried up. Twenty-one months of discussion, long and learned, were devoted at intervals to the settling of Church Government. "This work," said Mr. Marshall, "though it appears short, yet has spent much time, by reason of dissenting judgments, that if possible they might be satisfied." Into this period of twenty-one months must be intercalated the time spent on the Directory of Worship, which, though begun after Church Government, was completed before it. In fact, Church Government never was completed. It was the first topic, and it was the last, and

down to 1648 we find traces of its slow length as it dragged along. The Confession of Faith occupied the attention of the Assembly between two and three years. In August of 1644, it is already mentioned, and the last month of '46 it is completed. These dates show that the framing of the Confession began before either Government or the Directory were finished, overlapping both of them a considerable time. As early as November of 1644, Baillie reported the Catechism as drawn up, and "I think shall not take up much time," but our canny Scotchman lost his guess, since our Catechisms did not get themselves completed so soon, nor so easily—the larger not till October, 1647, and the shorter fully a month later; and here, as in the case of the Confession of Faith, and notably so in Government, 'twas not done when 'twas done—the Scripture proofs, as usual, lagged behind. Thus, from October 12, 1643, when the Assembly was ordered to take up Government, to April 12, 1648, when the Scripture proofs of both Catechisms were ordered to be sent up to Parliament, the standards were under discussion. All the parts were taken in hand before any one part had been completed, and as there were questions which came up, some in several of "the four things," and some in all of them, the discussions were necessarily duplicated and reduplicated, from time to time, during those four and a half eventful years.

For while the Assembly were discussing, in the seclusion of the Jerusalem Chamber, those standards, which were intended to give peace and security to the three Kirks and Kingdoms, those realms were in the fiercest ferment. Every element of discord was let loose. The whole atmosphere was charged with passions, threatening to explode in deeds of violence, cruelty, and blood; civil war had been flagrant in England for more than a year past. During the Assembly's sittings was fought every battle, from the Second of Newbery to the fatal day of Naseby. The King a fugitive, a prisoner, and a "martyr;"—the Primate tried, condemned, and executed; and the Church, whose articles they were met to explain and defend, prostrate and bleeding at every pore. Ireland was all ablaze from Dublin to Derry, Catholic against Protestant, and Protestant against Catholic, and, at times, both against the Parliament. In Scotland, Montrose had come down from the Grampians like a wolf on the fold, and scattered the Covenanters like sheep, from Tipper-

muir to Philiphaugh. Kingdoms were divided, counties were divided, neighborhoods and parishes—yea, a man's enemies were those of his own house. Fear and hate filled the land. It was at such a time that the Westminster Assembly met, and amid such scenes were its standards set up. Perhaps these pious laborers at their task applied to themselves Gabriel's words to Daniel. Certain it is, that the munitions of our Presbyterian faith and order, like the walls of Jerusalem, were built "even in troublous times." Without were fightings, within were fears.

In reading these Minutes, the meagre record of their daily doings—much of this outside conflict comes to the surface. Not only in the formal feasts and thanksgivings proclaimed because of military misfortune or military success; but in their standing committee for plundered ministers; in the appointment of chaplains for the army and navy; and in the non-appointment of persons to pray with the committee of both kingdoms and the House of Lords, we get a nearer view of the Assembly, and of their labors. How, when, by whom, and amid what circumstances our Articles of Faith were framed, are questions which never have been so satisfactorily answered as they now are by these official minutes, from Nov. 18, 1644, to February 22, 1649.

The Assembly numbered from first to last about one hundred and seventy-five members. This sum is made up of the original one hundred and twenty clerical names, twenty-five of whom never appeared; of the twenty-one superadded divines to fill these vacancies, and also to supplement the places of deceased members; of the four Scottish commissioners, and of the thirty-two lay-assessors—ten lords and twenty commoners. The Assembly opened with sixty-nine—forty being a legal quorum—and even this number was, with difficulty, kept up toward the last. The members had been summoned by name from all parts of the kingdom, and impartially, so far as appears; but the King's subsequent prohibition deterred a good many; fears and scruples kept back others of the established church, so that in effect the body was Presbyterian; the two Erastians, the seven Independents, and the few Episcopalian being as conspicuous—especially the Erastians and Independents—for the small number of their votes, as for the pertinacity and power of their opposition.

The following is "a taste of the outward form of the Assemblée:" "On Monday morning we sent to both Houses of Parliament for a warrant for our sitting in the Assemblée. Here no mortal man may enter to see or hear, lett be to sitt, without ane order in wryte from both Houses of Parliament. When we were brought in, Dr. Twisse had ane long harangue for our welcome; when he had ended, we satt down in these places, which since we have keeped. The like of that Assemblée I did never see, and, as we hear say, the like was never in England, nor any where is shortlie lyke to be. They did sit in Henry the 7th's chappell, in the place of the Convocation, but since the weather grew cold, they did go to Jerusalem Chamber, a fair roome in the Abbey of Westminster. At the one end nearest the doore and both sides are stages of seats. At the upmost end there is a chaire set on ane frame, a foot from the earth, for the Mr. Proloqutor, Dr. Twisse. Before it, on the ground, stands two chairs for the two Mr. Assessors, Dr. Burgess and Mr. Whyte. Before these two chairs, through the length of the roome, stands a table, at which sitts the two scribes, Mr. Byfield and Mr. Roborough. The house is all well hung, and hes a good fyre, which is some dainties at London. Foreanent the table, upon the Proloqutor's right hand, there are three or four rankes of formes. On the lowest we five doe sit. Upon the other, at our backs, the members of Parliament deputed to the Assemblée. On the formes foreanent us, on the Proloqutor's left hand, going from the upper end of the house to the chimney, and at the other end of the house, and backsyde of the table, till it come about to our seats, are four or five stages of formes, whereupon their divines sitt as they please, albeit commonlie they keep the same place. From the chimney to the doore there is no seats, but a voyd for passage. The Lords of Parliament uses to sit on chaires in that voyd about the fire. We meet every day of the week but Saturday. We sitt commonlie from nine to one or two, afternoon. The Proloqutor, at the beginning and end, hes a short prayer. The man, as the world knows, is very learned in the questions he hes studied, and very good, beloved of all, and highly esteemed, but merelie bookish, and not much, as it seems, acquaint with conceived prayer—among the unfittest of all the company for any action; so, after

the prayer he sits mute. It was the canny convoyance of those who guides most matters for their own interests to plant such a man of purpose in the chair. The one Assessor hes kept in of the gout since our coming ; the other, Dr. Burgess, a very active and sharpe man, supplies, so far as is decent, the Proloquor's place. Ordinarilie there will be present above three-score of their divines. These are divided in three committees. Every committee, as the Parliament gives order in wryte to take any purpose to consideration, takes a portion, and in their afternoon meeting prepares matters for the Assemblie, setts down their minde in distinct propositions with texts of Scripture. Mr. Byfield reads the proposition and Scriptures, where-upon the Assemblie debates in a most grave and orderlie way. No man is called up to speak, but who stands up of his own will—he speaks so long as he will without interruption. If two or three stand up at once, then the divines confusedlie calls on his name whom they desyre to hear first. No man speaks to any but the Proloquor. They harangue long and very learnedlie. I doe marvell at their very accurate and extemporall replies. . . . The scribe, when the question is called, rises and comes to the Proloquor's chair, who, from the scribe's book, reads the proposition. . . . When the question is once ordered, there is no more debate of that matter, but if a man will vaige [*i. e.*, wanders from the question], he is quickly taken up by Mr. Assessor, or many others, confusedlie crying—speak to order! to order! No man contradicts another expresslie by name, but most discreetly speaks to the Proloquor, and at most holds on the generall!—the reverend brother who lately or last spoke, on this hand, on that side, above, or below.” So much for Baillie, the Boswell of the Assembly. His description is so minute, and withal so frank, that no picture by Teniers could more graphically set this venerable body before us.

If we cannot unreservedly subscribe to the words of praise, spoken of its members in the above quotation, nor fully accept his farewell estimate, three years later, “that the piety and wisdom of the Assembly was more than, at that day, were to be found in any one place of the whole world,” we can, without scruple, give our hearty approbation to their patient labors, the extent of their learning, and the zeal and piety of their purpose. It is surprising how large a number of authors the

Assembly embraced. Men seemed to have rushed into print. It was harder to find one man who had not written a book, than seven men who had. There was no room for the lament, that your adversary had written a book. Instead of one, he had, in all likelihood, written half a dozen—if not books, at least sermons. The air was full of flying leaves, torn by the storm of controversy from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There were, doubtless, a few names that had kept themselves from this “battle of the books,” but they were very few. Here and there one has escaped the “Dictionary of Authors,” but there are not many whose names may not be found in our Allibone. Some, like John Ward of Ipswich, or Stanley Gower, and Thomas Temple, have brought with them a single sermon, or, mayhap, two—of course they are in quarto form. Others, like Richard Vines, and Anthony Tucker, come to us, the one with thirty-two discourses on one text, and the other with thirty-two on another. Occasionally, one is credited with an octavo volume, but, as a general thing, quartos are the favorite form, while not a few, like Caryll and Calamy, Lightfoot and Goodwin, Case and Bridge, stand on our shelves in massive folios, filled with erudition, comment, and controversy. Nor was there lack among them of the solidest learning. Usher, who was a member by brevet, and Reynolds and Gataker, were known beyond the seas, having an European reputation as the peers of Blondel and Bochart.

The titles of their publications point mainly to the field of theology and polemics. Philip Nye dabbled some in politics; John White, one of the Assessors, “the patriarch of Dorchester,” in England, and one of the most efficient patrons of “Old Dorchester” in Massachusetts, was the author of the “Planter’s Plea” for emigration; and Thomas Thoroughgood showed his interest in matters outside of theology, by his “Jews in America; or, a Probability that the Americans are of that race”—but divinity was the staple product, and the era was a theological era. While such training may have given an unduly militant cast to their labors, it was not a disqualification for their work. That was theological and controversial. They were met to formulate a creed, and to defend it against all comers. Episcopacy had been abolished, and the country was waiting for a church government and a rubric.

The titles of a few of their works will give us the spirit and flavor of the times. Arrowsmith's *Armillæ Catechetica*; Thomas Young's *Dies Dominica*; Cheynell's *The Rise, Growth, and Danger of Socinianisme*; also his *Chillingworthi Novissima*; or, *the Sickness, Heresy, Death, and Burial of W. C.*; Thomas Westfield, *The White Robe*; or, *Surplice Vindicated in Several Sermons*. Rutherford's *Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland*, and his *Lex Rex*—the latter burnt by the common hangman. Burning heretical books, instead of their authors, was one of the steps toward toleration, and on several occasions during their sittings, the Assembly appointed committees to superintend such work in London and Westminster. These burnings were the Protestant Indexes, *Expurgatorius and Prohibitorius*; Herle's *The Independency upon Scripture of the Independency of Churches*; Rathband's *Confutation of the Sect called Brownists and Separatists*. The limits of Church and State were far from being clearly defined in theory, while in practice they rubbed hard, and often disastrously, against each other. If every politician was not a clergyman, nearly every Puritan clergyman, whether Independent or Presbyterian, was somewhat of a politician. It seemed less dangerous to them to encroach on Cæsar, than on God, and the Scotch, to a man, were *jure divino* Presbyterians.

But while it was an age of speculative divinity, and of politico-theological controversy, it was eminently also an age of practical piety and biblical study. Catechisms and Scripture expositions abounded. There were brave men before Agamemnon, and there were Catechisms before the days of the Westminster Larger and Shorter Catechisms. As early as 1598, Mickelthwaite had put out his "Catechism for Householders," and even before that, a Catechism in Latin and Greek appeared, from the pen of William Whitaker. Palmer had the reputation of being "the best Catechist in England," and it is more than probable that Rutherford came down to the Assembly with a Catechism in his pocket. The "Morning Exercises," at Cripplegate, St. Giles, etc., by Thomas Case and his co-laborers, filled six quarto volumes; Caryll's "Exposition on Job" ran up to twelve quartos. Dr. Gouge is credited with one thousand Wednesday Lectures. Greenhill gives us five volumes on Ezekiel, and these are only specimens of the Ex-

pository work done by some of the members of the Assembly. The Assembly itself became a commentator, and to its "Annotations of the Bible," such scholars as Ley and Gataker contributed their large learning and labors.

Age, as well as training, is an element of power in such a body, and most of these men were in the prime of life. Twisse, Gouge, Gataker, Ley, Henderson, and Harris were among the oldest. They were between sixty and seventy—these were the old men for counsel. Then there were some very young men—such as Gillespie and Cheynell; but the great majority ranged between these two extremes, and at least four-fifths of the Assembly were born within three years of the line that divided the sixteenth from the seventeenth century.

If we except one or two questions where Erastianism came in conflict with *jure divino* Presbyterianism, the English Lay-Assessors took very little part in the Assembly's discussions. The Scotch Lay-Assessors were far more active, and especially is this true of the Scottish clerical delegates. They were very vigilant. Each one, says Baillie, was there with a set purpose: "Mr. Gillespie for the crying down of the English ceremonies, on which he has written; I for the convincing of that prevalent faction (Arminian Episcopal), on which I have written; Blair to wean off England from Independency to Scotch Presbyterianism." Scotland's predominance lies on the surface of these Minutes. Her commissioners occupy the place of honor in the Assembly—the moderator's right, and in front of the Commons—and great deference is shown to their letters and commissions. The Northern Kingdom always comes with observation. Rutherford, Gillespie, and Henderson were only three, but in the debates their names recur with marvelous frequency; this point seems to have arrested the notice of Gillespie himself. Granted that they made the best speeches, it will not be denied that they made, out of all proportion, the most. Gillespie has obtained most reputation; Baillie never took part in the debates, but gave his time to taking notes, writing letters, and "managing"—for he was shrewd, politic, and tireless. Rutherford makes no special mark, but Henderson—Alexander Henderson, without doubt—was the guiding spirit of the Scotch Commission. He had age

and experience. He was a man of affairs. During those critical days, when the covenant was to be adopted in Scotland, he had piloted "the cause" through the narrow straits between Scotch zeal and English state-craft, and he ever kept his hand steadily on the helm. Whenever he rose in the Assembly, it was to compose differences, and he seldom failed. We cannot deny that he was a diplomatist, but in his comprehensiveness he was more than the diplomate—a Hushai rather than an Ahithophel. On all important questions the Scotch Commissioners were "desired to be present," and without them, not anything was done that was done. We are now prepared to take up the work of the Assembly, in its several parts.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

This question which gave rise to the sharpest debate and the bitterest feelings, was one which touched least on the spirit of religion. It was the first, the longest, and the last to occupy the time of the Assembly. As early as the fall of 1640, it was a live question in Scotland; and Henderson, in the paper which he drew up to present to the Lords of the Treaty of Ripon, lays special stress on Uniformity of Religion. "It is to be wished that there were one Confession of Faith, one form of Catechism, one Directory for all the parts of the public worship, and *one form of Church Government* in all the churches of his majesty's dominions." The last part is, with this most astute and comprehensive of all the Scotch Commissioners, the point of a standing or falling national church. He has five separate arguments to prove this, and then addresses five more, with some subdivisions, to commend Scotch Presbyterianism as being the best, and by all reformed divines held to be "*jure divino* and perpetual." Baillie, in a private letter to his wife, most naively testifies to the same point. Before prelacy was abolished, and before the Assembly was called, England had begun to look with interest to the Scotch as allies in arms, if not as allies in faith, order, and worship. When the Assembly met in July, Scotland still waited for light, though invited to send commissioners, and had them in readiness; but the arrival of the English commission in August removed all doubts as to whether they should assist their "English brethren." But how? Should it be civil or religious aid? Both! Sir Harry Vane suggested, and Henderson agreed, and thus was the solemn League and

Covenant adopted by Scotland, amid smiles and tears and huzzas, and with equal zeal and solemnity by England a few months later.

Two weeks after the adoption of the Covenant by the Assembly and the Houses of Parliament, the former received its order to "treat among themselves of such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad." This order at once threw down the apple of discord before the three parties in the Assembly—Erastians, Independents, and Presbyterians. What is the church? A question which they did not answer, and which is not yet satisfactorily answered. They proceeded to settle the questions that lay about the centre, but wisely forbore through fear to fix the centre. They began with "church officers"—differing about their number, functions, perpetuity, and authority, especially did they stick at "ruling elders." This was the *pièce de résistance*, and the two week's struggle on this question would probably have ended in an open breach, had it not been for the experience and round-about common-sense of Henderson. He knew that the ideal and the real of human life, like the asymptotes of the hyperbola, are ever approaching, but never coinciding, and, by a few flexible words, such as the author of the solemn League and Covenant was fully master of, trimming without betraying, he made room for the spirit of compromise—and "ruling elders" were allowed to be of divine authority. This was a point gained for Presbyterianism, though for the present the duties of the office were left undefined. "Deaconesses" found no support, even from the Independents.

Parliament, having sequestered the benefices of scandalous and malignant ministers, especially in and about London, it became necessary to supply these vacant parishes. The plunderings and spoilings practiced by both armies in the north and west of England furnished abundance of applicants, and so there must be ordinations, and "ordination" must be discussed. A stormy debate of a fortnight followed, without any definite conclusion being reached. Independents and Presbyterians eyed each other with ill-concealed jealousy. Parliament urged action, and the Assembly tried to act, but though the doctrinal

part had been settled in April, it was not till Oct. that the Assembly was ready to ordain. The question, moreover, had got outside of the Assembly. The Scotch commissioners had prepared an outline of Presbyterianism and its workings in their own country. A copy of this pamphlet was put into the hands of each member of the Assembly. This was in Jan., 1644. Next month the "Dissenting Brethren" put forth their "Apologetic Narration"—a defense of themselves and of their system of government. This let loose all the imprisoned winds of controversy—in and out of the Assembly. Passion and prejudice blinded each party no less to the defects of its own system, than to the merits of the system of its opponents. Time, the wisest of all teachers, has taught us that there was too much good in both systems to be ignored, much less to be destroyed, by either party. "Ordinations," however, could now proceed, but during all the spring, summer, and autumn was heard the confused noise of battle between the Independents and Presbyterians in the Assembly, no less than the clangor of arms between the Royalists and Parliamentarians outside; for "ruling elders," "parish limits," "church censures," no less than ordination, had all in them the same element of debate, discord, and division, viz.: What *is* the church? The right of congregational ordination, says Lightfoot, "was managed with most heat and confusion of anything that had happened among us."

These questions of church government not only got outside of the Assembly and the Parliament, they got into the army. In September of this year Cromwell obtained an order from the Commons to have the toleration of the Independents referred to the "Committee of both Kingdoms." Oliver was an Independent, a member of Parliament, the hero of Marston Moor, and a prepondering weight in any scale into which he might throw himself. This committee, however, accomplished nothing, if we leave out of their report the expressed confidence that they could agree in everything except "in points of church government!"

The year 1644 wore out itself, but not this difference. The discussion ran into books—a very common controversial fuel in those days of heat. The Independents—Greenhill and Carter having joined them—being now seven, had put out forty pages to

state, explain, and defend their views. The Assembly answered with twice forty. Both papers go before Parliament, and after three years, are issued, by their authority, with this long title, "The Reasons presented by the Dissenting Brethren against certain Propositions concerning Presbyterian Government, together with the Answers of the Assembly of Divines to their reasons of dissent." In 1652 it gets a new title-page, but undergoes no other change, and, for brevity's sake, is now known and quoted as "The Grand Debate." Another year of debate, at intervals, on Church Government wore on, but nothing came of it but "A Copy of a Remonstrance." It is now the last of October, 1645. Of course to this remonstrance the Assembly has a counter-remonstrance, somewhat acrid, if not acrimonious. But another attempt at peace is made. The Committee of Accommodation is revived, meetings are held and papers read—the last meeting, in March, 1646, with more and longer papers than ever, but with no agreement and no compromise. Each party was still more observant of its opponent's wrongs than of its own. Jealousy made them alive to their own rights, and envy made them blind to the rights of their rivals. The atmosphere was too much heated for deliberation, much less for accommodation.

Thus far the debate on Church Government had been between parties who differed as to the question *where* the divine authority was lodged in the church; it was not a difference in kind, but rather in degree. Presbyterianism was a middle term between Prelacy and Independency, and where the State was not in question, had a decided congregational leaning. Independency was a middle term between Presbyterianism and Brownism, and when there was no State-Church to fear, wore a not unfriendly aspect toward Presbyterianism. But with reference to the State, the Presbyterians were High Church *jure divino*, and thus excited the ill-will of the Independents, the opposition of the Erastians, and the suspicions of the government. As early as the beginning of 1644, when the power of pastors to excommunicate was under discussion, Erastianism showed itself. At that early period Selden already demurred, intimating that there was no such thing at all as excommunication. This question, therefore, in its various forms of a "pure sacrament," "scandalous sins," and "the exclusion of the igno-

rant," was before the Assembly and Parliament at near intervals all through 1644 and 1645, and during all the month of the next January even, they debated it. What sins are worthy of excommunication? and shall they be specified? No, says Herle. Gouge would instance "incest and such like." Nye would excommunicate for obstinacy, but opposed classifying sins. There was much heat in the debate, and many calls to order. Then, from what should the excommunication be? Some said from the table, others from preaching, and others, still, from praying. At this point a six weeks' debate on appeals to higher judicatories was interjected. Then came the report of the particulars of that ignorance and scandal for which persons may be excluded; and, still further, an order from the House of Commons "to set down what they mean by a competent knowledge and understanding concerning 'God the Father,'" etc. In June the House asks for a catalogue of scandalous sins. The list is furnished in part—and it is a picture of the times. In making it up we hear debates for days and weeks about "absence from parochial congregations," about "naked breasts," about "love locks," "drinking healths," "keeping pictures of Christ," "neglecting family worship," etc., etc.

We are not yet through with the question of excommunication, but for relief from "the strife of tongues," let us listen to the sheriffs of London, who are called in to the Assembly: "We are sent as messengers from the Lord Mayor and our court of Aldermen. A day of thanksgiving is set apart on Thursday next, and that both Houses do intend to meet at Christ Church [this was for a sermon as a sort of grace.] The court have invited both houses to a short dinner, and present the like request . . . at a place near unto the church" [probably Grocers' Hall]. The art of dining was not then unknown to the State, and it is pleasant to think, that some difficulties in Church, as well as in State, may be resolved by good cheer. Man is a dinner-giving animal, and those stern Puritans, and Covenanters, who were so mighty in fasting and praying, were not, we are glad to know, strangers to the humane and humanizing effects of eating salt together. The invitation was to "a short dinner," but it was accepted with thanks. Naseby had been fought on the 14th of June. This dinner was on the 17th, and in part celebrated that victory. It helped along the debate on church

government, for we find the Assembly ready to carry up "their humble advice" July 4, 1645, and for the next three months, with one or two intrusions of "scandalous sins," the Assembly is quietly, solemnly, and in much unanimity, occupied with the Confession of Faith.

But the Parliament was preparing new trouble for the Assembly. What with Coleman's Erastian sermon preached before the House of Commons July 30, and Whitelock's Erastian speech before the House in September, there seemed no refuge but in God. Oct. 8, 1645, the Assembly observed one of their characteristic, but not unusual, days of humiliation, "in this place, for a blessing on their work."

"*Ordered*—Five members of the Assembly: three for prayer, two for exhorting.

"Time to begin at nine, to end at four o'clock. For exhortation: Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Palmer: for prayer, Dr. Burgess, Mr. Whitaker, Mr. Sedgewick."

It need not be said that the sermons were "to the times." In those earnest days there was no amateur preaching, praying, nor fasting.

Parliament, while gradually making concessions, insisted on its commissioners in each shire as a sort of court of appeal from pastors and elders, but the Assembly went quietly from their "fast" to their further work on the Confession, till into the opening months of 1646. The clergy said they could not yield their right to bar the table, and Parliament, in the flush of its victories, would not yield up its right to be supreme in the realm—there was a dead-lock; it was right against might. In January, 1646, Baillie is of the opinion that Parliament, because it subsists on London, may be starved into submission. He is bitter against "the court of commissioners in every shire," has most of the city and country clergy on his side, blames the Independents, the Erastians, and such lawyers as Evelyn, Whitelock, and Vane. "In the meantime, it mars us to set up anything, the anarchy continues, and the vilest sects daily increase." We are now well on in March, 1646. Presbyterianism is not yet set up, nor, judging from the 'temper of Parliament, likely to be; and now less likely, because, as England rises in power over her enemies at home, Scotch influence wanes,

and Scotch influence is ecclesiastical mainly, and Presbyterian exclusively.

At this juncture the Assembly rose in their action to a heroic stature, and the leader of the forlorn hope was Stephen Marshall, the preacher of Pym's funeral sermon, a memorably mild man, and, according to Baxter, the model Presbyterian. To avert the calamitous act of making civil officers the final judges of admission to the sacrament—an act to go speedily into effect—this meek-spirited man, "because some things in that ordinance did lie very heavy on his conscience, and the consciences of many of his brethren, moved that the Assembly would consider what is fit to be done." They appoint a committee, of which Marshall is to be chairman, "to make a humble address to Parliament by way of petition." The petition expressed much satisfaction with what Parliament has already done for the peace and reformation of the realm, but yet some things were wanting, and that "a pure sacrament was not possible under any system except the Presbyterian, which is *jure divino*." This was the crisis of the Assembly—it had now spoken its supreme word. All that went before were only steps up to this sublime height. Coleman's sermon, in which he had said to the Commons, "give us doctrine, and you take government," called out Gillespie's "*Brotherly Examination*," to be followed by Coleman's "*Brotherly Examination Re-examined*." Then Gillespie came with his Latin—" *Nihil respondes*," to which Coleman replies in the same spirit and dialect: "*Male dicis, Male dicis*." Gillespie once more: "*Male audis*," but Coleman is silent, takes sick in the midst of the debate, and dies before it is done. Rutherford adds his book, "The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication," but the mild Marshall has said the last and the greatest word. It brings down the House of Commons by a committee to lay the charge of a breach of privilege at the door of the Assembly, and demands answer and purgation, but before they enter this arena the Assembly is fain to accept, with thanks, another invitation to another of the Lord Mayor's conciliatory dinners "with the two Houses of Parliament at Grocers' Hall, on Thursday next" (which is the 2d of April, 1646). This communion of salt, as we have already seen, is not an empty ceremony.

The Commons see in Presbyterianism "ten thousand arbi-

trary and unlimited judicatories," and in the past Parliaments, the preservers of religion and the conservers of its purity; and so, on the 30th of April, 1646, Evelyn, Fiennes, and others came into the Assembly with the famous nine questions on *jure divino* Presbyterianism, and with authority to enlarge on said questions, which they proceed to do, somewhat as follows—*Evelyn* (quite sarcastic): "The House is very sensible of your endeavors thus far. Do not now give all the world occasion to say that as you were willing to serve the Parliament awhile, so you were willing to have them serve you forever after. Parliament is not unwilling to put on Christ's yoke—his yoke is easy—if it is a galling yoke it is not his, and we (will not bear it?)" and so on. *Fiennes*, Nathaniel by name, was even more severe than, if not quite so sarcastic as, *Evelyn*: "The Assembly was called to advise so often as asked, but not to propound. It was never given to you to interpret the National Covenant—the volunteering of your advice was a breach of privilege. The Parliament doth not pretend to infallibility, and the Parliament supposes this Assembly doth not either. In matters of fact Parliament may be ignorant, but in matters of right none must imagine any dishonorable thing of Parliament. Those things are not the way of Englishmen, Christians, and ministers of Christ. We come to speak plainly to you, and plain English"—very plain, Nathaniel, but hardly without guile. *Mr. Brown* was full of definitions anent privilege, and instances of punishment for its violation. "*Jus divinum* is a difficult thing—it has much engaged Parliament. The Covenant is much pressed—but are we bound by the Covenant to follow the practice of Reformed Churches, in case it be against the fundamental law of the Kingdom? 'Commissioners' is not a new word; it hath been in the church since the conquest. It is a Popish doctrine to take from princes their divine power. One parish will judge one way (of sins), and another, another"—and *Mr. Brown* wants uniformity!

Sir Benj. Rudyard said: "*Jus divinum* is of a formidable and tremendous nature. We want clear, express Scripture, not far-fetched arguments. Much is said about the pattern in the Mount. I could never find in the New Testament (such a pattern?). The civil magistrate is a church officer in every Christian commonwealth," and so on. The committee with-

drew, leaving behind the nine questions—like so many evil spirits. The questions are read over in the Assembly several times—but this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting, and the Assembly will approach the matter through a day of humiliation. Two exhortations and three prayers—time from nine to four o'clock. All the members to attend, so Parliament ordered; absentees to be summoned by letter. Dr. Temple excused upon special occasion; Reynolds, sickness; Ley, to visit his people, “after four years’ absence;” Spurstow, the same. Lord Wariston, in two words, gave the key-note to the discussion, before adjourning for the fast: (1) “Let us to the uttermost endeavor to exalt Christ as the only Lord over his church; and (2) Let us use all freedom in our debates.” Cawdry “exhorted” from 1. Tim. i: 19. “The life of a Christian—a wayfare, a warfare, a seafare.” Arrowsmith discoursed on Is. ix: 6: “Government upon his shoulder.”

On Monday, May 4th, 1646, the Assembly took up the “nine questions.” They found three ways in which Christ’s will is set forth in Scripture—express precept, necessary consequence, and example. For upward of six weeks they labored at these “proofs” by their committee; but by settling the headship of Christ, as they did in July, while debating chap. xxx. of the Confession of Faith, they in effect decided the main question of Church Government—against the Erastians; and thus the Assembly, by one of those oblique movements which mask a defeat, while they mark a victory, answered the nine questions of the House of Commons, indirectly, indeed, but adversely and victoriously. The vote on the sufficiency of the proofs was, *yeas*, 52—Lightfoot alone dissenting—Coleman being in his grave since March 30; Simpson, Carter, Jr., Goodwin, and Nye—all Independents, but all voting *yea*. The main question being decided, the dependent ones were easily passed, but with diminishing numbers of voters—partly owing to the Independents “forbearing till they did see the scope,” and partly to a generally declining interest.

For want of harmony between the Presbyterians and the Independents, matters again drag in the Assembly, and the politic Baillie tells us that he “put some of his good friends in the House of Commons to move the Assembly to lay aside

the nine questions, and finish the Confession and Catechisms, which are most necessary, and all are crying for;" it was so done. July 22, the day of Twisse's death, the order came, and the next six months of the Assembly are taken up mainly with the Confession and Catechism; and Church Government, as *jus divinum*, goes again into books and pamphlets. Gillespie dedicates and presents to the Assembly, receiving their thanks, "Aaron's Rod Blossoming; or, the Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated." A little later sundry London ministers put out: "The Divine Right of Church Government." In December, Parliament again calls for the nine questions, but not pressingly, and so the call is disregarded. Moreover, Parliament has in its hands full more than nine questions about getting well rid of their now somewhat superfluous "Scotch brethren," and getting possession of the King's person. The Confession of Faith having been completed in November, and the Assembly having resolved, Dec. 1, 1646, "that there shall be no alteration in chapter xxx. of 'Church Censures,'" this would seem to be their last word on Church Government. But it was not; for on Nov. 25, 1647, when the *Shorter Catechism* was sent up—it was resolved, that "something be said to the House of Commons, at the delivery of the Catechism, concerning *the queries*," and, as we learn from the "House Journal," the Assembly were directed to proceed with their answers, but "the logic of events" was fast answering all *jure divino* questions, whether of Church or State.

DIRECTORY FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The famous order of Parliament, under date of Oct. 12, 1643, which drew off the Assembly from the vindication of the XXXIX Articles, and put them upon a Church Government, "in nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other Reformed Churches abroad," in place of the present Church Government by archbishops, bishops, etc.; also asked for the advice of the Assembly, touching "the Directory of Worship, or Liturgy hereafter to be in the Church." A new church must have a new liturgy. But "Church Government" proved so absorbing in its interest, that the Assembly seems to have taken no steps in reference to a Directory till May 21, of the second year, when, on motion of Rutherford, the matter was pressed

upon them, and a few days after Mr. Palmer reported on it, and the debate began.

Strange as it may seem, considerable difference of opinion manifested itself on the question—whether any other person, except the minister, might read the Scriptures in public. This High-church difficulty was finally relieved by granting occasional permission to probationers. The Lord's Supper presented still graver questions. Should the communicants sit at the table, or in their pews? The Scotch were strenuous for the former; the Independents were equally strenuous for the latter. The extremes to which these things were then carried is illustrated by the satirical remark, that Sir Harry Vane emigrated to America that he might take the Communion standing. But a much more serious question was the minister's power to bar the table against ignorant and scandalous persons. A solid month was spent on this point. The Sacrament of Baptism occupied them about the same length of time. Respecting the Sabbath, some debate arose on the title—"The Lord's day,"—and the language, which finally got into the Directory, is a judicious mixture of both terms, so that the strict Sabbatarians and the Lord's Day people should have an equal footing. As to other "holy days," it was strongly resolved "that the Sabbath-day was the only standing holy day under the New Testament to be kept by all the churches of Christ." It was also discussed, whether "something should be expressed against parish feasts, such as rush-bearings, whitsunales, wakes, garlands, and other such like superstitious customs."

Dr. Burgess wanted something put in "concerning church members keeping themselves to their own congregations, because of the giddiness of the people in this kind." Palmer thought that, without some such order, "hundreds of people would come to no church at all, and that nothing could be more destructive to the right performance of family duties, than that one should go to one place, and another to another." Sedgwick interposed: (1) "That there be a good minister in every congregation, and (2) That there be sufficient church accommodations," neither of which objections Palmer thought ought to stand. These slight obstructions being removed, the Assembly proceeded to the chapter on marriage. The Directory,

in its nearly-completed form, was carried up to the House of Lords November 21, 1644,

But "marriage" was not so easily disposed of. Henderson wanted something put in on "espousals," and had high notions about marriage; it was "a covenant of God." Wilson regarded it as only "a civil contract." Palmer thought it "no part of the worship of God. It was no ordinance of the first table, nor peculiar to the church." Rutherford said, they had denied marriage to be a sacrament; it was valid, therefore, to deny its being part of God's worship. Burroughs: "I think it should be put out because, there being so much given to the minister, people will think it to be a part of God's worship." Goodwin agreed with Burroughs: "In the Old Testament, marriage was not appropriated to the priest," and grew so strong in his language that he was called to order. Bathurst and Dr. Temple held it to be a part of worship. The Earl of Pembroke would not meddle with the learned part; lore—Rabbinical and other—having been freely poured out by Lightfoot, Goodwin, and others, he "begged to take a care of the manner of doing it. I would be sorry any child of mine should be married but by a minister." The discussion had in it so much more heat than light, that the venerable Harris was compelled to say: "I look upon this day's work as a sad business. We can express nothing, do nothing, but one thing or other is cast into the way to hinder us;" and so it was recommitted for to-morrow. The question did come up next day, and next week, and with added difficulties. Should marriage take place only by daylight? Marshall thought the penalties too severe, but held that, "The Lord had not appointed any set time." Should it be between eight and twelve? Gillespie feared trouble here—"the Papists give the reason, because that mass is before twelve o'clock." Ley: "You may limit it by daylight." Vines thinks "it may be done by candle-light, as well as by day-light, and under certain circumstances, in a chamber, as well as in a church." Calamy contended for a public solemnization, because "many think no necessity of a solemnization." This part of the Directory was finally drawn up December 30, 1644.

The chapter on "burial" gave rise to the same sort of discussions. The more advanced members of the Assembly feared

the Book of Common-Prayer—the further from it the better. Should there be exhortation at burial? Herle could not see that there was any worship at a funeral; if exhortation, why not “word and prayer?” “Why,” it was said, “have a Directory for men when buried, and not when born?” Whitaker: “I think a man stands in a general relation to all his people, and every man, in the providence of God, is to get his heart affected.” “May the minister, if present, exhort?” asked Marshall. To say he should be invited to be there as a minister, would press far that it is a ministerial work. Hill: “No necessity that the corpse should be carried into the church, it should be first buried.” Palmer: “I desire we should take away all superstition, but do not think a dumb show becomes Christians.” This debate on burial ended by not “inhibiting exhortation.”

The month of December was mainly taken up with “Psalmody,” “visitation of the sick,” “fasting,” and especially with the question, “whether private family fastings should be recognized?” The vote, whether this question should be entertained, was very close, twenty-one to eighteen. “Should a fast day be kept as the Sabbath?” was waived, as was also “the churching of women.” It was while thanksgiving and fasting were under discussion, that the Parliament and the Assembly resolved to keep the coming Christmas as a fast—Parliament having already made the preceding Christmas a common day by sitting on it. Thirty years ago Andover Seminary kept Christmas as a fast-day, but what descendants of those Puritans would now think of a fast on Christmas, or of not knowing when Easter fell? With the last day of the year 1644, the Directory of Worship—provision having been made for its translation into Welsh—was sent up, and on the same day the debate on excommunication was resumed, and so the Assembly, after lying in comparatively quiet waters, feeling only the ebb and flow of the tide, was suddenly carried out into the restless, raging sea, where it was tossed to and fro by fierce winds of controversy, and well-nigh foundered amid the huge and conflicting billows of state-craft and religious intolerance.

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

This was, of course, the central theological work of the Assembly's labors, and as such, its origin and growth will always

draw to it the largest and most interested attention. It came early before the Assembly, as we learn from a letter of Baillie, under date of October, 1644, in which he says; "The Confession of Faith was referred to a committee, to be put in several of the best hands that are here." This committee is probably the one mentioned in the Minutes, August 20, 1644, which was "to prepare matter for a joint Confession of Faith." It consisted of Dr. Gouge, Mr. Gataker, Arrowsmith, Dr. Temple, Burroughs, Burges, Vines, Goodwin, and Dr. Hoyle, including the following additional names, asked for when the first report was made: Palmer, Newcommon, Herle, Reynolds, Wilson, Dr. Smith, Tuckney, Young, Ley, Sedgwick, and the Scotch Commissioners. In November, Baillie, touching again on the Confession, expresses a fear that it "will stick longer" than the Catechism, and "I think," says he, "we must either pass the Confession to another season, or, if God will help us, the heads of it being distributed among many able hands, it may, in a short time, be so drawn up, as the debate of it may cost little time." The committee above-named certainly corresponds with the description, "many able hands," and in April following he is more hopeful—the Confession is put in hand, progress is reported, and not so much debate is expected on it as on the Directory and Government. On the 12th of May, 1645, the report of the committee was read and debated. This, of course, was only "the matter" of a Confession, or rough draught; for later a committee was raised "for drawing up the Confession," and it was voted that "the first draught should be made by a committee of a few." This committee was formed from the other two, and, after several changes, consisted of Gataker, Harris, Tuckney, Vines, Reynolds, Dr. Hoyle, and Herle, with the assistance of the Scotch divines. "Government" is still on their hands for several months, but July 4, 1645, the Confession is brought up, and the sub-committee is ordered to report what is in their hands concerning "God" and concerning the "Scriptures." The work is now fairly under way, and "Reynolds, Herle, and Newcommon are desired to take care of the wording of the Confession of Faith, as it is voted in the Assembly from time to time, and report to the Assembly, when they think fit there should be any alteration in the words." They are, however, always, first to consult

with one or more of the Scotch Commissioners, before making report.

To facilitate the work, "the body of the Confession was divided to the three committees," the general committee having charge of the division into "heads." To the First Committee: "God and the Trinity" (the "Holy Scriptures" having already been reported), God's Decrees, Predestination, Election, etc., the Works of Creation and Providence, and Man's Fall; to the Second Committee: Sin, and the Punishment thereof; Free-will; the Covenant of Grace, Christ our Mediator; and to the Third Committee: Effectual Vocation, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification. This was on July 16, 1645. In November there was a further distribution. To the First Committee: Perseverance, Christian Liberty, the Church, and the Communion of Saints; to the Second Committee: Officers and Censurers of the Church, Councils or Synods, Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; to the Third: the Law, Religion, Worship. A third distribution was made February 23, 1646; to the First Committee: the Christian Sabbath, the Civil Magistrate, Marriage, and Divorce; to the Second: Certainty of Salvation, Lies and Equivocation, and the State of the Dead after Death; and to the Third: the Resurrection, the Last Judgment, Life Eternal; and finally, in August, 1646, Faith, Repentance, and Good Works were put into the committee's hands. Most of the work was done in committee. When questions came before the Assembly, there was great disparity in the amount of time consumed in debate, some being disposed of very briefly, others taking up many days, and then to be committed and recommitted. Nor does the amount of time always seem to correspond with the gravity of the subject. "God and the Trinity" were before the Assembly only one day, and that a Wednesday—their "day of religion—" while "the Scriptures" occupied them from the 7th to the 22d of July.

The protestation taken by every member before he was admitted to a seat in the Assembly, and which was read every Monday morning during all the years of their sittings, contained these words: "I do solemnly promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly I will maintain nothing in point of doctrine but what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God." To this they held; they had a zeal

for that Word. They gave it the first place in their Confession of Faith—the place of honor. And no part of their work does them more credit, than the loyalty and the constancy, with which they placed the Scriptures in the foreground; and the fidelity with which they strove to square with this word, all their labors in the four several departments: of Worship, Government, the Confession, and the Catechisms. The Word of God was their strong tower, whereunto they always fled for safety, and from which they ever went forth, armed with new weapons and fresh courage, to fight the battles of the Lord. We must ever revere them for their submission to Holy Writ, even when we know that they erred. Their errors were the errors of their age. It was an age mighty in the Scriptures, and many of those divines were mightiest among the mighty; but a better critical apparatus and a wider basis of comparison, have emancipated us from much of their bondage to the letter of Scripture, as well as to the spirit of their age. Few men, for example, outside of the Church of England, would be willing to say now, what the Assembly of divines said then, of the Nicene, Athanasian, and Apostles' creeds—"That they are thorowly to be received and believed, for that they may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture." It would be a work worthy of our age and church, to purge the margin of our standards of some of these inept Scripture proofs. We know that those who arranged the texts, both added to and took away, according to their wisdom.

The doctrinal interest of the Assembly centered on "the Decree." The debate on this and its affiliated and dependent doctrines—the Fall, Reprobation, the Covenant, the Mediatorship, Effectual Calling, etc.—continued from August 29, to the end of the year, but it culminated in the discussion of the extent of the Atonement; or, as it was stated by them, "Redemption of the Elect only." This one point was under debate during three entire days. The minuteness and sharpness of these disputations are best appreciated by looking at the following transcript from their Minutes:

"Debate on the report of the first committee of 'God's decree.'

"Debate upon the 'title.'

“Debate about the word ‘counsel;’ about those words ‘most holy, wise;’ and about those words, ‘his own.’

“Debate about the word ‘time;’ about the word ‘should.’

“Debate about the transposing,” etc.

They did not despise, certainly did not neglect, to tithe even mint, anise and cummin. In the old formulas of Christ’s birth, they found the virgin called “blessed,” but, as Gillespie had taken the “saint” from Matthew, and some places in the New Testament, in printing the “Annotations on the Bible,” because prelatial men made use of it, so the Assembly said, “‘blessed’ shall not stand”—Dr. Burgess dissenting. Words were things, and the very accidents of words were not overlooked.

Discussing the permission of man’s fall brought up the question of one decree, or more. *Seaman* thought, to leave out the words, “in the same decree,” would hinder them in a great debate. *Rutherford* believed that there was but *one* decree, “but doubted whether it was fit to express it in a Confession of Faith.” *Whitaker* believed in one decree, and in saying so. *Dr. Gouge* : “I do not see how leaving out those words will cross that we aim at; I think it will go on roundly without it.” *Seaman* saw all the odious doctrines of the Arminians in their distinguishing of the decrees, “but our divines say they are one and the same decree.” *Gillespie* was for liberty : “leave out that word (‘same’) is it not a truth, and so every one may enjoy his own sense.” *Reynolds* was opposed “to putting such scholastical things into a Confession of Faith,” and *Calamy* agreed with Reynolds in leaving it out, though he endorsed the Prolocutor’s book, which was strongly supralapsarian.

Next day was “the debate about redemption of the elect only, by Christ,” opened by *Calamy*. “I am far from universal redemption in the Arminian sense. Christ did pay a price for all—absolute intention for the elect, conditional intention for the reprobate, in case they do believe. Christ did not only die sufficiently for all, but God did intend, in giving Christ, and Christ, in giving himself, did intend, to put all men in a state of salvation in case they do believe. *Palmer* : *De omni homine?* *Calamy* : *De adultis.* *Gillespie* wanted them to observe “the concatenation of the death of Christ with the decrees.” *Calamy* : “In point of election, I am for special election.” *Reynolds* : “The

Synod of Dort intended no more than to declare the sufficiency of the death of Christ. To be salvable is a benefit, and, therefore, belongs only to them that have interest in Christ."

The proposition was then stated more definitely: "That Christ did intend to redeem the elect only." Against this *Calamy* cited Jno. iii: 16—in proof of God's love to the world of elect, and reprobate, and not elect only; "also, Mark xvi: 15—"if the Covenant of Grace be to be preached to all, then Christ redeemed, in some sense, all." *Rutherford*: "This is only true if Christ died, in some sense, for all." "I deny this connection, because it holds as well in election and justification, as in redemption." *Calamy*: "We do not speak of application. It cannot be offered to Judas except he be salvable." *Rutherford*: "The promise of justification, no less than of redemption, is made to Judas." "The ground of this is to make all salvable, and so justifiable." *Seaman*: "He makes it absurd, but it is not; every man was *damnabilis*, so is every man *salvabilis*, and God, if he please, may choose him, justify him, sanctify him." *Wilkinson*: "Christ prayed not for the world." *Gillespie*: "the brother (*Calamy*) takes it for granted that by the world (Jno. iii: 16) is meant the whole world. Those that will say it, must needs deny the absolute reprobation. He does not distinguish between God's *voluntas decreti* and *mandati*. God's command doth not hold out God's intention." *Marshall*: "There is not only a command, but a promise; according to this there are two covenants to the elect, one general and the other special." *Calamy*: "The difference is not in the offer, but in the application." *Gillespie*: "I say it is most good sense to say, God so loved the elect, that whomsoever believeth," etc. *Lightfoot* understood "the world" as only opposed to the Jews. *Price*: "Prove that there is such a covenant with mankind. If so, why mention the children of the covenant?" *Vines* agreed that "the world" meant more than the elect. *Goodwin* favored a definite atonement. *Rutherford* interpreted Jno. iii: 16, of a particular, special love; it is an actual saving love, and, therefore, not a general love. *Harris'* objections strong on both sides: "I see more than I can answer. I doubt whether there be any such thing at all as a conditional decree; agree with *Lightfoot*, that 'the world' meant the Gentiles, 'but that love is the highest love that can be.'"

Here this "long and tough" debate ended, and Baillie's remark is—"yet thanks to God, all is gone right, according to our mind." It is clear enough, not only from what Gillespie and Rutherford said, but from the whole drift against Calamy, that the general view of the Assembly was *high* Calvinism, and such, beyond the shadow of a doubt, is the sense of our standards. Logically and historically, they stand for a limited atonement.* Nov. 3, a motion was debated about leaving out the words—"foreordained to everlasting death," and a year later Whitaker moved their omission, but the Assembly resolved—"the words shall stand without alteration." From this time forward the interest of the Assembly slackened, though the discussion on the related questions ran on to the end of the year.

It is impossible to resist the conviction, that Milton had in his mind the Assembly wrestling with these questions, when he penned those lines:

"Others apart sat on a hill retired,
In thoughts more elevate, and reason'd high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute;
And found no end, in wandering mazes lost."

For was not all "Smectymnus" in the Assembly? and Calamy, and Marshall, and his old preceptor, Young, in the very fiercest fray of these high questions?

Baptism, and "about the grace which is in it," proved quite vexatious, and occupied a good deal of time. Whitaker was the champion of opinions, which would now be considered conservative and churchly; while Palmer stood for the more modern views. Both tried to find the point of equilibrium between an *opus operatum* and a bare sign; but they moved from opposite poles.

Dec. 5, 1645, an order of haste having come from Parliament, the Assembly proceeded to revise the Confession; but for the next six months hardly anything was debated in the Assembly, save *jus divinum* and its entangling alliances. However, in June they proceeded to adopt the heads of the Con-

* [This statement is stronger than the facts. The Westminster Assembly carefully avoided the extremes of Calvinism. —H. B. SMITH.]

fession. In the course of a fortnight, the first ten were adopted, then came three weeks more of *jus divinum*; another order of haste from the Commons was followed by the adoption of xi. and xii; after several months of debate on Marriage and Divorce, Synods, etc., the heads on Perseverance, Assurance, and Saving Faith, and then the Law of God and Repentance. Sanctification was the last of the nineteen heads to be adopted—"assurance" having given rise to a great deal of debate. Sept. 21, Good Works; and on the same day also it was ordered, that "the several heads of the Confession of Faith shall be called by the name of chapters;"—and Sept. 25, 1646, Parliament having again urged haste, the first nineteen chapters were presented under the title: "To the honorable, the House of Commons, assembled in Parliament, the humble advice of the Assembly of Divines, now, by authority of Parliament, sitting at Westminster, concerning part of a Confession of Faith."

The rest of the Confession followed rapidly. Chapter xx, on Civil Rights, was, of course, a bone of contention—for a whole month, and when it was adopted, the last clause had to be laid over. Chapters xxi—xxiii, xxvii, xxviii, and xxiv, with the clause of wilful desertion in it; xxix, xxv, xxvi, and on Nov. 26, 1646, chapters xxx—xxxiii were adopted, and "the Confession of Faith was finished on this day, and by order of the Assembly, the Prolocutor gave thanks to the Committee that had taken so great pains in the perfecting of it." After a few verbal alterations, *e. g.* substituting "Christ" for "God" in three places in chapter xxiii, and a futile attempt to alter the chapter "of censures," it was resolved, Dec. 4 1646, that the whole Assembly should present the completed Confession to both Houses of Parliament. It was so done.

The Assembly went in a body. "They were called in—the Prolocutor informed the House that they had now finished the latter part of the Confession, and, for the more conveniency, had reduced both parts to one entire body, and desired humbly to present it, and, in conclusion, do further desire, that if either the thing do seem long, or that they have been long in perfecting it, that you would consider, that the business is matter of great weight and importance." On the 7th inst., the same ceremony of presentation and thanks was gone

through with in the House of Lords. On the occasion of their receiving the first nineteen chapters, the House ordered the Scripture proofs to be placed in the margin, "to confirm what had been offered," and after the whole Confession was in, the Assembly appointed Wilson, Byfield, and Gower to prepare these proofs, and have them entered in the margin of "books specially for the votes of the Assembly thereon." This collating and approving of texts was done in the Assembly, each member being enjoined to bring with him his printed copy for reference, while the Scripture proofs were under debate. A most venerable Bible-class! The same stones of stumbling appeared in the proofs that had appeared in the original discussions, *e. g.*, xx: 4; election, etc., but by the 5th of April, all the texts are in, and after a review of a few days more, are carried up to both Houses, April 29, 1647.

THE CATECHISMS.

There remained yet a Catechism, and to this the Assembly could now give their undivided attention. As we have already seen, a catechism was among the first things mentioned, as a means to the desired uniformity of religion in the three Kirks and Kingdoms; and was one of the four points in the Solemn League and Covenant. Nov. 21, 1644, Baillie reports it as already "drawn up," and a month later "as near agreed to, in private, so that when it comes in public, we expect little debate." Six months later, he speaks of it as in the hands of a committee and, in part, reported on, but if we except the naming of a committee (Aug. 20, 1645) to draw up the whole draught of the Catechism, we hear little of it till July 22, 1646, when an order from Parliament urges "haste in perfecting the Catechism and Confession, because of the great use there may be of them in the Kingdom." In September, the Assembly got to work on the Catechism, beginning apparently with Question 3 of our Larger Catechism, though their numbers do not run the same as ours, and go only up to Question 35. Being turned aside for two months by the rest of the Confession, when they resumed the Catechism, in November of 1646, the Scribe ceased to give the number of the question. They began, however, with: "Why is our Saviour called Christ?" (42d Question), but fell into difficulties as "to the method of proceeding," difficulties seemingly con-

nected with the headship of Christ, which ended in their taking up the Commandments, Dec. 1, 1646. They got as far as the fourth, when, on motion of Mr. Vines, *two catechisms* were resolved on—"one *more large*, and another *more brief*, with reference to the Confession of Faith (now finished), and to the matter of the Catechism already begun."

It is a trifling matter in itself, but why must we always print and say, the *Larger Catechism* and the *Shorter*, instead of the larger and smaller, or the longer and shorter? No loyal Presbyterian would ever think of not crossing these two comparisons, despite grammar and analogy. If any one should speak of the *Longer* Catechism, he would at once prove himself an alien in the Presbyterian commonwealth; and if he spoke to our Sunday-school children of the *Smaller* Catechism, his speech would bewray him, and his little hearers would look perplexed, if not amused. Perhaps it is because in those days "large" was the current equivalent for our "long," and what we, in the *lingua sacra*, still designate "the long prayer," they called "the large prayer." But in looking over the Assembly's Minutes, one is struck with the variety and the instability of the terms by which the two Catechisms were spoken of. The *Shorter* Catechism is called the little, the lesser, the small and the short—its name fluctuating to the last. The same is true of the *Larger* Catechism. But when presenting them to Parliament—their titles are "A *Larger* Catechism," and "A *Shorter* Catechism," and these titles the House of Commons scrupulously gave them; but the Lords seem to have been less careful, in fact, never caught the exact words, so as to adhere to them. Not so Scotland—the true home of the Catechism. Both in her Assembly and Parliament, their distinguishing titles are always correctly entered and spoken, and thence, in all probability, has come to us the correct application of the terms "*Larger*" and "*Shorter*."

THE LARGER CATECHISM.

It is worth our while to look in on the Assembly for a few minutes, and hear them discuss the report as to the method of catechizing. *Rutherford*—on objections—(1.) It is said the Apostles did not use such a way. I think they did. "Is then the Law of God of none effect?" is a sort of sample question from the Apostolic Catechism. (2.) It takes away the proper

work of the minister. Denied. "There is as much art in catechising as in anything in the world. It may be doubted, whether every minister do understand the most dextrous way of doing it." *Marshall* hesitated a little about adhering, too formally, to the bare question-and-answer method of the Catechism. *Bridge*: "Two ends of catechising: increase of knowledge and test of knowledge. For the first there must be explication of the terms of divinity—redemption, etc., must be first explained. For the test of their knowledge it is better that answers should be made by sentences than by *aye* and *no*." *Gillespie*: "This is a profitable discourse, which is the best way of catechising. I like the form—capital questions by themselves, and particular questions by *aye* and *no*. When we were lately in Scotland, we had occasion to speak of this way, and showed them the example of it, and they all liked it very well." *Dr. Gouge*: "Ministers are physicians; they must observe the patient." *Herle*: "I would have *aye* and *no* to be expressed, but not distinct. It should be the first word of the answer." *Seaman*: "There are two things before us: about a catechism, and about catechising. It is a little too much to prescribe to the minister this form or that." *Reynolds*: "We all agree that way which is most for ingenerating knowledge is to most to be used—but I do not see that this way before us is the best." *Delmy*: "A catechism is for propounding knowledge in the most familiar manner, and to find out the measure of the knowledge of the party. The experience of the Reformed churches is to be considered." *Palmer*: "You must consider others as well as children." This is enough.

Let us see how the Larger Catechism grew. The Scripture proofs on the Confession being finally completed, April 15, 1647, the Assembly at once proceeded with the Catechism, beginning with question and answer, but though not numbering them, it is obvious that they followed the order of the questions in their previous Catechism, as far as Question 42, and then on as far as Question 58 of our Larger Catechism. Here they are again confronted with the extent of the Atonement. The matter is referred to a special committee and the Scotch Commissioners, to report at a future day. The Assembly resume their work with effectual calling (Question 67), and passing by Question 76 (Repentance), reach 82, and then pass

over to Questions 154—196 in our present order, except 172 and 173. In April they had resolved to attend to nothing at the morning session, beginning at nine instead of ten o'clock, till the Catechism was finished. They seemed very urgent. In June they distributed the ten commandments to as many separate committees, besides increasing the number of the General Committee. In July they took up what now is included in Questions 61—64, but which was originally one question, and in a much harsher form, and aimed to soften it, viz.: *Ques.* "Are all thus saved by Christ, who live within the visible church and hear the Gospel?" *Answer.* "Although the visible church (which is a society made up of all such as, in all ages and places of the world, do profess the true religion and their children) do enjoy many special favors and privileges, whereby it is distinguished from other societies in the world, and the gospel when it cometh doth tender salvation by Christ to all, testifying that whosoever believeth on him shall be saved, and excludeth none that come unto him, yet none do or can truly come unto Christ, or are saved by him, but only the members of the invisible church, which is the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be, gathered into one under Christ, their head." Questions 172—173 were answered at the same time, but there seems to be no notice of Question 76 till we come to the end of the discussion on the Commandments (Sept. 17, 1647,) when it is spoken of as amended. The Larger Catechism being completed October 15, 1647, was carried up by the whole Assembly, October 22, and received by both Houses with thanks.

THE SHORTER CATECHISM.

It was ordered, August 5, 1647, that "the Shorter Catechism shall be gone in hand with presently by a committee now to be chosen." This committee consisted of the Prolocutor (Herle), Palmer, Temple, Lightfoot, Green, and Delmy. The Larger Catechism being finished, the Shorter was all that remained. Mr. Tuckney seems to have had special charge of it, as he had had of the Larger. In a very few days it was brought before them, and the discussion on it began October 21st, but there are few marks in the Minutes of the order in which it was debated. November 8th it was resolved that the Commandments, Lord's Prayer, and Creed be added, and on the 15th the Cat-

echism was read to the Fourth Commandment, and ordered to be transcribed. The next day the remainder was reported, and ordered transcribed. The addition of the Creed raised some debate—Ney, Rayner, Greenhill, Wilson, and Valentine dissenting—any further debate of the matter, however, being cut short by a vote of twenty-three to twelve. On the same day the Committee on the Catechism was still further increased, and next day, which was the 19th of November, the words, “he descended into hell,” being, by a vote of nineteen to twelve, put into the margin, the Shorter Catechism was completed, and ordered to be “carried up by the whole Assembly,” which was duly done, to the Commons, November 25th, and to the Lords November 26th, and by both accepted, with thanks and commendation for the Assembly’s great pains, and with an order to print six hundred copies, and no more, for the use of the Houses and the Assembly of Divines, and “that they would affix the texts of the Scripture in the margin.”

Everything in the Assembly is now looking toward the end. The Commissioners of the Church of Scotland have all left; Henderson, a year ago last May, stopping at Newcastle to convert Charles from the divine right of bishops to the divine right of Presbytery, and since August 12, 1646, in his grave; and Gillespie, in July of the present year—Baillie and the Lord Chancellor having already left on Christmas of 1646. Rutherford alone is left. Upon a motion made by him, it was ordered that it be recorded on the scribe’s books: “The Assembly hath enjoyed the assistance of the honorable, reverend, and learned Commissioners of the Church of Scotland in the work of the Assembly; during all the time of the debating and perfecting of the four things mentioned in the Covenant, viz.: the Directory for Worship, the Confession of Faith, Form of Church Government, and Catechism, some of the reverend and learned divines, Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, have been present in and assisting to this Assembly.” With this endorsement of the departed and the departing, and thanks from the Prolocutor, by order of the Assembly, and in their name, Samuel Rutherford took his leave November 9, 1647. The same day a committee of seventeen was appointed “to consider what the Assembly is to do when the Catechism is finished?” They were in danger of falling to pieces, not now

through dissension, but for want of something to do. There is a good deal of straggling, late-coming, and early-going, and no coming at all.

Before we dismiss this matter, let it be noted, that this venerable body was afflicted with the common malady of all deliberative bodies—non-attendance. Further on there really might be some excuse for such delinquency, since eight or nine years was a long session, even in the days of long Parliaments; but as early as March, 1645, Marshall moved “in regard to late-coming, which was a great loss of time,” and often delayed the organizing of the body for want of a quorum. And when they did come, their inattention was as derogatory as their tardiness, since we find it ordered, that the members of the Assembly do not bring any books or papers to read privately in the Assembly during its sittings; that they forbear ordinary going from one place to another in the Assembly; that in case any member has occasion to be out of his seat, that then he be uncovered. But absenteeism, tardiness, and inattention are not easily cured. They are chronic vices. May 26, 1645, forty-four members banded together and bind themselves by a promise to be present every morning at nine o'clock; but already, in July, a numerous and weighty committee of fifteen members and four doctors of divinity—then not as plenty as now—on it, is appointed “to consider if the seldom-coming and going-away before adjournment,” to meet to-morrow, and report with all convenient speed. They report, debate, and give the names of the delinquents. It would be worth much to us, to know who of that grave body played truant during these high debates. They were not Dr. Gouge, Herle, Nye, Smith, Dr. Burgess, Calamy, Marshall, Sedgwicke, Dr. Temple, White, Palmer, Guibon, Chambers, Cawdry, and Ash, seeing they were this police committee, and, moreover, we know them as zealous workers. Next week the names of the delinquents were sent to the Parliament; from this Mr. Woodcock, a young and reputable man, dissents; we know not why.

Things, however, seem not to mend, and after some six months, the Lords and Commons, who are now “hastening” the Confession of Faith, take the matter in hand. Henceforth, there is to be “a roll-call every morning at nine o'clock” (the former hour was ten, but business was becoming more press-

ing and we are glad to record that this spurt of zeal on the part of Parliament synchronizes with a good stent of work on the Assembly's part. We hear no further complaint for another six months, when the two Houses of Parliament issue a second order, which I do not find recorded in these minutes, but which was "to be duly executed in all its parts." After another half-year, for the disease seems semi-annually remittent, it is resolved "that the distribution of money for the time to come (we are now in December, 1646, and have been sitting three and a half years) shall be exactly according to the presence or absence of members from this day forward." This has a business look. Attempts were made to pass even something stronger, such as the weekly reading out of the names every Friday, after twelve o'clock, but clearly the *vis inertiae* was becoming very stable. "A Mr. Hodges went away, and was called back by the Prolocutor, and would not return," and no remedy, we judge, for such discourtesy; for the Assembly resolve, "no further question shall be put concerning the business." But the spirit of murdered time would not down, for November 15, 1647, it is resolved, that those who go away without leave, or before the rising of the Assembly, "they"—with an emphasis—shall be accounted as absent for the day; and the last numbered session, February, 1649, closes its Minutes of that day with the resolution, "that the £200 now to be distributed shall be according to the rule of the last distribution," which we take to mean, no work, no pay—the *per diem* being four shillings. It seems small, but a trooper did his fighting for two shillings and six pence.

When "the truants" called us off, the Assembly had presented the Shorter Catechism, and returned "to affix the texts." In March "the Scriptures were read in full Assembly." April 12 "the proofs" of both Catechisms were ordered to be transcribed, and to be carried up on Friday morning, April 14, 1648. September 20, 1648, the Assembly requests Lord Manchester, to desire the Lords to urge the Commons "to hasten the Little Catechism." This is their last word on the Shorter Catechism. Their minutes grow more meagre from day to day. The Assembly has dwindled down to three days a week, with a good many *lacunæ* in its roll and sessions. February 1, 1649, there is no King since day before yesterday,

and no present business for the Assembly, but still "prayers for the Lords and Commons," at four shillings a day. February 8, "Mr. Carter, of London (he is an Independent), to pray;" there being, by vote of the Commons, no House of Lords since two days past, their lordships need no chaplain. The Assembly is now small enough "to adjourn to the scribe's chamber."

February 15, "Mr. Hardwick to pray next week."

February 22, 1649, "Mr. Johnson to pray."

This is session 1163, the last one numbered, and the Assembly thenceforth disappears in a committee for examining ministers. Zealous and accurate calculations have shown that it sat five years, six months, twenty-two days.

When the curtain again rises, there is neither crown nor crosier, House of Commons nor Assembly of Divines—but a soldier booted and spurred, and leaning heavily on his sabre—OLIVER CROMWELL, afterward Lord Protector.

Such then was the Westminster Assembly. A body of noble, learned, courageous, and God-fearing men—not inspired, and, neither by themselves nor others, regarded as infallible—wide differences, and, at times, sad divisions being among them. Moreover, they labored under certain grave disabilities. The State had called them, not to propound, but to advise, and necessarily sought to use them for political ends, and these feudal fetters limited them on all questions of church and state, questions of a most precarious nature, because of the perilous times—when the church was without a bishop, and the state without a king, and that in an age when kings, no less than bishops, were God's anointed, and royalists and prelatists constituted the mass of the people. But in all ideas of government, there was becoming manifest a drift toward freedom, at least away from authority. In polity, it looked toward Independency, and in theology, toward Arminianism; and along both lines toward a larger liberty of conscience and conduct.

The creed of the Assembly was, of course, retrospective and not prospective, since they had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which were most surely believed among them. Confessions are necessarily conservative, because they are human, and not divine; the spirit of tolerance is all that we can expect, never the spirit of prophesy. Conser-

vatism, therefore, prevailed in their formulas, as it always does, and, as in historical movements, it always must, but it prevailed by concession, which is the coefficient of progress. To prevail in any other way, would be to stand still, when God's word is that the people "go forward." Such victories end in death.

Their work was a grand one in its aim and result, and yet was, in some sense, a failure. It was done on English soil, and by English hands, and yet was not an English product; nor was it ever accepted by the English people. In fact, it was an exotic. It did not take kindly to the climate then, nor has it since. Scotland is its habitat, as it was its home. Old England and New England, and all their descendants, have cast out high Calvinism and high Presbyterianism. But these men faithfully did their work. *Per aspera*, they attained *ad astra*. Because of these perils, caution and precaution—which are something of wisdom,—and charity—which is well-nigh all of wisdom—had the fuller sway, and by them, God gave the work of the Westminster divines a wider dominion than he has been pleased to give to any other Protestant Symbol, save the *Confessio Augustana*.

Art. II.—THEORIES OF LABOR REFORM AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT.

By REV. WM. A. HOLLIDAY, Belvidere, N. J.

SOCIETY may be regarded as distributed into three main classes. At one extreme we have all those who live upon their fellow men in a sense not creditable to themselves. The idle, the vicious, the criminal belong here. They are not in direct relation with the great branches of honest production. Their lot, consequently, is not so immediately affected by the fluctuations to which these are subject. The thrift of the community, of the country, is not their thrift, and its reverses are not their reverses. So far is this from being the case, that it may be most plausibly maintained that a bad year, as respects the general prosperity, is a good year for all who live and prey upon