

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, pp. 2, 7.

THE old English Puritan was such an one that honoured God above all, and under God gave every one his due. His first care was to serve God, and therein he did not what was good in his own, but in God's sight, making the Word of God the rule of his worship. He highly esteemed order in the house of God, but would not under colour of that submit to superstitious rites. . . . He revered authority keeping within its sphere, but durst not, under pretext of subjection to the higher powers, worship God after the traditions of men. He made conscience of all God's ordinances, though some he esteemed of more consequence. He was much in prayer, with which he began and closed the day. In it he was exercised in his closet, family, and public assembly. He esteemed that manner of prayer best where by the gift of God expressions were varied according to the present wants and occasions; yet did he not account set forms unlawful . . . he did not wholly reject the Liturgy, but the corruptions of it. He accounted preaching as necessary now as in the primitive church, God's pleasure being still by the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe. . . . He esteemed that preaching best wherein was most of God and least of man, . . . and that method best which was most helpful to understanding, affections, and memory. The Lord's day he esteemed a divine ordinance, and rest on it necessary so far as conduced to holiness. He was careful to remember it, to get house and heart in order for it, and when it came he was studious to improve it. Lawful recreations he

thought this day unseasonable, and unlawful ones much more abominable. Yet he knew the liberty which God gave him for needful refreshing, which he did neither refuse nor abuse. The sacrament of baptism he received in infancy, which he looked back to in age to answer his engagements and claim his privilege. The Lord's supper he accounted part of his soul's food . . . he esteemed it an ordinance of nearest communion with Christ, and so requiring most exact preparation. He endeavoured to have the scandalous cast out of communion, but he cast not out himself because the scandalous were suffered by the negligence of others. He thought that God had left a rule in his Word for discipline, and that aristocratical by elders, not monarchical by bishops, nor democratical by the people. Right discipline he judged pertaining not to the being but to the well-being of a church; therefore he esteemed those churches most pure where the government is by elders, yet unchurched not those where it was otherwise. Perfection in churches he thought rather a thing to be desired than hoped for. And so he expected not a church state without all defects. The corruptions that were in churches he thought it his duty to bewail with endeavours of amendment, yet would he not separate where he might partake in the worship and not in the corruption. . . . He put not holiness in churches; he would have them kept decent, not magnificent. His chiefest music was singing of Psalms, wherein though he neglected not the melody of the voice, he looked chiefly after that of the heart. He accounted religion an engagement to duty, that the best Christians should be best husbands, best wives, best parents, best children, best masters, best servants, best magistrates, best subjects. . . . The family he endeavoured to make a church, both in regard of persons and exercises, admitting none into it but such as feared God, and labouring that those that were born into it might be born again unto God. He blessed his family, morning and evening, by the word and prayer. . . . His whole life he accounted a warfare, wherein Christ was his Captain, his arms prayers and tears, the cross his banner, and his word, '*vincit qui patitur.*'—*The Character of the Old English Puritan or Nonconformist* by John Gere, M.A. London, 1646.

THE ODDS OR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE KNAVE'S PURITAN
AND THE KNAVE PURITAN.

The Knave's Puritan.

He that resists the world, the flesh, and
fiend,
And makes a conscience how his days
to spend,
Who hates excessive drinking, drabs,
and dice,
And (in his heart) hath God in highest
price,
That lives conformable to law and state,
Nor from the truth will fly or separate,
That will not swear or cozen, cogge or lie,
But strives in God's fear how to live
and die;
He that seeks this to do the best he can,
He is the knave's abused Puritan.

The Knave Puritan.

He whose best good is only good to
seem,
And, seeming, holy gets some false
esteem ;
Who makes religion hide hypocrisy
And zeal to cover o'er his villany ;
Whose purity (much like the devil's
ape)
Can shift himself into an angel's shape ;
And play the rascal most devoutly
trim,
Not caring who sinks, so himself may
swim ;
He's the Knave Puritan, and only he
Makes the Knave's Puritan abused be.

It is now come to that pass that if any one give up his name to Christ, or but look toward religion, he is presently branded with the infamous name of Puritan ; but the truth is, it is no disgrace to be so stiled, but rather, as now, it is an honour. Once (as a learned bishop could say) only such passed for Puritans as opposed the church-government, and cried out for discipline, but now to be truly religious is to become a Puritan ; . . . yea, to be a mere moral honest man is to incur that censure. Yea, if a man be but orthodoxal, evangelical, papists will not doubt to load him with names more than a few.—P. 391 of *Works of R. Harris, B.D.*, one of the members of the Assembly. See also E 85, No. 20.

NOTE B, p. 53.

Travers, if ordained to the office of deacon in England, was certainly ordained to that of presbyter in the Puritan Church of Antwerp. He was admitted as Lecturer at the Temple, and for some years was associated with Hooker there, and was very highly esteemed by the benchers, who till that time had continued to receive the communion sitting. When deprived of his lectureship he was invited to Dublin by the Archbishop, and made Provost of Trinity College, where he had the honour of training Archbishop

Ussher, who held him in the highest regard. With respect to purity of language and style, Mr. Marsden says that 'Cartwright and Travers are at least equal to Hooker, whose power lies rather in majesty of thought than in felicity of expression. In the pulpit, Travers preaching before the same audience—one of the most accomplished in England—carried away the palm of eloquence from his great opponent by the consent of all parties. Cartwright's eloquence had won the admiration of Cambridge.' Yet according to Hallam, 'so stately and graceful is the march of Hooker's periods, so various the fall of his musical cadences upon the ear, so rich in images, so condensed in sentences, so grave and noble his diction, so little is there of vulgarity in his racy idiom, of pedantry in his learned phrases, that I know not whether any later writer has more admirably displayed the capacities of our language or produced passages more worthy of comparison with the splendid monuments of antiquity. . . . He inquired into the nature and foundation of law itself as the rule of operation to all created being, . . . and having thoroughly established the fundamental distinction between laws natural and positive, eternal and temporary, immutable and variable, he came with all this strength of moral philosophy to discriminate by the same criterion the various rules and precepts contained in the Scripture. . . . It was maintained by this great writer, not only that ritual observances are variable according to the discretion of ecclesiastical rulers, but that no certain form of polity is set down in Scripture as generally indispensable for a Christian church. Far, however, from conceding to his antagonists the fact which they assumed, he contended for episcopacy as an apostolical institution, and always preferable when circumstances would allow its preservation, to the more democratical model of the Calvinistic congregations' (*History of England*, vol. ii. pp. 215, 217). Hooker, says Mr. Rawson Gardiner, 'had maintained that the disputed points being matters which were not ordained by any immutable divine ordinance, were subject to change from time to time, according to the circumstances of the church. For the time being, these questions had been settled by the law of the Church of England, to which the Queen as the head and representative of the nation had given her assent. With this settlement he was perfectly content, and he advised his opponents to submit to the law which had been thus laid down. Upon looking closely, however, into Hooker's great work, it becomes evident that his conclusions are based upon two

distinct arguments, which, although they were blended together in his own mind at some sacrifice of logical precision, were not likely in future to find favour at the same time with any one class of reasoners. When he argues from Scripture and from the practice of the early church, the as yet undeveloped features of Bancroft and Laud are plainly to be discerned. When he proclaims the supremacy of law, and weighs the pretensions of the Puritans in the scales of reason he shows a mind the thoughts of which are cast in the same mould with those of that school of thinkers of whom Bacon is the acknowledged head. Hooker's greatness indeed, like the greatness of all by whom England was ennobled in the Elizabethan age, consisted rather in the entireness of his nature than in the thoroughness with which his particular investigations were carried out.'—*History of England from 1603 to 1616*, vol. i. pp. 157, 158.

NOTE C, p. 70.

Their petition is reprinted in E, 170, No. 4. Its contents are given pretty fully by Fuller and Neal, and somewhat abridged are the following:—1. In the church service—That the cross in baptism, interrogatories ministered to infants, and confirmation be taken away; that baptism be not ministered by women, and cap and surplice be not urged; that examination go before admission to the communion; that *priests, absolution*, and such terms be corrected; that the ring be not enforced, the service be abridged, church music moderated, and canonical Scriptures only read. 2. Concerning church ministers—Not to be admitted unless able for duties, and to preach diligently, and such as are already entered, and cannot preach to remove or pay a preacher; that non-residency be not permitted, that King Edward's statute for the lawfulness of ministers' marriage be revived, that ministers be not urged to subscribe but, according to law, to the Articles of Religion and the king's supremacy. 3. For church livings and maintenance—That *commendams* and pluralities be discontinued, and that impropriations be to some extent recovered. 4. For church discipline—That the discipline and excommunication may be administered according to Christ's own institution, or at least enormities redressed, as the issuing of excommunications by lay officials, and the too free use of them and of the *ex officio* oath. The official account of the conference to which this petition led was published

by Dr. Barlow, Dean of Chester, who, according to Fuller, 'set a sharp edge on his own, and a blunt one on his adversaries' weapons.' Drs. Reynolds and Sparkes complained that they were wronged by that relation, and Neal says that the author afterwards repented of it. Dr. Harris thinks the Puritans need not have complained so much, since, if he has not done justice to their arguments, he has abundantly made up for it by showing that their opponents were gross flatterers. None of their flatteries, however, was more gross than that of the author of this 'Sum and Substance of the Conference,' who, while omitting all the coarse jests and low buffooneries of the king, does not hesitate to say that in his abridgment of the proceedings the only wrong he has done 'is to his excellent Majesty, a syllable of whose admirable speeches it was pity to lose—his words, as they were uttered by him, being as Solomon speaketh, *like apples of gold with pictures of silver.*' Sir John Harrington has preserved some of these precious pictures, which may still be seen in *Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. ii. p. 228, or in Spedding's *Bacon*, vol. iii. p. 127. The king's own account of it is that they had 'kept such a revel with the Puritans . . . as was never heard the like,' and that he had 'peppered them soundly.' Some still defend his jest about weak consciences, forgetting that though others than ministers were not called to subscribe, others than ministers were expected to observe the 'nocent ceremonies.' Some also suppose that they increased their demands, asking not only exemption from certain ceremonies, as in their petition, but the abolition of them; but this arises from not distinguishing between their demands, and the reasons they urged, when pressed to it, in support of these demands.

Besides the concessions mentioned on page 69 as made to them, there was one in regard to confirmation which has not attracted the notice it deserves, and which, when completed in 1662, nearly brought it to what Calvin had desired. It was only to be administered to those who had come to years of discretion, and who were prepared to take on themselves the vows made for them when baptized. Previously it might be administered to children as soon as they could say their catechism, and no promise or vow had been required of those receiving it. The addition made to the title of the absolution, to have brought out the king's idea, would have required to be 'or *declaration* of remission of sins,' not simply 'or remission of sins.'

The contest did not end with the discomfiture of the Puritans at

the Conference. It was only removed from Hampton Court to Westminster. One of the first steps taken by the House of Commons was to name a Committee to prepare bills for the redress of ecclesiastical grievances. The king deeply resented this, and through his influence the bills were rejected in the House of Lords. But the Commons followed up their bills by an 'outspoken address to the king,' in which they aver that their 'desires were of peace only and their device of unity.' Their aim, as Mr. Green says (vol. iii. p. 61), had been to put an end to the long-standing dissension among the ministers, and to preserve uniformity by the abandonment of a few ceremonies of small importance, by the redress of some ecclesiastical abuses, and by the establishment of an efficient training for a preaching clergy. If they had waived their right to deal with these matters during the old age of Elizabeth, they asserted it now: 'Let your Majesty be pleased to receive public information from your Commons in Parliament, as well of the abuses in the church as in the civil state and government. Your Majesty would be misinformed if any man should deliver that the Kings of England have any absolute power in themselves, either to alter religion or to make any laws concerning the same, otherwise than, as in temporal causes, by consent of Parliament.' Thus nobly did the English House of Commons range themselves on the side of the contemned ministers in the struggle which the ministers in Scotland had been left to maintain alone.

NOTE D, p. 87.

'Anticipating their high destiny and the sublime doctrines of liberty that would grow out of the principles on which their religious tenets were established, Robinson gave them a farewell breathing a freedom of opinion and an independence of authority such as then were hardly known in the world. . . . "When the ship was ready to carry us away," writes Edward Winslow, "the brethren that stayed at Leyden, having again solemnly sought the Lord with us and for us, feasted us that were to go, at our pastor's house, being large; where we refreshed ourselves, after tears, with singing of psalms, making joyful melody in our hearts, as well as with the voice, there being many of the congregation very expert in music; and indeed it was the sweetest melody that ever mine ears heard. After this they accompanied us to Delft-haven, where we went to embark, . . . and after prayer performed by our pastor,

when a flood of tears was poured, they accompanied us to the ship, but were not able to speak one to another for the abundance of sorrow to part." A prosperous wind soon wafts the vessel to Southampton, and in a fortnight the *Mayflower* and the *Speedwell*, freighted with the first colony of New England, leave Southampton for America.—Bancroft, vol. i. p. 307. Once and again they had to return through the faint-heartedness of the captain of the *Speedwell*, and, dismissing her, with numbers winnowed, 'the little band, not of resolute men only, but wives and children, a floating village, went on board the single ship, which was hired to convey them across the Atlantic.' Many attempts have been made to reproduce such memorable incidents in verse, none perhaps more interesting than the following, coming from the very time:—

In midst of all these woful stirs grave godly men sat musing,
 How they their talents might improve to honour God in using.
 Nine hundred leagues of roaring seas dishearten feeble parts,
 Till cruel handling hasten on, and God doth strengthen hearts.
 'Come,' quoth the husband, 'my dear wife, canst thou the seas endure,
 With all our young and tender babes? Let's put our faith in ure.'
 With watery eyes the wife replies, 'What remedy remains?'
 'Forsaking all for Christ his sake will prove the greatest gains.'
 Thus pass the people to their ships. Some grieve they should go free,
 But make them swear, and search them bare, and take what coin they see.
 And, being once on ocean large, whose depths the earth wide sever,
 Return no more, though winds them taught to end their course endeavour:
 In unknown depths and pathless seas their nights and days they spend;
 Midst stormy winds and mountain waves, long time no land they kenn'd:
 At ship's mast doth Christ's pastor preach while waves, like prelate browed,
 Would fling them from their pulpit place as not by them allowed;
 The swelling surges raging come to stop their mouths with foam
 For publishing of very truth that by God's word is known.
 But Christ, as once, now says, 'Peace, ye waves, be still;'
 For all their height they fall down flat, they must obey His will.
 Long-looked-for land at last they eye, unknown, yet own they will,
 To plant therein new colonies, wide wilderness to fill.

NOTE E, p. 92.

'Of all Charles's errors the most fatal to him was his misunderstanding of his own countrymen. They were loyal to the Crown, as they showed at Preston, and Dunbar, and Worcester. They were proud of seeing a prince of their own race on the English throne. As long as their religion was let alone, their lives and all that they had were at the disposal of their sovereign. But Charles chose to touch their allegiance to a still higher Sovereign,

and they became immovable as their own mountains. There is something humorous in the spectacle of an Archbishop Laud trying to teach such a people as this a better religion. He was the man who was to show Scotland how to say its prayers! No more memories of Knox and Melville; no more outpourings of the spirit and rash extempore addresses to the Almighty of ignorance and vanity; no more lay elders; no more General Assemblies. Scotland was to be once more decently ruled by bishops duly consecrated, the parish churches served by surpliced clerks, on whose heads the bishops' hands had rested. And there must be a liturgy and altars, and reverential music to generate correct "catholic" emotions, and canons of discipline and ecclesiastical courts to enforce them. . . In England, where the Church was composite, Laud had perhaps the letter of the law, or at least some show of law for himself. In Scotland he had no law at all, but when he heard how his liturgy had been received, he said merely that "he meant to be obeyed," and when he was told that he must back his orders there with 40,000 men, both he and the king thought it was both right and convenient that the 40,000 men should be raised and sent. To this intention the Scots replied with the ever-famous National Covenant, by which they declared "their sincere and unfeigned resolution, as they should answer to Jesus Christ in the great day, and under pain of God's everlasting wrath," to defend their national faith. The signing of the Covenant in Edinburgh on March 2, 1638, was perhaps the most remarkable scene in Scotland's remarkable history.'—*Edinburgh Review*, October 1882.

NOTE F, p. 102.

The following specimen of their barbarities has been recently brought under my notice:—

'Thomas Murray, minister of the Episcopal Church of Killelagh, was brutally massacred in the Irish Rebellion of 1641. It appears, by a petition presented by his widow to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland at St. Andrews, in 1642, that he was actually crucified on a tree; her two sons killed, and cut to pieces before her eyes; her own body frightfully cut and maimed in sundry parts; her tongue half cut out, and that she was kept in prison and inhumanly used by the rebels, from whom, at last, by God's merciful providence, she escaped, all which was testified

under the hands of the best nobles and councillors of the kingdom ; and humbly praying them to extend their charity to her, which was granted.—*The Hamilton Manuscripts*, edited by Dr. Lowry, 1867, p. 35, note. See also, E 112, No. 24.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSEMBLY.¹—Pp. 170, 171, 172.

The question is often asked, Is there any trustworthy engraving of the Assembly in session? and I am afraid it must be answered in the negative. Portraits of a number of the divines, arrayed as they were wont to appear in the pulpit, are still preserved, and there is a modern engraving professing to represent the Assembly in that stormy session when Nye made his famous speech against Presbytery. But it does not rest on any sure historical basis, nor give an accurate idea of the conclave as it really sat. It represents the divines as arrayed in gowns and as generally bareheaded, and in both these respects I think it is incorrect. Fuller tells us that Bishop Westfield and the episcopal divines, who appeared in their gowns and canonical habits, seemed the only nonconformists. Neal says that the most of the divines ‘came not in their canonical habits, but chiefly in black coats [or cloaks] and bands, in imitation of the foreign Protestants.’ The best aid therefore to a correct idea of the Assembly in session is probably furnished by the engraving of the French Synod prefixed to Vol. i. of Quick’s *Synodicon Gallie Reformatæ*, and by that prefixed to the account of the Dissenting Synod of Salter’s Hall in 1719. In both, the divines are represented as wearing not the academic gown or the modern so-called Geneva one, but the old Geneva cloak, and as retaining not only their skull-caps, but their high-crowned hats when seated in the Assembly. I think it was so also at Westminster, in regard to the hat as well as the cloak, both because that was the practice of the House of Commons, to which in most things they conformed, and also because Neal expressly includes among their earliest rules the following: ‘That all the members of the Assembly have liberty to be covered except the scribes.’ To these some time after the same indulgence was granted, and on 17th June 1645 the following additional rule was adopted: ‘That in case any member have occasion to be out of his place, that then he be *uncovered*’²

¹ It was on 21st September that the Assembly was authorised to remove to and at its last session in the following week that it ‘adjourned to Hierusalem chamber Monday morning [2d October] 10 o’clock.’

² *Minutes of the Assembly*, p. 105.

—that is undoubtedly, take off his hat, not his skull-cap. In the satirical pamphlets of the period, there are various references to the dress of the Puritan ministers, especially (with a portrait) in that entitled *The Assembly Man*: ‘His hands are not in his gloves, but his gloves in his hands. . . . His gown (I mean his cloak) reaches but his pockets. . . . His doublet and hose are of dark blue, a grain deeper than pure Coventry; but of late he’s in black.’ Their hair was generally cut close, according to a fashion now in vogue again, and the beard and moustache were often retained and carefully trimmed. The description applies chiefly to the younger men. The older members, I suppose, continued to have longer cloaks, and more flowing locks, and to wear the Elizabethan ruff rather than the broad band or falling collar. In E 95, No. 3, the following description is given of the Reformed minister: ‘His habit shall be a high-crowned hat, a black leather [skull] cap, a sad medley cloak, and jerkin of the same, violet hose, and russet stockings.’

NOTE G, p. 191.

Besides the extracts from the Minutes given in the text, the following are the authorities which seem to me to warrant this view of the Assembly’s attitude towards this question:—

1. *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, by sundry ministers of Christ within the City of London. ‘The third argument for the divine right of the mere *ruling elder* shall be drawn from 1 Tim. v. 17: “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they that labour in the word and doctrine.” From which words we may thus argue for the divine right of the *ruling elder*: *Major*—Whatsoever officers in the church are, according to the word of Christ, styled elders, invested with rule in the church, approved of God in their rule, and yet distinct from all them that labour in the word and doctrine, they are the ruling elders in the church (which we inquire after), and that *jure divino*. *Minor*—But the officers mentioned in 1 Tim. v. 17 are, according to the word of Christ, styled elders, [are] invested with rule in the church, approved of God in their rule and yet distinct from all them that labour in the word and doctrine.’ The detailed proofs and answers to exceptions extend to more than twenty pages.

2. *A Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry*, published by the ministers and elders met together in a Provincial

Assembly, November 2, 1649. 'The third text for the divine right of the *ruling elder* is 1 Tim. v. 17: "Let the elders that rule well," etc. . . . Now according to the grammatical construction, here are plainly held forth two sorts of elders, the one only ruling, and the other also labouring in word and doctrine. Give us leave to give you the true analysis of the words. 1. Here is a genus, a general, and that is elders. 2. Two distinct species or kinds of elders, *those that rule well*, and *those that labour in word and doctrine*. . . . 3. Here we have two participles, expressing these two kinds of elders—*ruling and labouring*; the first do only rule, the second do also labour in word and doctrine. 4. Here are two distinct articles distinctly annexed to these two participles *οι προεστῶτες*, *οι κοπιῶντες*, *they that rule*, *they that labour*. 5. Here is an eminent discrete particle set between these two kinds of elders, these two participles, these two articles evidently distinguishing the one from the other, viz., *μάλιστα*, *especially*.' The heads of the argument as well as the illustrations of the several heads, closely resemble some of the speeches made in the Assembly in 1643-4.

3. *A Model of Church Government*, by John Dury, one of the Assembly of Divines. '1. That *ruling elders* are officers in the church of God may be clearly gathered from Rom. xii. 8, 1 Tim. v. 17, and 1 Cor. xii. 28. 2. That they are officers distinct from other officers is also plain from the same places; chiefly from that of 1 Tim. v. 17, . . . for in [it] he doth mention two sorts of elders' (p. 19). See also *A Model of Church Government under the Gospel*, by a minister of London, approved by divers of his learned brethren: 'All elderships, consisting of preaching presbyters and other elders who do rule well, . . . are *jure divino*, 1 Tim. v. 17.'

4. *A Treatise of Ruling Elders*, by a minister of the Church of Scotland [James Guthrie, of Stirling], Edinburgh, 1652, reprinted 1699. 'The officers in the House of God, who in the Scriptures are called by the name of *elders*, are of several sorts. Preaching elders or ministers, teaching elders or doctors, and ruling or governing elders; all these three are oftentimes in the New Testament comprised under the general name of elder' (pp. 21, 22). Then, after reference to the mistake of those 'who, either out of ignorance or disdain, do call them lay elders, as if they were a part of the people only, and not to be reckoned among the officers of the Lord's House, whom the Popish church in their pride, and others following them, call the clergy' (p. 23), the author proceeds to treat of the institution of ruling elders, in which chapter,

after adducing other texts, he says: 'The third place of Scripture is 1 Tim. v. 17, . . . which text doth hold forth and distinguish two sorts of elders in the church, to whom the Lord Jesus hath committed the power of ruling; one sort who do also labour in the word and doctrine, to wit pastors and teachers; another sort who do only rule, . . . and these are the ruling elders of whom we speak' (p. 29).

5. Dickson's *Expositio Analytica omnium Apostolicarum Epistolarum*, Glasgux, 1645. His comment on 1 Tim. v. 17 is: 'Horum presbyterorum duos facit ordines: alterum eorum qui laborant in sermone et doctrina quales sunt pastores et doctores, alterum eorum qui bene quidem præsunt, i.e. gubernandæ ecclesiæ in vita et moribus incumbunt et non laborant in sermone et doctrina, quales sunt seniores qui gubernatores vocantur, 1 Cor. xii. 2; Rom. xii. 8' (p. 534). This work was published in 1647, with recommendatory notices by the Prolocutor and Assessors, and the Scotch Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly.

6. *Wylie's Abridgment of Rutherford's Catechism*. 'Q. How is Christ's Kirk ruled at this time under the gospel? By his office-bearers, doctors that opens up the word, pastors that presses it upon the hearers, elders that rules in discipline, and deacons that cares for the poor.'

7. Rutherford's *Due Right of Presbyteries*. '1 Tim. v. 17. The elders who rule well are worthy of double honour, etc. This place speaketh clear for ruling elders' (p. 142). On p. 145 he gives, as he had done in one of his speeches in the Assembly, the same five reasons as are given above in No. 2 for so expounding this text, and enters into a long argument in defence of the last of these reasons. In his later work on the *Divine Right of Excommunication and Church Government*, he again (pp. 432, 434) expresses his adherence to this interpretation of the text, and refers to what he had previously said in support of it.

8. *CXI. Propositions concerning the Ministry and Government of the Church*, by George Gillespie. 'This ecclesiastical government, distinct from the civil, is from God committed, not to the whole body of the Church or congregation of the faithful, or to be exercised both by officers and people, but to the ministers of God's word, together with the elders which are joined with them for the care and government of the church.—1 Tim. v. 17.'

9. *Christian Concord or Agreement of the Associated Churches and Pastors of Worcestershire*. Baxter's own opinions are well known;

and therefore it is the stronger proof that there were those even in that district who held the presbyter theory of the elder's office, that he should have found it necessary to express himself in the following tolerant terms:—'It having been the custom of the church in the Apostles' day to have ordinarily many officers in a church, . . . we therefore judge it needful to use all lawful means to procure more ministers or elders than one in each church, even proportionally to the number of souls, and if not learned men and supported by the public maintenance, then less learned labouring at their callings, and taking private duties of the pastorate, and *as long as we agree that these elders are ordained church officers, and what shall be their work there need be no breach among us, though we determine not of their power in sacraments, and whether their office be the same with the teaching elders.* Whilst we agree in practice, we may leave men's several principles in such a difficult controverted point to their own judgment.' See also Hatch's *Bamp. Lect.*, pp. 54, 76.

NOTE H, p. 195.

'That the magistrate is not obliged to execute the decrees of the church without further examination, whether they be right or wrong, as the Papists teach that the magistrate is to execute the decrees of their Popish councils with a blind obedience . . . is clear. 1st. Because if, in hearing the word, all should follow the example of the men of Berea, . . . try whether that which concerneth their conscience be agreeable to the Scriptures or no, and accordingly receive or reject; so in all things of discipline, the magistrate is to try by the word whether he ought to add his sanction to those decrees which the church gives out for edification. . . . 2d. The magistrate and all men have a command to try all things, *ergo*, to try the decrees of the church. . . . 3d. We behoved [otherwise] to lay down this Popish ground, that the church cannot err in their decrees. . . . Whoever impute this to us who have suffered for nonconformity, and, upon this ground that synods can err, refused the ceremonies, are to consult with their own conscience whether this be not to make us appear disloyal and odious to magistracy in that which we never thought, far less presumed to teach and profess it to the world.'—Rutherford's *Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication*, pp. 596, 597. Even more noteworthy are the utterances of Gillespie, when striving to vindicate

against the reasonings and gibes of the Erastians, that more free and independent government of the church from which they feared so many evils and oppressions. 'I dare confidently say,' he affirms, 'that, if comparisons be rightly made, presbyterial government is the most limited and least arbitrary government of any in the world.' And after entering into details to make good this affirmation as regards the Papal and Prelatical forms of government, he proceeds to maintain that Independents must needs be supposed to exercise much more arbitrary and unlimited power than the Presbyterians do, because they exempt individual congregations from all control and correction by superior courts, and because one of their three grand principles '*disclaimeth that binding of themselves for the future, unto their present judgment and practice, and avoucheth the keeping of this reserve to alter and retract.* By which it appeareth that their way will not suffer them to be so far . . . bounded within certain particular rules (I say not with others but even among themselves) as the Presbyterian way will admit of.' He denies that, in claiming a distinct government for the church, the Presbyterians meant to deprive the Christian magistrate of that power and authority in matters of religion which the word of God and the Confessions of the Reformed Churches recognised as belonging to him. On the contrary, he maintains that not only in extraordinary cases, 'when church-government doth degenerate into tyranny, ambition, and avarice,' or those who manage it make defection from the truth, the Christian magistrate may, and ought to 'do divers things in and for religion, and interpose his authority divers ways, so as doth not properly belong to his cognisance, decision, and administration ordinarily,' and in a well-constituted church; but also that in ordinary cases he is free to act as his own conscience directs, in giving or refusing his sanction to the discipline of the church, and that if he is offended at any sentence given by its courts, they ought to be ready to give him an account of their proceedings, and by all means to endeavour to satisfy his conscience, or otherwise to be warned or rectified if themselves have erred.—Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod Blossoming, etc.*, Bk. ii, ch. iii.

NOTE I, p. 211.

Professor Masson has frankly admitted that the Church of England was more tolerant than the Church of Rome, and Scottish

Presbyterianism or Scottish Puritanism was more tolerant (though the reverse is usually asserted) than the Church of England prior to 1640; he might have added, prior to 1688, whatever may have been the *theoretical* sentiments of Jeremy Taylor. The ordinance against blasphemies and heresies, harsh and cruel as it seems to us, was not a tightening, but a relaxation, of the old law, and the restraint without law formerly practised, but put in temporary abeyance, by the abolition of the Court of High Commission, and of the office of bishop. Offenders were no longer to be punishable for opinions *held*, but for opinions *deliberately expressed*. They were not obliged to clear themselves by oath as in the Court of High Commission, but must be convicted by the testimony of two credible witnesses, or by their own voluntary confession. The charge must be prosecuted and proved in the civil courts within a limited time, and, as I take it, at least in graver cases, before a jury. Cromwell himself, when at the height of his power, deemed it necessary to set limits to toleration and the freedom of church courts; and even when the Toleration Act was passed at the Revolution it was so, not in general or latitudinarian terms, but to the definite and limited extent required to meet the cases of the Puritans, the Baptists, and the Quakers. King William III., though probably as wise a monarch as ever sat on the throne of Britain, gave his assent to an Act for suppressing blasphemy and profaneness, by which it was provided that if any persons having been educated in, or at any time having made profession of, the Christian religion within this realm, should by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be God, or should assert or maintain there are more Gods than one, or should deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine authority, he should the first time be subject to severe legal disabilities, and the second should suffer imprisonment for three years. Tillotson's successor in the see of Canterbury wrote in support of these Acts and the king's injunctions. The melancholy words of Rutherford so often quoted, were but the echo of those of the judicious Hooker (Bk. viii.) that in matters of faith, 'law should set down a certainty which no man afterwards is to gainsay.' The more melancholy words of the Lancashire ministers, that such a toleration as the sectaries then demanded 'would be the putting of a sword into a madman's hand, a cup of poison into the hand of a child, a letting loose of madmen with firebrands

in their hands ; an appointing of a city of refuge in men's consciences for the devil to fly to, a laying of a stumbling-block before the blind, a proclaiming liberty to the wolves to come into Christ's fold to prey upon the lambs,' etc., were but the rhetorical concentration of various utterances of the gentle Burroughs, cropping up here and there in his treatise on *Heart Divisions* : ' If there were a company of madmen running up and down the streets with knives and swords in their hands, . . . must we do nothing to restrain them ? The devil must not be let alone though he get into men's consciences. God hath appointed no city of refuge for him ; if he flee to men's consciences as Joab to the horns of the altar, he must be fetched from thence, or fallen upon there.' Nay, the more clear-headed Owen, in a sermon preached before Cromwell's Parliament in 1652, is found thus indoctrinating them : ' Know that error and falsehood have no right or title from God or man unto any privilege, protection, advantage, liberty, or any good thing you are entrusted withal : to dispose that unto a lie, which is the right of and due to truth, is to deal treacherously with Him by whom you are employed ; all the tenderness and forbearance unto such persons as are infected with such abominations is solely upon a civil account, and that plea which they have for tranquillity whilst neither directly nor morally they are a disturbance unto others,'—that is, as even the Lancashire ministers admitted, they are not to be disturbed so long as they keep their opinions to themselves, but they have no right to propagate them at their pleasure.¹ So much of matters of opinion

¹ According to Baxter, Owen, Goodwin, Simpson, and Nye were chiefly concerned in drawing up the list of Fundamentals which the Parliament of 1654 wished to impose on all who claimed toleration. Neal (vol. iv. pp. 98-100) gives sixteen of them. The Journal of the House of Commons speaks of twenty, but inserts only the first—on Holy Scripture—which alone had been passed when Cromwell dissolved the Parliament, and in considerably longer form than the Committee had proposed :—

That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God and the only rule of knowing him savingly and living unto him in all holiness and righteousness in which we must rest ; which Scriptures whoso doth not believe, but, rejecting them, doth, instead thereof, betake himself to any other way of discovering the mind of God, cannot be saved.

That the Holy Scripture is that rule of knowing God and living unto Him, which whoso does not believe cannot be saved.

or belief. As to matters of practice, he continues : ‘ Know that in things of practice as of persuasion, that are impious and wicked either in themselves or in their natural and unconstrained consequences, the plea of conscience is an aggravation of the crime ; if men’s consciences are seared and themselves given up to a reprobate mind to do those things that are not convenient, there is no doubt but they ought to suffer such things as to such practices are assigned and appointed.’ But perhaps the strangest of all the strange utterances on this subject is that contained in a pamphlet published at London in 1652, and entitled *The Key of True Policy or a Free Dispute concerning the conservation of lately obtained liberty*. It professes to be the production of a Scotchman, but apparently of one who had espoused Republican principles, who boldly adopts the line of argument which an able reviewer in our own day has attributed to the Presbyterians and the majority of the Long Parliament. It is thus he argues (p. 9) : ‘ It is an old maxim in philosophy, *Sublata causa tollitur effectus*. And consequently such unprofitable and noisome members being put aside one way or other, it removeth the non-security and danger obtained liberty is exposed to. Will you tell me, is he not a desperate and unskilful physician who will take it on him to cure the body and not remove the cause of the disease ? That verily is to build without a foundation. What madness is it to go about to secure purchased liberty, and not remove the cause of its non-security ? Truly it is so much, as to keep fire in the bosom, and not to be burned, to touch pitch and not be defiled, to keep the thief in the house and the throat not to be cut, and to keep a viper in the bosom and not to be stinged. Oh ! shall liberty be preserved as long as its enemies are free ? No, verily. They will be still conspiring and taking crafty counsel against it. So long as the son of Jesse liveth they will never think themselves secure, and that their kingdom shall be established. And therefore, Saul-like, they will still fall a-persecuting David. Nay, let me tell you, *those become decessory to their own hurt and ruin, who would not destroy the destroyers of their liberties*. Thus they become negative cut-throats and burrios to themselves. But to prevent bondage and slavery, it is good, it is good to root out those who go about to destroy our liberty. Otherwise we abuse the power God and nature have conferred on us to maintain and defend our own liberties against our adversaries.’ He then proceeds to offer his judgment in particulars as follows :—‘ 1st. All malignant and formal Presby-

terian incendiaries should one way or other be rooted out if we mind to maintain our own liberties inviolable. This is evident from what is already said, for *they* are the very enemies by whom the Lord's people in the three nations only stand in hazard. They indeed are the *Canaanites* whom the Lord hath commissioned to destroy. They verily are the inhabitants of the land, and therefore must be rooted out. . . . They are bears robbed of their whelps, and therefore they will never be satisfied till they be destroyed. They are *Amalek* indeed, they lay in wait, while as the Lord's people in Britain came out of the spiritual Egypt from under the Episcopal and Malignant yoke, *And therefore their name deserveth to be razed from under heaven.* 2. Albeit all such should be rooted out and destroyed, yet not one and the same way. They should be dealt with according to their guilt. Some of them who are prime incendiaries and leading men should be finally cut off. Others again of them who are not so deep in the guilt, deserve not physically but politically to be cut off, *i. e.* (as Artaxerxes saith, Ezra v. 26) either by banishment or imprisonment, or confiscation of goods, according to their desert.' To the objection that this would make a pretty clean sweep in Scotland where such men were the more numerous party, and where few or none even of the 'godly' were for the English interest, and where their action could not be said to be *illegal* even when it was hostile, the author replies (p. 21) : 'If the Parliament of England look not more to conscience and duty than quirks and law formality, they will be forced to condemn the best and weightiest of all their proceedings. I wonder if law-quirks taught a handful of godly men in the nation to turn a king off his throne, to cut off his head, to banish his son, to cut off the peers of the land, to turn out betrayers of their trusts and such like? I trow not; I believe duty only led them on to such things. Oh! shall not duty as yet lead them on to proceed against their and our implacable enemies? . . . Hath he not rented the kingdom from Saul for sparing Agag, and given it to them? Will they spare him too? No, I hope, as Samuel, they will hew him in pieces. The Lord put it in their hearts so to do.' This is the only pamphlet of the period in which I remember to have met with this famous simile. It proceeded not from sober-minded Puritan in time of peace, nor from maddened Covenanter in the day of sore distress, but from a fanatic sectary or rabid Protestor in the day of his triumph, and was adduced to encourage harsh measures, not against Papists and Prelatists, but against

the Presbyterians, his fellow-countrymen and fellow-covenanters. They, in his eyes, were the Canaanites, the Amalekites, the Ammonites, the Joab and Shimei, whom King Solomon was to cut off,—nay, apparently the Saul who spared Agag and the Agag who was spared rolled into one. No comment on this production could well be more cutting than that which I find written in an old hand on the copy of it now before me :—

‘To hang all Scots, the doom is sad ;
Better it were to hang the dog that’s mad.’

NOTE K, p. 257.

1. *Act of General Assembly approving the Propositions concerning Kirk Government and Ordination of Ministers*—‘ . . . And now the Assembly having thrice read and diligently examined the Propositions (hereunto annexed) concerning the officers, assemblies, and government of the Kirk, and concerning the ordination of ministers brought unto us as the results of the long and learned debates of the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster, and of the Treaty of Uniformity with the Commissioners of this Kirk there residing : after mature deliberation, . . . doth agree to and approve the Propositions aforementioned, touching Kirk government and ordination, and doth hereby authorise the Commissioners of this Assembly who are to meet at Edinburgh to agree to and conclude in the name of this Assemblie, an uniformity betwixt the Kirks of both kingdoms in the aforementioned particulars, so soon as the same shall be ratified without any substantial alteration by an Ordinance of the Honourable Houses of the Parliament of England.’ The Assembly excepted from their Act, and reserved the liberty of further discussion, respecting the right of the doctor to administer the sacraments and the respective rights of presbyteries and people in the calling of ministers.

2. *Extract from Act approving of the Confession of Faith*.—‘ But lest our intention and meaning be in some particulars misunderstood, it is hereby expressly declared and provided that the not mentioning in this Confession the several sorts of ecclesiastical officers and assemblies shall be no prejudice to the truth of Christ in these particulars to be expressed fully in the *Directory* of government.’

3. *Ratification of the Propositions for Church Government, Ordination of Ministers, and of the Act of Assembly thereanent.*—‘The Estates of Parliament now convened in the second session of this first Triennial Parliament, by virtue of the last Act of the last Parliament, holden by His Majesty and three Estates *in Anno* 1641, after public reading of the following propositions concerning Kirk government and ordination of ministers, together with the Act of General Assembly approving the same, DO UNANIMOUSLY ratify and approve the said Propositions according to the said Act of General Assembly, to the which Act the Estates do hereby add the authority of Parliament, and ordaine the same to have the strength and force of a law in all time coming.’ This Act was not contained in former collections of the Scotch Acts, nor printed till the original register of the Parliament of 1645 was discovered a short time ago, and printed in full in the last edition of vol. vi. of Thomson’s Acts of the Scottish Parliament.

NOTE M (1), p. 333.—CALVIN’S RELATION TO ENGLISH REFORMERS.

A vast amount of unchristian temper and unseemly bitterness has been expended on the discussion of this question, and the reformer of Geneva in particular has been loaded with an amount of abuse and misrepresentation more than sufficient to save him for ever from the woe denounced against those of whom all men speak well. *Sed sis tua sorte contentus, O magne Calvine!* One must read the impassioned diatribes which were fashionable sixty or eighty years ago, to be able to understand the noble courage and candour of Bishop Horsley when he uttered the words, ‘I hold the memory of Calvin in high veneration; his works have a place in my library, and in the study of the Scriptures he is one of the commentators I frequently consult.’ And one cannot but rejoice that in our own day Dean Perowne has expressed himself in still stronger terms. It would require not a note or even a lecture, but a volume, to deal with these misrepresentations in detail, and that may safely be left to some true-hearted successor of Toplady, or Thomas Scott, or Bishop Waldegrave, who still deems it the highest commendation of his Church that she is one of the fairest daughters of the Reformation. All that I feel called to do is to put in a demurrer to such misrepresentations, and to state briefly two or three pleas in support of it. It is said the xviiith Article *cannot* be meant of a *decretum*

absolutum of a predestination in the Augustinian or in the Calvinistic sense, but in that of the later Lutherans or Arminians, for it was with the Lutherans that the English Reformers were specially intimate, and from them, or through them, that some of their offices and several of their Articles came to them. One may leave on one side the offices with the remark that, so far as they came from the Nuremberg Liturgy, they came through the *Consultatio* of Herman, Archbishop of Cologne. In the preparation of that Bucer was quite as much concerned as Melancthon, and Bucer was a predestinarian of the Augustinian school, who probably would have considered himself entitled to harmonise his views on baptismal regeneration with his views on predestination in the same way as Bishop Carleton and others did in the next century,¹ and Mr. Gorham in the nineteenth. If any parts of the Burial Service came through Lutheran formularies, they came from ancient Western sources, reaching back to a time when Augustinianism, which affirmed the perseverance of all the predestinate, but not of all the regenerate, was the prevailing faith of the Western Church. With respect to doctrinal formularies, even if one were to grant all that has been advanced as to the close connection of the English Reformers with the Lutherans and their less close connection with Calvin and the Swiss, it would still remain to be pointed out—*1st*, That at the time the Augsburg Confession was composed, Melancthon, as well as Luther, was still Augustinian, and that good authorities in our own day affirm that Luther remained so to the last, as did Flacius Illyricus, Schnepff, Heshusius, and some others of his followers. *2d*, That Brentz, who had the chief hand in drawing up the Württemberg Confession (which in several articles seems in 1563 to have been followed by the English), though not a pronounced Augustinian himself, framed it when doing his utmost to preserve a good understanding with the more moderate of the Reformed, especially with Bucer and Martyr, and with others, of their school still remaining at Strasburg; that his Confession was accepted by that free city, and that it was probably from thence, through Jewell, it found its way into England before 1563. John ab Ulmis had been employed to translate a Strasburg Confession into Latin for Cranmer. *3d*, That it is only in Articles as to which Lutherans and Reformed were agreed, that a real similarity can be traced between the Edwardian Articles and the Augsburg or the early German Confessions.

¹ *Examination of an Appeal to Cæsar*, pp. 96, 97.

None of these have an article on predestination, nor does any other Lutheran Confession, as Dr. Dörner tells us, have it. Nor can any such marked similarity be traced between this Article and any of the definitions of Melancthon or of any Lutheran doctor of the Synergistic school. The only resemblance traceable is to certain expressions in the treatise of Luther on the Epistle to the Romans, and that, as already stated, was written while he was still a pronounced Augustinian, and teaches distinctly the Augustinian or predestinarian view.

But it cannot be granted that the intimacy between the English and the Swiss Reformers was only formed during the later Marian times. Had the English exiles been regarded as Lutherans when driven from their own country, they would have been received with open arms by their co-religionists in Germany. But the very reverse was the fact. The strict Lutherans afforded them no shelter, shewed them but little kindness, and were not appealed to in their differences. We do not find even the gentle Melancthon specially exerting himself in their behalf, nor them resorting to him for counsel. Nor was it to him that the thoughts of those in prison in England turned. Hooper's recourse was still to his old friend Bullinger, and the one letter Cranmer is known to have written from his prison was addressed to his old and much trusted friend Martyr. Even in 1551-52, it was not to Melancthon, but to Bullinger, that those who were exercised about predestination, and desired further counsel than the writings of Calvin and the teaching of Martyr supplied, were disposed to turn. Traheron or Trehern, tutor to the young Duke of Suffolk, the intimate friend and associate of Cheke, the young King's tutor, and, like him, a member of the sub-committee of the Ecclesiastical Commission, wrote to Bullinger on the question in the following terms:— 'There are certain individuals here who lived among you some time, and who assert that you lean too much to Melancthon's views. But the greater number among us (*plurimi*), of whom I own myself to be one, embrace the opinion of John Calvin as being perspicuous and most agreeable to holy Scripture.' Then after thanking God that Calvin's treatise against Pighius on this question had appeared at the very time when it had begun to be agitated among them, he adds:— 'We confess that he has thrown much light upon the subject, or rather so handled it as that we have never before seen anything more learned or more plain.' Bullinger, some time before, had concluded with Calvin and the Genevese a

consensus on the subject of the sacraments, in the xvith Article of which the topic of election was touched on, but, though it was so in the most guarded terms, its bearing was so obvious that Melancthon is said '*confodisse eum articulum*' in the copy sent him. In the letter Bullinger sent to Traheron he states, even more decisively than in the *consensus*, that faith foreseen is not the cause, but the consequence of election, though still refusing to follow Calvin in his teaching on the subject of reprobation: 'Electionis et prædestinationis causa non est alia quam bona et justa Dei voluntas indebite salvantis electos debite autem damnantis . . . reprobos.' '*Interim fidem ceu opus nostrum non constituimus causam electionis quasi propter fidem quam in nobis prævidit Deus nos elegerit sed gratiæ Dei tribuimus electionem et salutem . . . Etenim Paulus non dicit Deum elegisse nos quod credituri eramus sed ut crederemus; unde et Augustinus sumpsisse videtur quod dixit, Non quia credimus ipse nos elegit sed ut credamus ne priores videamus ipsum elegisse.*' This letter, written in March 1553, can hardly have arrived in England in time to be used in the framing of the xviiith Article. It was not altogether to the mind of Traheron and those who thought with him, as appears by his reply, which, as well as his previous letter, is given at length among the Parker Society's original letters relating to the English Reformation (pp. 324-328). But it really concedes almost all that is maintained as dogma in the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, even those of them composed or approved by Calvin, though not all that he, Bucer, Beza, Martyr, and Knox deemed themselves warranted as private doctors to inculcate. So much importance was attached to it by Bullinger, that he had copies of it, evidently meant to be shown to others, sent to Hooper and to Martyr, who in reply informed him that, though not agreeing with him altogether, he had been especially on his guard in treating on that subject, 'lest men should cast all their faults and sins upon God, or derive from the will of God an excuse for their wickedness,' as would appear when his commentaries on the Romans were published, as he hoped they would be that same year. 'May God,' he adds, 'grant us all so to feel respecting predestination, that what ought to be the greatest consolation to believers may not become the painful subject of pernicious contention.'

Neither was Calvin himself so little known nor so lightly esteemed in England at that time as some have represented. He was in high repute with the young King, the Protector, and several

of the reforming nobles, with Cheke the King's tutor, and Traheron, as well as with Knox, Martyr, à Lasco, and the other foreigners then helping on the work in England. Bishop Coverdale, when in exile, had translated from the Latin his treatise on the Lord's Supper, which had commended his views on that subject to favour and acceptance, just as, we know from Traheron, his treatises on predestination were commending to favour his views on the only other subject then occasioning difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed. The treatise in answer to Pighius, which was published in the very beginning of 1552, is the one specially referred to by him, but that was not the first in which he had handled this subject, nor the first which had reached England. His commentary on the Romans, which was published in 1539, was well known, and in it he had treated on predestination in the same spirit as Martyr subsequently did. His *Institutions* were not unknown, and in the second edition of that work, issued in 1539, a distinct chapter was assigned to this subject, which in the fifth edition, issued in 1550, was further enlarged, and so much run on that, without the author's consent, it was published separately the same year. It is not unusual yet to represent Cranmer as by no means on the most friendly footing with Calvin, and but half-reluctantly inviting him to that great council of the chief Reformers which he was so desirous to assemble. It is also represented that the main, if not the only object that council was intended to accomplish, was to heal the divisions that had arisen among Protestants on the subject of the Lord's Supper. But the letters of the Primate, and none of them more decisively than his letter to Melanchthon himself, show that the Confession, or *consensus*, was meant to embrace the whole circle of Christian doctrine. Strype expressly includes the question of predestination among others. When obliged reluctantly to abandon or postpone his grander scheme, he intimated his intention to press on without further delay the lesser one of preparing such a confession for his own Church, and strenuously proceeding in the reformation of manners as well as doctrine. This he did in a letter to the much maligned Calvin, who had shown himself more ready to second his efforts for the council, as well as for a closer civil league among Protestant States, than either Bullinger or Melanchthon had ventured to do. This letter, so far as I know, has only been recovered in our own day, and printed by the Strasburg theologians who are re-editing the works of Calvin with such loving care. For English-

speaking churches, no more valuable addition has for long been made to our knowledge of the esteem in which he was really held by those who were engaged in the noble enterprise of reviving the life and restoring the purity of the English Church. Archbishop Laurence has much to say of his 'bold temerity,' and 'love of hypothesis,' as perhaps exceeding both his piety and his learning, and the entire want of community of spirit between him and the Reformers of the English Church, and what he has said many lesser men since have repeated with still greater bitterness and scorn. Here is how the honoured primate, who, more than any other, determined the character of that church, wrote to him in the autumn of 1552. No more noble or brotherly letter ever went to foreign Protestant from Lambeth Palace:—

'Et pietate et eruditione præstanti viro D. Joanni Calvino, amico suo dilecto.—Quod consilium meum laudas de conventu doctissimorum et optimorum virorum in Anglia habendo, ut posteris traderetur de reformatæ doctrinæ capitibus, juxta scripturæ normam consensus, et studium operamque tuam ad hoc institutum perficiendum alacri animo offers, recte tu quidem mea sententia judicasti, et ad Dei gloriam propagandam voluntatem te habere propensissimam non obscuris argumentis declarasti. Atque utimam daretur facultas ad effectum perducendi hoc quod ecclesiæ tam utile judicamus. Verum multa sunt quæ in animum meum inducunt hanc nostram deliberationem irritam fore: tum quod D. Philippus ad meas literas nihil hactenus rescipsit, tum quod D. Bullingerus respondet se vereri ne frustra de convocando concilio deliberemus hoc tempore, in quo Germania bello sic divexatur ut neque sibi neque D. Philippo consultum sit ecclesias suas relinquere. Quare hæc consultatio aut prorsus omittenda aut in aliud tempus magis opportunum differenda videtur. Interim nos ecclesiam Anglicam pro virili reformabimus dabimusque operam ut et dogmata et mores juxta sacrarum literarum regulam corrigantur. Dominus Jesus te gubernet et tueatur ad suam gloriam et ecclesiæ ædificationem. Vale. Tuus quantus est.—T. CANT.

'LAMBETHII, 4 Octobris 1552.'

Sir John Cheke's letter, of 22d May 1553, 'Homini doctissimo ac pientissimo et mecum multis de causis conjunctissimo,' is even more laudatory, and speaks of a 'conjunctio doctrinæ,' as well as of a 'societas humanitatis et ingenii.'

NOTE M (2), p. 336.

MARTYR'S STATEMENTS, ETC. ANGLICAN ARTICLES OF 1553.

Nostra enim [sacramenta] . . . numero pauciora actu faciliora intellectu augustissima, observatu castissima et significatione præstantissima. — *Augustinus citatus in commentario Martyris*, p. 118.

Multi satis habent si contemplati fuerint, etc. (*ut postea*). Nemo enim sumendo sacramenta gratiam ullam recipit quam fide non percipiat . . . neque vi, ut loquuntur, operis operati quicquam ex eis accedat (salutem afferant) Vox ea peregrina est nec auditur usquam in sacris literis (123).—Qui enim sacramenta percipit vel dignè vel indigne accedit: si indignè nil habet nisi damnum et jacturam, si digne, igitur fide viva qua percipit representatam gratiam.—494.

Neque tantum sunt signa nostrarum actionum sed etiam promissionis et voluntatis Dei ejusque oblationes. Et Spiritus Sanctus istis utitur ad animos nostros excitandos.—117.

Sunt quidem et hi sacramentorum fines, ut notæ sint ac tesseræ Christianæ professionis et societatis sive fraternitatis . . . vera gratiæ suæ testimonia et sigilla ut per ea nobis gratiam suam testetur Deus, representet atque obsignet.—*Formula Consensus Tigurini*.

Dominus Noster Jesus Christus sacramentis numero paucissimis observatu facillimis significatione præstantissimis societatem novi populi colligavit sicuti est baptismus et cœna Domini.

Sacramenta non instituta sunt a Christo ut spectarentur aut circumferuntur, sed ut rite illis uteremur; et in his duntaxat qui dignè percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum, idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato, quæ vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota sic parit sensum minime pium, sed admodum superstitiosum: qui vero indigne percipiunt damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

Sacramenta per verbum Dei instituta non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum sed certa quædam, potius testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat verum etiam confirmat.

Neque illi satis dicunt qui arbitrantur . . . cœnam Domini signum tantum esse Christianæ benevolentiae et officiorum mutuae charitatis . . . caput et summam in hoc ponimus quod obsignet nobis Dei dona et promissiones quas ille offert fide apprehendendas (113), ut ibi mors Domini commemoraretur et communicantes fructum ejus perciperent et Christo conjungerentur (34) gratiam reconciliationem et remissionem peccatorum. Falluntur ergo illi qui putant transubstantiationem, etc. (*ut postea*).

Tollenda est quaelibet localis praesentiae imaginatio. Tametsi enim philosophice loquendo supra caelos locus non est; quia tamen corpus Christi, ut fert humani corporis natura et modus, finitum est et caelo ut loco continetur necesse est a nobis tanto locorum intervallo distare quanto caelum abest a terra.—*Form. Cons. Tig.*

Non tamen sentiendam est corpus Christi tam late fundi quam late patet divinitas ejus. Illud enim ut humanae naturae conditio requirit, certo ac definito loco continetur qui est caelum . . . ut articulus de ascensione fidem facit (350). Falluntur ergo illi qui putant vel transubstantiationem vel praesentiam Christi in Eucharistia quasi ex illius carne quam, ut illi volunt, realiter manducamus (realiter et corporaliter percipimus (306), aeternam vitam hausturi sumus.—305.

Cæna Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque adeo rite digne et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi. Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest sed a pertis scripturae verbis adversatur et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Quum naturae humanae veritas requirat ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non possit sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus in multis et diversis locis eodem tempore praesens esse non potest et quoniam ut tradunt sacrae literae, Christus in caelum fuit sublatus, et ibi usque ad finem seculi est permansurus non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis realem et corporalem (ut loquuntur) praesentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri. Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non servabatur, conferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

Elevatio, etc., non parvam occasionem idololatriæ præbent. (*Martyr in Ep. ad Cor. p. 162*). Qua in re multum peccatur hodie . . . satisque habent homines si contemplati fuerint genuflexerint atque adoraverint.

Ministri malitia non vitiat sacramenta, etc. (p. 118).

Sacrificium unicum nostræ salutis perfectum est per mortem Christi Jesu servatoris nostri in ara crucis (492), una enim ejus mors satis fuit ad omnia peccata expianda.

Sacrifici qui illud sacrificium suis missis et superstitiosis et impiis susurris nobis applicent . . . Christum offerre pro aliis omnino commentum est (296).

Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

Ministorum malitia non tollit efficaciam institutionum divinarum, etc.

De unicâ Christi oblatione in cruce perfecta. Oblatio Christi semel facta perfecta est redemptio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi tum originalibus quam actualibus : neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pænæ aut culpæ pro vivis et defunctis figmenta sunt et perniciosæ imposturæ.

NOTE TO PAGE 369.

THE first part of the following elegy on the older members of the Assembly is found appended to more than one funeral sermon. I give part of it from the funeral sermon on Vines, contained in E 870 :—

'That venerable Synod, which of late
Was made the object of men's scorn and hate,
(For want of copes and mitres, not of graces),
Are now called up, like Moses ; and their faces,
When they return, shall shine. God sees it fit,
Such an Assembly should in glory sit.
The learned Twisse went first (it was his right),
Then holy Palmer, Burroughs, Love, Gouge, White,
Hill, Whitaker, grave Gataker, and Strong,
Perne, Marshall, Robinson, all gone along.
I have not named them half. Their only strife

Hath been (of late) who shall first part with life ;
 Those few, who yet survive, sick of this age,
 Long to have done their parts and leave the stage.
 Our English Luther, Vines, whose death I weep,
 Stole away (and said nothing) in a sleep.
 Sweet (like a swan) he preached that day he went,
 And for his cordial took a sacrament ;
 Had it but been suspected he would die,
 His people sure had stopped him with their cry.'

The elegy on Ussher in E 875, almost exceeds the bounds of legitimate laudation. I can find room only for a few lines :—

'This was the man so just, so stout, so sage,
 The shame and glory of our sinful age.
 How said I? *Man?* That epithet's too mean.
 Armagh was more ; the miracle of men.
 Could he be less, who was both learned and meek ?
 Could he be less, who self did never seek ?
 Could he be less, who knew no guile, no gall ;
 Wise as a serpent, yet a dove withal ?
 Could he be less, who knew no kind of pride,
 And yet knew more than all the land beside ?
 His intellect scorned to be confined by Dover,
 Bravely expatiating the whole world over,
 Beyond the common *ne plus ultra*, he
 (Like Drake ambitious of discovery),
 Sailed still on, bounded by no degree
 On this side of universality,
 Storing his country with more noble prize
 Than that which in the Western climate lies ;
 America doth no such mines contain,
 As those comprised in the Indies of his brain.

NOTE N, p. 377.

The full title of this remarkable book is, '*A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace: wherein the gradual breakings out of Gospel-grace from Adam to Christ are clearly discovered, the differences betwixt the Old and New Testament are laid open, divers errors of Arminians and others are confuted; the nature of uprightness, and the way of Christ in bringing the soul into communion with Himself: together with many other points, both doctrinally and practically profitable, are solidly handled.* By that faithful servant of Jesus Christ and minister of the Gospel JOHN BALL . . . London, 1645.' The following is the table of the contents of the several chapters :—I. *Of the first part.*—1. Of the signification of the word

left this refuge when he wrote the *Paradise Lost*. At least in the passage I have quoted, and some others in the poem, there seems to me more affinity to the opinions of that school than of any other. The opinion, that while God has given sufficient grace to all, he gives peculiar grace to some who of His will are elect above the rest, seems akin to their teaching.

NOTE O, p. 424.

I intended to exhibit at length in this note the correspondences between the rules given in the Larger Catechism for the explication of the Divine Law, and those found in the earlier treatises of Perkins, Attersoll, Ball, and Ussher. I must refrain, however, from inserting these. Any one who will compare the rules as first inserted in the *Minutes of the Assembly* with the form in which they appear in the earlier treatises will see at a glance how closely the Westminster Divines followed in the wake of their predecessors.

NOTE, p. 368.—EARLY EDITIONS OF THE CONFESSION
OF FAITH.

The first three impressions of the Confession, as stated on the above page, were meant for the private use of the members of the English Parliament,¹ and the Assembly of Divines, and copies of them are still to be found in the British Museum (E 366 (?), E 368, E 516). From the third impression, but with certain variations preserved in most Scottish editions, 300 copies were reprinted in Edinburgh for the use of the members of the Scottish Assembly of 1647 (St. Andrews University Library, and in other libraries in Scotland). After the Confession was adopted by that Assembly, one edition appears to have been published before the close of 1647 (E 418, No. 12). A copy of this and of the London edition No. 3 is in the Advocates' Library at Edinburgh. In the same year the Confession, in the form approved by the English Houses, was published at London with the title *Articles of Christian Religion*, etc., as on p. 368. Principal Lee seems to have doubted if it was ever published in this form, but copies exist both in the British Museum (116 f, 19, E 449, T. 1918^s) and in the Bodleian; and another copy has recently been offered for sale in London.

¹ In E 388, No. 6, it is expressly stated that 'the members subscribed their names to the receipt' of their copies.

These are all in *quarto*. Another edition in octavo or 12mo was published at Edinburgh in 1648, with the following title: '*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster concerning (1) a Confession of Faith, (2) a Larger Catechism, (3) a Shorter Catechism.* Presented by them lately to both Houses of Parliament' (3505 bb, Brit. Mus.) It was probably from one of the Scottish editions, that those published by Bostock at London in the same year were taken. They are—1st, '*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, etc.* [as in No. 3, above], Printed for Robert Bostock at the King's Head, Paul's Churchyard 1648' (116 f, 20). At the end it has '*Imprimatur James Crawford, December 7, 1647.*' 2nd, '*The Confession of Faith, and Catechisms agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster to be a part of uniformity in religion, between the Churches of Christ in the Three Kingdoms.* London, Printed for R. B. etc. [as above], 1648.' This is accounted the first English edition. The copy in the British Museum is from the library of the late Duke of Sussex, and bears the press mark I 412 a, 13. Another copy, bearing the press mark E 1419, has the Propositions concerning Church Government appended, and seems to have been the edition which brought him into trouble with the House of Commons (see their *Journals* under date 6th August 1649). I suppose it was from the first of these editions of Bostock that a German translation was made in the same year. Its title is: '*Demüthiger Bericht der versammelten und ietzund aus macht und Befehl des Parlaments zu Westmünster sitzenden Lehrern der heiligen Schrift belangende, ein Glaubens Bekenntniss beyden häusern des Parlaments neulich überreicht, im Jahr nach Christi Geburt 1648, 8vo.*' A copy of this edition, we learn from the Appendix to Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*, is preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin. It is remarkable as being the first edition in which the Scripture proofs are inserted at length, instead of being merely indicated in the margin. The preface contains a very notable testimony to the high regard in which the divines of Britain and their work were held by their brethren in Germany, who also had been called to suffer for their faithful attachment to the doctrines of the Reformation. They speak of the Confession as, 'ein Tractätlein reich in allen Stücken Göttlicher Weisheit und Lehre, fast von Wort zu Wort aus heiliger Schrift . . . abgefasst, und ist ein kurtzer Begriff des heilsamen Worte an deren Fürbild dieselbe Engländische Kirche nach abgeworffenen Joche

Bäbstischer Menschen-satzungen und Haupt-irrthümen bis daher beständig gehalten und annoch halten thut. . . Siehe, so stehet doch der Leuchter dieser so lehr und glauben-reicher Kirchen, durch Gottes guade unbeweglich und leuchtet auf demselben in diesem wollgegründetem Glaubens-bekennniss das Licht der Wahrheit . . . hell und klar herfür, gläubigen hertzen zum Trost und Versicherung.' Possibly a Dutch edition may have been published about the same time, and in 1649 a rare and much prized edition in English issued from the Elzevir press. Several editions in 12mo or 18mo were published in London and Edinburgh between 1650 and 1655, (3504 a, B. M. etc.), as were also two Latin editions in small 8vo at Cambridge in 1656 and 1659, and others of smaller size at Glasgow in 1670, and at Edinburgh in 1660, 1680, and 1694.¹ In 1658 there issued from the London press what is termed the second English edition of the Confession, a large and neatly printed quarto, with the Scripture proofs inserted at length, and the emphatic parts of them in a different letter. A copy, with the press mark E 757, is in the British Museum, but it is by no means a rare edition. An edition in 12mo was published at London in 1660 (3505 aa, Brit. Mus.). The third (so called) English edition, is a small octavo, published at London in 1688. The fifth, bearing the date of 1717, is a large octavo, and perhaps the most handsomely printed of all these early editions of the Confession. After the Revolution, editions in 12mo, without the proofs printed at length, were published in Scotland in 1688-9 and 1690, and in the latter year one in folio for the use of church courts, which, like the copy engrossed in the records of the Scottish Parliament in the same year, does not contain the proofs either in their abbreviated or lengthened form. The editions of later date need not be specified, with the exception of the beautiful octavo forming vol. i. of Dunlop's *Collection of Confessions*, etc., and published at Edinburgh in 1719, with a memorable preface in defence of Confessions of Faith.

The Independents' recension of the Confession was published in 1659, with the title, *A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England*. It does not differ materially from the recension of the Parliament save in the insertion of a chapter (xx.) on the Gospel and the extent of the grace thereof. This will appear to most Calvinists now-a-days a less happy statement than that sanctioned by the Westminster

¹ It was reprinted in Glasgow in 1674.

Assembly in their Larger Catechism, in answer to the question, 'How is the grace of God manifested in the second Covenant?' The Baptist recension was published in 1677, and again in 1688, under the title, *A Confession of Faith, put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many congregations of Christians (baptized upon profession of their faith) in London and the country, with an Appendix concerning Baptism.* It follows mainly the Independent recension, but seems to me to show traces of the moderating influence of Bunyan. The first editions of the Catechism are in E 411, 416.

NOTE (Additional), p. 369.—SUBSCRIPTION TO THE
CONFESSION.

I have said elsewhere that the Westminster Divines, from their earnest desire to form one comprehensive Church, did not require subscription to their Directories for Public Worship and for Church Government, nor exact conformity to their minute details, as Laud had done to those of the Prayer-Book and Canons. It may be doubted if the English section of them meant to require more for their Confession of Faith than that it should be (like the Irish Articles) the norm of public teaching. They felt with Baxter that 'there is a singular use for a full body of theology or a profession concluded on by such reverend assemblies, that the younger ministers may be taught by it, and the reverence of it may restrain them from rash contradicting it; and there is a necessity of exercising power in ministerial assemblies for the actual restraint of such as shall teach things intolerably unsound, and all ministers should be there accountable for their doctrine.' Such a full body of theology in a non-liturgical Church was essential as a guide in prayer as well as in preaching, and its authority as the norm of both was the least restriction that could be imposed if reasonable soundness was to be maintained, and due security given to the congregations that the liberty allowed in the devotional services should not degenerate into licence. Probably this was all that the majority of the English divines were disposed to insist on. At any rate a sentence of Tuckney often quoted, seems to point in that direction. 'In the Assembly I gave my vote with others that the Confession of Faith, put out by authority, should not be either required to be sworn or subscribed to, . . . but only so as not to be publicly preached or written against.' I have not come on any

clear trace of this vote in the *Minutes of the Assembly*, but possibly it occurred on or soon after 26th November 1646, when the Confession was completed, and about to be sent up to the Houses, and when it is recorded that 'Mr. Nye, Mr. Carter junior, and Mr. Greenhill enter their dissent to the sending up of the Confession of Faith in order to the Preface,' and is ordered that 'before the Confession of Faith be sent up the Preface shall be debated and prepared to be sent up with it, *if any be made.*' But so far as appears from the Minutes none was debated or sent up.

The Church of Scotland, while agreeing with the English Divines as to the Directory of Public Worship, and Form of Church Government, has always required her ministers to regard the Confession of Faith as something more than the norm of teaching to which in their public ministrations they were to conform, and by the Act of the Scottish Parliament in 1693 she was sufficiently authorised to require more than this, including at least personal acceptance of its main doctrines, and of the sum and substance of the Reformed faith, as set forth in it.

Writing from recollection of an examination of the Minutes of the Kirk-session of St. Andrews twenty years ago, and wishing to err on the safe side, I had said that the celebration of the Lord's Supper was discontinued for more than a year. Within the last few days I have had an opportunity of re-examining the Minutes, which are now in the Register House at Edinburgh, and am sorry to find that, at p. 236, I have so far understated the facts of the case. The Lord's Supper was not administered there between June 1650 and August 1656. Again and again in 1653 and 1654 'the four ministers' were 'seriously recommended' and 'airnestly requested' by the elders to confer together how this might be remedied, and, after it was begun to be again administered in the burghs, they were assured that 'the people heir are much greived y^t they are so long depryved of that comfortable ordinance,' but it was not till August 1656 that they resumed the dispensation of it.