

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 1.—January, 1880.

I.

THE IDEA AND AIMS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN
REVIEW.

THERE has been for some time a conviction, constantly widening and deepening, that a Review is needed that will adequately represent the theology and life of the Presbyterian Church. This need has been felt all the more that in former years our Church derived so much strength and advantage from the Reviews so ably conducted by Drs. Charles Hodge, Albert Barnes, Henry B. Smith, and others. Two years ago, the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, which had gathered up into itself the various older Presbyterian Quarterlies, was sold out by the proprietors and editors, and the *Princeton Review* appeared in its place, devoting itself chiefly to Philosophy, Science, and Belles-Lettres, and presenting an array of scholarship and talent unprecedented in the history of periodical literature. Yet this very fact called the more attention to its defects in those very respects that made the older Reviews so important to the Presbyterian Church; consequently the desire for a representative Presbyterian Review grew to be so strong and irrepressible, that several efforts have been made during the past year, in various parts of the land, culminating in the present enterprise, which seeks to combine all the varied interests and sections of our Presbyterian Church in order to secure a Review that will truly represent it by a strong, hearty, steady, and thorough advocacy of Presbyterian principles. The managing and associate editors have been requested by a large number of theologians,

VII.

THE DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

IT is of the utmost importance to the churches that bear the name of Presbyterian, and require subscription to the Westminster standards from their office-holders, that they should take pains to put before them all the information possible with reference to the historic origin, interpretation, and authority of these standards. It can hardly be deemed sufficient that the standards themselves should be made accessible to all, when there are constantly arising numberless questions as to their interpretation. Nor is it sufficient to hold that the ecclesiastical courts are the lawful interpreters, and a digest of their proceedings the final appeal in cases of controversy ; for unless the judges of our courts, themselves, are well grounded in the origin and history of the standards, they may pervert them, and gradually cause the Church to drift from its historic position ; especially when new questions arise, or fresh phases of old questions, that may need nice discriminations and careful adjustment in their historic relations. For if the Word of God, notwithstanding its divine inspiration, and the influence of the Holy Spirit in guiding the body of believers, and especially the humble and prayerful student, nevertheless needs all the light that philology and history can throw upon it, for its interpretation ; how much more must this be the case with reference to those historic documents, which, whilst they may be the most carefully framed and admirably composed of all the symbols of faith, are yet without divine inspiration and are to be studied without the Holy Spirit's guidance.

Futhermore, it is the common fortune of all churches, and indeed of all human institutions, to shift insensibly into new situations and circumstances, that modify in many respects their original life and character. Thus even the Word of God has not unfrequently been covered over by an accumulation of

traditional learning, as by the Pharisees in the time of our Lord, and by the Romanists in the Christian centuries. Thus symbols of faith which, to the generation that composed them, represented vital and absorbing interests, become to the succeeding generations more and more historical monuments, and abstract formulas, and gradually there gathers about them, through the interpretation of the schools and the exposition of the pulpit, a body of tradition, that unconsciously influences and controls the most exact and painstaking student in their interpretation.

History and tradition are ever at war, and no Church can stand fast very long by its historic symbols, unless these are kept fresh and distinct, in the minds and hearts of the office-holders, at least, in their historic setting. More than two centuries have passed since the Westminster Assembly composed our confession and catechisms, centuries abounding with great movements in thought and life, which, whilst they sprang from the mighty forces then at work and that had been in operation since the Reformation, have yet been subject to influences from other world-wide forces, and have assumed proportions that are enormous and vastly complex. The Westminster standards were the products of some of the noblest of these forces, and have perpetuated their influence in constantly increasing dimensions; and yet the question is forced upon us, whether they have kept the churches, that bear the Presbyterian name, in the normal line of their growth; or whether the external forces may not have deflected the churches from their standards, so that the line of their faith and life may not entirely correspond with the line of the standards, but may be rather at an angle with it. In these times especially, when it has been suggested in not a few quarters, that the time has come to revise the work of the Assembly at Westminster, is it not important, that we should rather make ourselves familiar with the historical work of that Assembly, and take pains to gather together all the documents that they produced, or occasioned on the part of others, that we may have all the facts before us, and not meet the issue with inadequate preparation?

It is the object of this article to call attention to some of the more valuable of these documents, and to suggest the line of work that might be serviceable for bringing them into

wider circulation, and thus make our standards more interesting and valuable to the present generation of students.

It should be a matter of profound thankfulness on the part of all Presbyterians, that such a large amount of valuable historical material has been preserved to us, relating to the Westminster Assembly. We have three partial records of their proceedings: (1.) "*The Journals of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines convened for the work of Reformation in the Church by the authority of Parliament, 1643,*" by John Lightfoot, a member of the Assembly.* These journals extend from the day of the opening, July 1, 1643, until December 31, 1644, some eighteen months. Lightfoot was present every day until January 22, 1644[5], when he was absent for the first time at Munden, which became his charge (Journals, p. 116). After this, he was frequently absent on Mondays, and sometimes later in the week, and is then quite brief in his summary of proceedings, but is generally full, especially in matters of church government and discipline. (2.) "*Notes of the Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster,*" by Geo. Gillespie, one of the Commissioners from the Kirk of Scotland to the Assembly.† These notes extend from February 2, 1644 to January 3, 1645, some eleven months; although there is a gap from May 14th to September 4th, of more than three months. Gillespie is full in his notes, when present, in the discussions of church government. (3.) "*Minutes of the Sessions of the Assembly of Divines,*" three volumes folio, mss., in the Williams Library, in Grafton Street, London. Each volume has a title in a later hand; the title of the first and second volumes containing the additional clause, "from August 4, 1643 to April 24, 1653;" the third volume, the correct statement, "from August 4, 1643, to March 25, 1652."‡

* These journals were published in Vol. XIII. of the "Whole Works of John Lightfoot," edited by Rev. J. R. Pitman. London, 1824.

† These debates were published in the "*Presbyterian Armoury,*" vol. ii, Edinburgh, 1846, edited by David Meek, from the Wodrow MSS. in the Advocate's Library at Edinburgh.

‡ A copy of these minutes has been made at the expense of the Church of Scotland, and placed in the Kirk Library at Edinburgh. The third volume in part has been published with valuable introduction and notes under the title: "*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

These minutes are supposed to be in the handwriting of Adoniram Byfield, one of the scribes, on account of his absence during the time of the omissions in the minutes, or when they are written in another than the prevailing hand, and besides that, on p. 2 of Volume II., the name Adoniram Byfield occurs three times in the same handwriting as the Minutes.* The writing is hurried and abbreviated in style, evidently made on the spot, with the design of securing as full an outline of the discussion as possible. It requires a long study and a practised eye to read it, and there are several instances of shorthand.†

Volume I. has three parts bound together: (1.) Sessions 45–86, from August 4, 1643, to November 1, 1643; (2.) Sessions 87–119, from November 2, to December 20, 1643; (3.) Sessions 155–198, from February 15, 1643[4],‡ to April 11, 1644.

Volume II. has two parts bound together: (1.) Sessions 199–264, from April 12, 1644, to August 9, 1644; (2.) Sessions 265–323, August 14, 1644, to November 15, 1644.

Volume III. has four parts bound together: (1.) Sessions 324–604, from November 18, 1644, to March 16, 1645[6]; (2.) Sessions 601–900, from March 9, 1645[6], to August 16, 1647; (3.) Sessions 604–1163, from March 16, 1645[6], to February 22, 1648[9], where the numbering of the sessions ends, and from thence on to March 25, 1652, unnumbered sessions; (4.) the Minutes of the Provincial Assembly of London from the third session of the eighth Provincial Assembly, November 27, 1650, to the thirteenth session of the sixteenth Assembly, April 24, 1655.

Church of Scotland. Edited for the Committee by the Rev. Alex. F. Mitchell, D.D., and Rev. John Struthers, LL.D. Edinburgh, 1874.

* Hetherington, in the Preface to his *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, fourth edition, Edinburgh, 1878, states that "Dr. Thomas Goodwin, one of the leading Independent divines, wrote fifteen volumes of notes and journals of the Assembly proceedings, as we are informed in a memoir of his life by his son, three only of which are still preserved in Dr. Williams' Library, London. It was my intention to have consulted these, but I found it impracticable at the time." This conjecture of Hetherington is impossible, for Goodwin is said by his son to have taken "a brief account of every day's transaction, of which I have fourteen or fifteen volumes in 8vo, wrote with his own hand;" whereas these minutes are folio in size, nine and not fourteen or fifteen in number of volumes, and quite full in reports of speeches.

† The Minutes of June 17, 18, 19, 20, of Vol. II., are in shorthand, and those of June 21st are mixed.

‡ The English still continued to begin the year with the 25th of March; the year in brackets is after the present method.

Part 2 of Vol. III. stands by itself as a duplicate, going back seven days into the previous part, and extending as far as Aug. 16, 1647, into the following part. It differs from them, however, in being written with more care and exactness. Hence Dr. Mitchell (Preface to Minutes, p. viii.) concludes: "They may fairly claim to be received in the strictest sense as the 'minutes of the sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines,' though even in it many documents or parts of documents sanctioned are not entered at length." There are two great defects in Vol. I. that we must set over against these parallel records. There are no minutes from July 1 to Aug. 4, 1643, which may have constituted a part by itself, now lost, of forty-four sessions, over against forty-two in Part 1, and thirty-three in Part 2. There is then another long interval, from December 20, 1643, to February 15, 1643(4), of thirty-five sessions over against forty-four sessions in Part 3, which may also have been a part by itself. The paging running through the three parts is evidently by a later hand, probably the same one who wrote the titles. If, then, two of the original parts have been lost, they balance the parts of the third volume, that must be taken away, namely, the duplicate Part 2, and Part 4 containing the minutes of the Provincial Assembly of London, so that we would have nine parts as probably constituting the original work.

In addition to these three records of proceedings, there are the invaluable "*Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*," another of the Scotch Commissioners,* which give faithful pictures of the interior of the Assembly, and familiar gossip with reference to the relations and strifes of parties. There are, besides, large numbers of official documents, not only in the Journals of Parliament, but also in the various publications of the time.† Especially worthy of notice are the Parliament and Lord Mayor's sermons,‡ the controversial tracts

* The best edition is that edited from the authors' mss., in the Archives of the Church of Scotland, by David Laing, Esq. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1841.

† The most of these are to be found in the collection known as the King's Pamphlets in the British Museum, and in the libraries of Dr. Williams and Zion College in London, the Bodleian at Oxford, Trinity College at Cambridge, and the Advocates and Church of Scotland libraries in Edinburgh. The McAlpin collection of the Union Theo. Sem., N. Y., contains not a few of them.

‡ There are nearly three hundred of these, giving expression to the historical circumstances and opinions of the divines on the great events and discussions of the time.

of the Smectymnuans, the London ministers, Thos. Edwards, Bastwick, and others on the one side; and the Dissenting Brethren, John Goodwin, Henry Burton, and others on the other side; besides the published works of the members of the Assembly covering the entire field of the discussions in which they were engaged. All this material should be gathered, and the most important of it made accessible to Presbyterian divines in some compact form. Some such movement might be appropriately inaugurated at the next meeting of the Presbyterian Alliance in Philadelphia.

The *History of the Westminster Assembly*, by Hetherington, although it has done excellent service, is entirely unsatisfactory, for it is not based upon a thorough acquaintance with the material above represented. The "*Lives of the Westminster Divines*," by Reid, Paisley, 1811, contains much valuable information of a biographical and bibliographical character, but it has been long out of print and is extremely scarce. Prof. Alex. F. Mitchell, in his brief article on the *Westminster Assembly* in Johnson's *New Universal Cyclopædia*, Vol. IV., in his *Lecture on the Westminster Confession*, Edin., 1866, and in his Introduction to the Minutes referred to above, has laid the foundation for future work, and excited the appetite for fuller information from the same competent source. Masson, in his "*Life of Milton*," Vol. II.—III., 1871-'3, has collected a large amount of valuable material in an incidental way, based on thorough historical study, with reference to his principal theme, and Dr. Schaff, in his "*History of Creeds*," New York, 1877, has compacted together the most important statements from these and other sources, yet it must be admitted that no one has as yet gone further than the threshold of the subject, and there is much remaining to be desired by all Presbyterian students of church history.

The Westminster Assembly was not called together until after long and matured deliberation. Already on December 1, 1641, the Parliament, in the *Grand Remonstrance* then presented to the king, had said :

186. "And the better to effect the intended Reformation, we desire there may be a General Synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines of this Island, assisted by some from foreign parts professing the same religion with us, who may consider of all things necessary for the peace and good government of the Church, and represent the results of their consultation to Parliament, to be there allowed and con-

firmed, and receive the stamp of authority, thereby to find passage and obedience throughout the kingdom." (Masson, ii. p. 327 seq.)

On the 9th of April, 1642, an order was passed by the Commons, naming two divines from each county in England except London, which was to send four, and one each from the Welsh counties, and also two each from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, ninety-nine in all, and stating:

"The Lords and Commons doe declare that they intend a due and necessary reformation of the Government and Liturgy of the Church, and to take away nothing in the one or other, but what shall be evill and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burthensome. And for the better effecting thereof speedily to have consultation with godly and learned divines." *

It would seem that further action was taken on the 19th of April, and that from the 20th to the 25th, the names were gone over one by one until a total of 102 divines were named, and on the 9th of May a bill was brought in, "calling an Assembly of godly and learned divines to be consulted with by the Parliament for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrines of the Church of England from false aspersions and interpretations." On the 19th of May, it was read a third time and passed, and on the 26th, the Lords added fourteen divines, and on June 1st, it passed both houses, and required only the signature of the king to become law. [Masson's Milton, ii. p. 510 f.] † The king refused to sign the bill, and it had no effect.

* "Catalogue of the Names of the Divines appointed by the House of Commons for each severall county in this Kingdom of England and Wales, London, 1642."

† See also a tract, entitled "Sixteene Propositions in Parliament touching the manner and forme for Church Government, by Bishops and the clergy of this Kingdom. Whereunto is added; The opinion of the English Doctors and Divines at the Synod at Dort, concerning Episcopacy and lay elders. London, 1642." We make some extracts in order to show the mind of a portion at least of Parliament at this time. "The order for Church Government read in the House of Commons, 1642: I. Every severall shire of England and Wales to be a severall circuite or diocesse for the ecclesiastic jurisdiction, excepting Yorkshire, which is to be divided into three. II. A constant Presbyterie of twelve choyse divines to be selected in every shire or diocesse. III. A constant President to be established as a Bishop over this Presbyterie. IV. This Bishop in each Diocesse to ordaine, suspend, deprive, degrade, excommunicate by, and with the consent and assistance of seven divines of his Presbyterie then present and not otherwise. XII. The Bishop once a year (at midsummer) to summon a *diocesan synod*, there to heare, and by generall vote, to determine all such matter of scandall in life and doctrine among the clergie-men, as shall be presented unto them. XIII. Every three yeares, a Nationall Synod to be, which for persons shall consist of all the Bishops in the land. and of two *Presbiters* to be chosen by the rest out of each *Presbitery*, and of two *clarkes* to be chosen out of everie Diocesse, by the *Clergie* thereof. XIV. This

Several other similar bills were introduced in the course of the year, and at last, on the 13th of May, 1643, an ordinance was introduced into the Commons, and passed and ordered to be printed, June 1, 1643, "for the calling of an Assembly of learned and godly divines." They were directed to meet

"at Westminster, in the chappell called King Henry the Seventh's Chappell on the first day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1643 . . . to conferre and treat amongst themselves of such matters and things touching and concerning the liturgy, discipline and government of the Church of England, or the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false aspersions and misconstructions, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the said houses of Parliament, and no other, and to deliver their opinion and advices of or touching the matters aforesaid, as shall be most agreeable to the Word of God, to both or either of the said houses, from time to time, in such manner or sort as by both or either of the said houses of Parliament shall be required, and at the same time not to divulge by printing, writing, or otherwise, without the consent of both or either house of Parliament. And be it further ordained by the authority aforesaid, that William Twist, D.D., shall sit in the chaire as prolocutor of the said Assembly."

This ordinance, as contained in the Lords' Journals of June 12th, has 119 divines, the most of them the same as in the previous orders, but with some changes; and also twenty members of the House of Commons and ten of the Lords—149 in all. Masson (*Life of Milton*, Vol. II., p. 516, sq.) gives a list in accordance with this journal, but adds Peter Sterry, whom he regards as omitted by mistake, thus making 120 divines in all. The ordinance of June 12th, as printed at the time,* contains 121 divines, adding to the Lords' list Peter Sterry and John Erle. Prof. Mitchell follows the ordinance as finally printed by order of the Houses, June 20, 1643, which substitutes Simeon Ashe for Josias Shute, deceased, and includes John Erle, making 121, which is doubtless correct. These names were fairly representative of all the counties of England and Wales, the two Universities, and the parties, with the exception of the extreme High Churchmen of the type of Laud and the extreme men among the Dissenters.

Of the defenders of Episcopacy were Archbishop Ussher, Bishops Brownrigge and Westfield, Drs. Featley, Hackett, Hammond, Holdsworth, Master of Emanuel College, Cam-

Nationall Synod to make and ordaine *Canons* of the *Government* of the *Church*, but they not to bind untill they be confirmed by *Parliament*."

* See the reprint in the *Presbyterian Armoury*, Vol. II.; so also, "*An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament for the calling of an Assembly of learned and godly divines*, etc., London, 1658," which has the same names.

bridge, Morley, Nicholson, Saunderson, Prof. of Divinity at Oxford, Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College, all able men, and doubtless others; but only Bishop Westfield and Dr. Featley attended, for a short time—the former dying June 25, 1644, the latter being expelled in September, 1643. Of the Independents, the five who had returned from exile in Holland, Thos. Goodwin, Philip Nye, William Bridge, Jeremiah Burroughs, and Sidrach Simpson, were the chief; but others held their opinions in whole or in part. The main body was thus selected, from the necessity of the case, from the great middle body of the ordained ministry of the Church of England, who were Presbyterians; and hence these controlled the Assembly, not without severe and long-continued struggles with the Independents; and also the Erastians, especially John Lightfoot, Thos. Coleman, and John Selden, who were in many respects the ripest scholars in the body.

The Assembly met, in accordance with the ordinance, on Saturday, July 1, 1643, in Westminster Abbey, "with a great congregation besides"; and listened to a sermon by the prolocutor on John xiv. 18. "After sermon all the members of the Assembly present went into Henry VII.'s Chapel, where the names being called, the appearance of names that day was sixty-nine, or thereabouts."*

On Thursday, July 6th, instructions were brought in from Parliament:

(1.) That two assessors be joined to the prolocutor to supply his place in case of absence or infirmity. (2.) That scribes be appointed, to set down all proceedings, and these to be divines who are not of the Assembly, viz.: Mr. Henry Roborough and Mr. Adoniram Byfield. (3.) Every member, at his first entry into the Assembly, shall make serious and solemn protestation, not to maintain anything but what he believes to be truth in sincerity, when discovered unto him. (4.) No resolutions to be given upon any question the same day whereon it is first propounded. (5.) What any man undertakes to prove as necessary he shall make good out of Scripture. (6.) No man to proceed in any dispute after the prolocutor has enjoined him to silence, unless the Assembly desire he may go on. (7.) No man to be denied to enter his dissent from the Assembly and his reasons for it in any point, after it hath been first debated in the Assembly, and thence (if the dissenting party desire it) to be sent to the Houses of Parliament by the Assembly, not by any particular man or men, in a private way, when either House shall require. (8.) All things agreed on and prepared for Parliament to be openly read and allowed in the Assembly, and then offered as the judgment of the Assembly, if the major part assent. Provided that the opinion of any persons dissenting and the reasons urged for it be annexed thereunto, if the dissenters require it, together with the solutions, if any were given by the Assembly, to their reasons." (Lightfoot, p. 4.)

* Lightfoot, p. 3.

The importance of all these rules we will see further on.

On Saturday, July 8th, the protestation was taken as follows :

"I do seriously and solemnly protest, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly, whereof I am a member, I will not maintain anything, in matters of doctrine, but what I think in my conscience to be truth; or in point of discipline, but what I conceive to conduce most to the glory of God and the good and peace of his church" (Lightfoot, p. 4).

On the same day, Drs. White and Burgess were appointed assessors. This was the more important, that,

"Dr. Twisse, on account of his age and manifold infirmities, was not able to attend upon the concerns of the Assembly; but in a few months was taken ill, falling down in the pulpit to rise no more. . . He was carried to his lodging, and laid upon his bed, where he languished about a twelvemonth. . . He died July 20, 1646, aged seventy-one years" (Brook's "Lives of Puritans," Vol. III., p. 16).

Charles Herle was then appointed in his place, July 22d, and remained prolocutor until the close. Herbert Palmer was also appointed an additional assessor, September 23, 1646, on account of the long-continued illness of Mr. White, who died in 1648, aged seventy-three, and finally Dr. Gouge, November 26, 1647, in place of Palmer, who had recently died.

In addition to the scribes, Henry Roborough and Adoniram Byfield, John Wallis was subsequently appointed an amanuensis or assistant, on account of the great amount of clerical labors required.*

On the 8th of July the whole Assembly was cast into three grand committees, according to the order of the names in the ordinance; the first to meet in Henry VII.'s Chapel, the second in the Lower House of Convocation, the third in the Jerusalem Chamber. They met for the first time on the 10th, and organized by the appointment of Dr. Burgess as chairman of the first committee, Dr. Staunton of the second, and Mr. Guibbon of the third (Lightfoot, p. 5).

There is no list of these committees at the date of their organization, but three lists are found in the minutes of the Williams Library, one dated November 2, 1643, another February 15, 1643[4], the third April 12, 1644, the last of which is published by Prof. Mitchell (Minutes, p. lxxxv). These lists constitute without doubt the real members of the Assembly at the time. The list of November 2, 1643, the earliest one, is as follows:

* He took the covenant, December 22, 1643 (Lightfoot, p. 89).

First committee: Mr. Palmer, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Wilkinson, Sr., Mr. Valentine, Mr. Rayner, Dr. Hoyle, Mr. Bridge, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Ley, Mr. Case, Dr. Gouge, Mr. White, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Sedgwick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Bathhurst, Mr. Nye, Dr. Smith, Dr. Burgis, Mr. Green, Mr. Gower, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Tuckney, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Herle, Mr. Hericke, Mr. New, Mr. Paynter—twenty-nine. Second committee: Mr. Clayton, Mr. Gipps, Mr. Burroughes, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Walker, Mr. Carrill, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Hill, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Carter of L., Mr. Thorowgood, Mr. Arrow-smith, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Whitaker, Dr. Stanton, Mr. Lightfoot, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Langley, Mr. Tisdale, Mr. Young, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Conant, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Hall, Mr. Scudder, Mr. Bayley, Mr. Pickering, Mr. Caudry—twenty nine. Third committee: Mr. Salloway, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Burgis, Mr. Vines, Mr. Greenhill, Dr. Temple, Mr. Ash, Mr. Gataker, Mr. Spurston, Mr. Channell, Mr. Delamarch, Mr. Newcommen, Mr. Carter of D., Mr. Hodges, Mr. Perne, Mr. Prophet, Mr. Sterry, Mr. Guibon, Mr. Michaelthwaite, Dr. Wincop, Mr. Price, Mr. Wilkinson, Jr., Mr. Woodcocke, Mr. Delaplace, Mr. Maynard—twenty five; or eighty-three in all.

This list contains two divines that were admitted subsequent to the first organization: Francis Woodcocke, August 5, 1643, in place of Moreton, deceased, and John Maynard, admitted September 15, 1643, in place of Henry Nye, deceased. The remainder were named in the ordinance. Thus, including the prolocutor, eighty-four of the 121 named were present, November 2, 1643; the remaining thirty-seven having declined to attend, or withdrew. The list, February 15, 1643[4], adds to the first committee Mr. Rathband, and takes away Mr. Paynter; to the second committee Mr. Strickland and Mr. Bond; and to the third committee Mr. Paynter and Mr. Good. The list, April 12, 1644, adds to the first committee Mr. Hickes, to the second committee Mr. Harris, and to the third committee Mr. Hardwicke, making ninety-one in all. An edition of "*The Confession of Faith, Catechism,*" etc., London, 1658, contains in an appendix the list of all the divines who took the promise and vow. This includes all the names of the last list, and adds thereto Edward Perle, John Dury, Philip Delme, John Foxcroft, John Ward, Richard Byfield, Thos. Ford, seven

who entered the Assembly subsequently, making ninety-eight in all.* These are the men who really constituted the Assembly and did the work. Besides dividing themselves into these three committees, it was resolved subsequently that the whole number assembled at the time appointed for daily opening, before the arrival of a quorum, should constitute a *grand committee*, to report to the Assembly when organized.

July 19th, Mr. Palmer, as chairman of a committee appointed for the purpose, brought in a petition to Parliament for a fast-day, which was signed and sent up. We note the following requests :

“I. That you would be pleased to command a publicke and extraordinary day of humiliation, this weeke—that every one may bitterly bewaile his owne sinnes and cry mightily unto God for Christ his sake, to remove his wrath, and to heale the land, with professed and renewed resolutions of more full performance of the late covenant for the amendment of our wayes. II. That you would vouchsafe instantly to take into your more serious consideration, how you may most speedily set up Christ more gloriously in all his ordinances within this kingdome, and reforme all things amiss throughout the land wherein God is more specially and more immediately dishonoured ; among which we humbly lay before you these particulars: (1.) That the brutish ignorance and palpable darkness possessing the greatest part of the people . . . may be remedied by a speedy and strict charge to all ministers constantly to catechise all the youth and ignorant people. . . (2.) That the grievous and heinous pollution of the Lord's supper, by those that are grossly ignorant and notoriously profane, may be henceforth with all Christian care and due circumspection prevented. (3.) That the bold venting of corrupt doctrines . . . may be speedily suppressed everywhere, and that in such manner as may give hope that the church may be no more infected with them.” . . . That so God, who is now by the sword avenging the quarrell of his covenant, beholding your integrity and zeal, may turn from the fierceness of his wrath, heare our prayer, goe forth with our armies, perfect the work of reformation, forgive our sins, and settle truth and peace throughout the kingdome.”†

Parliament appointed Friday, July 21st, as the fast-day, and promised “to take the other particulars into speedy consideration.”

August 4th, the Westminster Assembly united with Parliament in each addressing letters to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and requesting that they would,

“according to their former promise and resolution, send to the Assembly here such number of godly and learned divines as in their wisdom they think most expedient for the furtherance of the work which so much concerns the honour of God, the prosperity and peace of the two churches of England and Scotland.”

* Mr. Strong, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Bolton also entered, took the protestation, and were active in the proceedings, as we see from the minutes, though not included in this list. It must have been a republication of an older list, prior to the appointment of these men to the Assembly.

† *Petition of the Divines of the Assembly, delivered to both houses of Parliament, July 19, 1643. Together with the houses' answer to the said Petition.* London, 1643.

The Assembly assured them "of all testimonies of respect, love, and the right hand of fellowship." A Committee of Parliament, and Stephen Marshall and Philip Nye of the Assembly, carried them to Scotland. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland sent Alexander Henderson and George Gillespie, ministers, and J. L. Maitland, ruling elder,

"to reparaire unto the Assembly of Divines and others of the Kirke of England, now sitting at Westminster, to propound, consult, treat, and conclude with them . . . in all such things as may conduce to the utter extirpation of Popery, Prelacie, Heresie, Schisme, Superstition, and Idolatrie, and for the settling of the so-much-desired union of the whole island in one forme of church government, one confession of faith, one common catechism, and one directory for the worship of God.

August 28th and 29th "the covenant agreed upon by the Scots, and sent to England for approbation, for uniting the two nations forever," was discussed; and it was finally recommended to Parliament: that, in point of conscience, the covenant might be lawfully taken, with certain explanations. September 15th the Scotch Commissioners came into the Assembly, and were received by the prolocutor with an address, being followed by Dr. Hoyle and Mr. Case, to which Alex. Henderson responded. Monday, September 25th, the Assembly, with the House of Commons, took the solemn league and covenant in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, lifting up their hands at the conclusion of every clause, and then subsequently signing it.* On November 20th the Scotch Commissioners were reinforced by Robert Bayly and Samuel

* They solemnly swore: "1. That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavor, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the Reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies; also, the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the Word of God and the example of the best Reformed Churches; and we shall endeavor to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of church government, directory for worship, and catechising, that we, and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us. 2. That we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (*i. e.*, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that Hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness; lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive the plagues, and that the Lord may be one and his name one in the three kingdoms," and so on.

Rutherford, who were received by the moderator in accordance with the order of Parliament.

The Assembly, immediately after organization, set to work and did not adjourn until July 22, 1644, after sitting an entire year, when they took recess for two weeks. Their first attention was given to

THE REVISION OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES.

On the 8th of July the first ten articles were distributed to the three committees; to the first committee, Articles I.-IV.; to the second committee, Articles V.-VII.; to the third committee, Articles VIII.-X.; and a committee was appointed to seek out copies of the thirty-nine Articles, that "the proceeding may be upon the most authentic" (Lightfoot, p. 5). July 12th it was resolved that, "in our proceedings upon all the Articles we should produce Scriptures for the clearing of them" (Lightfoot, p. 5). The committees reported after preparing their revision, and the Articles were debated, amended, and adopted, step by step, until October 12, 1643. The mss. minutes of the Williams Library represent them as debating the Xth and XIth Articles on September 5th. From this date until the 12th of October the progress was slow, owing to the important doctrines under consideration: free will, justification, good works, works before justification, works of supererogation, and Christ alone without sin; so that they were still engaged upon the XVIth Article, having only finished the first fifteen Articles, when, by order of Parliament, they were required "to take in hand the discipline and liturgy of the church." These debates occupy one hundred and five folios in the mss. minutes of Williams Library, are the fullest of any that are reported, and really lie at the basis of the same subjects as subsequently discussed and adopted in the construction of the Confession of Faith. Lightfoot is remarkably silent with reference to these doctrinal discussions, his chief interest being in matters of church government. The work of revising the Articles never went any further,* but that which had been

* However, we find that April 21, 1645, it was ordered that "the XXXIX Articles be reviewed by the former committee, and the committee to consider how far they, or any of them, may be useful to be recommended to both houses of Parliament for the present, till a Confession of Faith can be drawn up by the Assembly."

done became permanent by subsequent official action of the Assembly and Parliament. Thus, December 10, 1646, an order was received from the House of Commons, "to send up what is finished upon the Articles of the Church of England;" and a committee: Dr. Temple, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Bond, and Dr. Staunton were appointed to consider what had been done. January 5th and 6th, 1646[7], they reported, and "the old Articles and Scripture proofs of them" were debated and ordered to be transcribed, to be sent up to the House of Commons. April 12, 1647, a committee, composed of Mr. Gower, Dr. Burgess, Mr. Palmer, and Dr. Temple, were appointed to prepare a Preface to the old Articles. They reported on the 14th the Preface, which was debated and recommitted. On the 15th it was ordered that "the scribes do write out what is done upon the old Articles, and insert the Scriptures in the margin to be presented to Parliament." On the 22d an additional order from the Commons was received, "requiring them to send into this house the former Articles of the Church of England." April 23d, the Preface was again reported, debated, and adopted and ordered to be transcribed. April 26th a large committee was appointed to carry up the old Articles to both Houses of Parliament. Six hundred copies of them were ordered to be printed for the use of the Houses and the Assembly.*

A comparison of *Article XI.* will give a specimen of the work of revision :

Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Homily of Justification.

Of the Justification of Man BEFORE GOD.

We are justified, that is, we are accounted righteous before God, and have remission of sins, not for, nor by, our own works or deservings, but freely by His grace, only for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ's sake, his whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us, and Christ with his righteousness being apprehended, and rested on, by faith only. The doctrine of justification by faith only, is a wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort; notwithstanding God doth not forgive them that are impenitent, and go on still in their trespasses.

* Parliament was anxious for these Articles at this time, in order to make them a basis for an arrangement with the king, as we see from "The four bills sent to the king to the Isle of Wight, to be passed together with the propositions sent unto him at the same time, which, upon the passage of those bills, were to be treated upon, also the Articles of the Church of England, with the rules and directions concerning suspension from the sacrament of the

The importance of these changes, which are emphasized by us to make them more distinct, is manifest in view of the Antinomians and other errorists of the time. A comparison of these revisions with the original XV. Articles would be instructive throughout, especially in their relation to the Irish Articles on the one side and the Westminster Confession on the other. In this connection it is appropriate to refer to the various actions of the Assembly with reference to Antinomianism, Anabaptism, and other heresies. August 10, 1643, the Assembly adopted a petition to Parliament against the Antinomians, mentioning especially Eaton's "*Honeycomb of Free Justification*," and Tobias Crisp's "*Christ Alone Exalted*;" and on September 1st the printer was called to account (Lightfoot, p. 12). On September 14th Mr. Calamy was appointed chairman of a Committee on Antinomians. November 2d an order was received from the Commons, "to take into revising our judgment which we sent in to the House concerning the Antinomian opinion, and that we should enlarge and print it." November 3d a committee was appointed for the purpose, Mr. Walker chairman. On December 18th the committee was enlarged "for the Antinomian business, because of its weight and haste" (Lightfoot, p. 84). August 7, 1644, a committee was appointed to draw up a petition to Parliament with reference to Anabaptists and Antinomians, Marshall chairman; and he reported on the 9th, mentioning especially Hanserd Knollys. August 14th an order of the Commons was read for the quelling of Antinomians and Anabaptists (Lightfoot, p. 303). August 21st a committee was appointed to consider a way for the suppression of Antinomians; August 22d Mr. Palmer reported for the committee; September 4th the way for suppressing Anabaptists and Antinomians was voted (Gillespie, p. 65). May 20, 1645, upon information against Mr. Knollys, his preaching

Lova's Supper in case of ignorance," ordered to be printed March 11. Printed March 20, 1647. The XV. Articles of the Church of England, as amended, were signed by Charles Herle, prolocutor, and Henry Roborough and Adoniram Byfield, scribes. Among the propositions is an indulgence with the qualification, "Th u this indulgence shall not extend to tolerate the printing, publishing, or preaching of anything contrary to the principles of Christian religion as they are conteyned in the I.—XV. Articles of the Church of England, according to the true sense and meaning of them, as they have been cleared and vindicated by the Assembly of Divines now sitting at Westminster."

in private and venting his Antinonian opinions, it was ordered that Dr. Burgess and others be a committee to consider of this complaint and all others of like nature. June 10th the whole Assembly went to the House of Commons to complain of the blasphemous opinions of Paul Best, the prolocutor and assessors expressing their views.* July 11th the attention of the Assembly was called to the book of John Archer, entitled "*Comfort for Believers*," making God the author of sin. Dr. Gouge was appointed chairman of a committee to inform both Houses of Parliament, and desire the suppression of the book, and that all copies should be seized and burned. July 16th and 17th, a declaration of the Assembly with reference to the book was adopted and sent to Parliament, who ordered it printed with their own orders respecting the book.† In it they say :

"For whereas, that most vile and blasphemous assertion, whereby God is avowed to be the author of sin, hath hitherto, by the general consent of Christian teachers and writers, both ancient and modern, and these as well Papists as Protestants, been not disclaimed only, but even detested and abhorred ; yet in this book it is, not closely intimated, or occasionally hinted, or inconsiderately and through inadvertency stumbled upon, but openly, in express terms and in a very foul manner, propounded, maintained, and purposely at large prosecuted. . . . And the scandall hence arising is every whit as great, both in regard of the offence which is thereby given unto the Reformed churches, who in their publick confessions make Satan, and man himself, the only causes or authors of sin, and some of them do in these, their confessions, by name damne this wicked position ; and also in regard of the great advantage which it giveth to our common adversaries the Papists, who have hitherto only calumniously charged the doctrine of the Reformed churches with so odious a crime. . . . Whereas now should this book be tolerated, they might justly insult over us, and publish to the world, that now in the Church of England it was openly and impunely maintained, that God is the author of sin. . . ."

Mr. Walker, Dr. Gouge, Dr. Smith, Mr. Foxcroft, and Mr. Corbet were ordered to be present at the several places of

* This Paul Best, complained of by the ministers of York, was finally, on March 31, 1646, brought before the Assembly, where he persisted in his errors. April 4th he was brought to the bar of the House of Commons. He seems to have denied the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity, while holding to the Trinity in some sense. He was frequently before the committee of the Assembly, and his books were burned, but little could be done for suppressing him, on account of the increasing demand for toleration ; (Mitchell, p. 214).

† The title is, "*A short declaration of the Assembly of Divines, by way of detestation of this abominable and blasphemous opinion, that God is, and hath an hand in, and is the author of, the sinfulnesses of his people ; mentioned in a book entitled, 'Comfort for Believers, about their Sins and Troubles.'* Together with the order of both Houses of Parliament for the burning of said books by the hand of the common hangman. London, July 25, 1645." The author of the book complained of was John Archer, a noted Premillenarian, and author of "*The Personal Reigne of Christ upon Earth*. London, 1642."

burning the book. December 25th Dr. Gouge moved against a book of John Tombes', an Anabaptist,* and a committee was appointed, which was enlarged December 25th, to "consider of heresies and blasphemies published and licensed." And so throughout their proceedings we find similar efforts to meet and overcome heresies in accordance with their covenant obligation, but all in vain; for they and their adherents combined the Independents and Baptists with the Antinomians as heretics, and these were forced to unite with all the detached parties in favor of toleration. A special effort was made, however, by the observance of March 10, 1646[7], as a "solemne day of Publike Humiliation to seek God's assistance for the suppressing and preventing of the growth and spreading of Errors, Heresies, and Blasphemies; and Richard Vines preached before the Commons on "*The authors, nature, and danger of Heresie,*" and Thomas Hodges on "*The growth and spreading of Heresie.*" Finally, December 14, 1647, the ministers of London united and subscribed their names to "*A Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ, and to our Solemn League and Covenant; as also against the Errours, Heresies, and Blasphemies of these times, and the Toleration of Them.*" This was followed by similarly subscribed papers from the assembled ministers in all parts of England.† But the current of the times was against them, and all their efforts were ineffectual.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

On the reception of the order from Parliament, October 12th,

"to forthwith confer and treat among themselves, of such discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve,

* This same John Tombes had already, in 1644, presented to the chairman of a committee of the Divines an "*Exercitation about Infant Baptism,*" which was published with additions, London, 1646. Then he published "*An Examination of the Sermon of Stephen Marshall about Infant Baptisme, in a letter sent to him,*" London, 1645. These were afterwards published together under the title, "*Two Treatises and an Appendix to them Concerning Infant Baptism,*" London, 1645, December 15th. This was followed by "*An Apology or Plea for the Two Treatises against the original charges, complaints, and censures of Dr. Homes, John Geree, Stephen Marshall, John Ley, etc.,*" London, 1646; and several other treatises, all finally collected into three parts of the "*Full Review of the Dispute Concerning Infant Baptism,*" in which he contends with Robert Baylie, Richard Baxter, and others.

† We have seen them, from Lancaster, Norfolk, Wilts, Devonshire, Stafford, Somerset, Gloucestershire, Essex, Northampton, and Salop, representing in these more than seven hundred ministers.

the peace of the church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches abroad, to be settled in this church instead and place of the present church government by archbishops, bishops, . . . which is resolved to be taken away. And touching and concerning the directory of worship or liturgy hereafter to be in the church. . . .”

The Assembly left off debating the XVIth Article, and on the 17th resolved to begin with the government of the church. The three committees went to work: “to collect together all the texts where mention of any church officer is” (Lightfoot, p. 21), and on the 19th the first and second committees reported, and the debate began, which continued for several months without interruption. There is an admirable summary of this discussion about church government published in the *Presbyterian Armoury*, Vol. II., entitled: “*Votes passed in the Assembly of Divines in Westminster concerning Discipline and Government*,” signed by the scribes, which, Wodrow states, was copied from the original copy, thus signed, among the Gillespie papers. This should be compared with Lightfoot’s journals throughout, as it gives the votes from Session 76, October 17, 1643, to Session 186, which, by comparison with Lightfoot, we find to be March 22, 1644. In this whole debate Lightfoot is very full, giving pages 17–234 to it. During this period occurs the chief defect in the minutes of the Williams Library, December 20, 1643, to March 15, 1643[4], fortunately precisely where information is least needed. Gillespie’s minutes begin February 22, 1643[4], when the question of Presbytery was opened, and are very full on this subject. On that day Lightfoot was absent, but mentions the fact that “they fell upon the propositions brought in by the committee concerning many churches under one Presbytery, which the Independents did most vehemently oppose the handling of” (Lightfoot, p. 131). After finishing this discussion, the Assembly refrained from sending up their votes for some time, hoping for accommodation with the Independents; but in vain, for the discussion with them was renewed from time to time for many months. The draft of Government was finally voted, and sent up to Parliament by a committee (Marshall chairman) July 4, 1645, entitled, “*To the Right Honorable the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, the humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now sitting by*

ordinance of Parliament at Westminster, concerning Church Government."* (Appendix to Confession of Faith, etc., London, 1658). April 3, 1644, Dr. Burgess reported from the committee on drawing up the votes on ordination twelve propositions (Lightfoot, p. 237). These were debated and with some modifications adopted, together with a directory for ordination (Gillespie, p. 53), and both were ordered to be sent up to Parliament April 19th (Lightfoot, p. 253), entitled, "*To the Right Honorable the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament: The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines now sitting by ordinance of Parliament at Westminster, concerning the Doctrinal part of Ordination of Ministers.*"†

* This discussion, thus opened with the Dissenting Brethren, became most troublesome and prolonged, both inside the Assembly and without. Inside it culminated in a series of papers *pro* and *con*, which were collected and published by order of Parliament by Adoniram Byfield, at first under the title: "*The Reasons Presented by the Dissenting Brethren against certain Propositions concerning Presbyterian Government and the Proofs of them voted by the Assembly of Divines, sitting by authority of Parliament at Westminster, together with the Answer of the Assembly of Divines to those Reasons of Dissent*, London, 1648; afterwards under the title: "*The Grand Debate concerning Presbytery and Independency*, 1652." Outside the Assembly the leaders on both sides first united in the effort to prevent debate, and published: "*Certain Considerations to dissuade men from further gathering of churches in this present juncture of Time, subscribed by diverse churches of the Assembly hereafter mentioned*. London, 1643." Among these were Twisse, Marshall, Herle, Tuckney, Palmer, etc., on the one side, and Goodwin, Nye, Greenhill, Burroughs, on the other; and Chas. Herle reduced the difference to a minimum in his "*Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches*, 1643." But the publication of the "*Apologetical Narration*," December 30, 1643, after its presentation to Parliament, brought on a fierce discussion, in which Thos. Edwards, in his "*Antapologia*," July, 1644, and his "*Gangrena*," three parts, 1646; Dr. Bastwick, in his "*Independency not God's Ordinance*," 1645, and "*The utter Routing of the whole army of all the Independents and Sectaries*," 1646, and others on the side of Presbyterians; and Henry Burton, John Goodwin, and others in numerous tracts and books, on the side of the Independents, took part. Dr. John Bastwick, a ruling elder of one of the London churches, was especially obnoxious to his opponents, and called forth bitter replies, among which it is interesting to note: "J. Sadler: *Flagellum Flagelli, or Dr. Bastwick's quarters beaten up in two or three pomeridian exercises by way of animadversions upon his book entitled, 'Independency not God's Ordinance'*, London, 1645;" and "*Medico Mastix, or Pill for the Doctor, a reply to Dr. Bastwick, by E. A., a she-Presbyterian*. London, 1645."

† June 5, 1645, Palmer reported from a committee of conference with a sub-committee of the Commons, in which the latter expressed the desire that the Assembly would consider of a catalogue of sins to be added to the rules of exclusion from the Sacrament. This catalogue was debated by the three committees, the Assembly, and a special committee (Marshall chairman) for several days, and finally sent up, June 13th. August 6th a committee was appointed to consider what is fit to be done by the Assembly to discharge their duties and conscience on the business of the sacrament, for the preserving of it pure, occasioned by the statement that the ordinance is drawing up only for seven sins. They reported, and August 8th a petition was sent up to Parliament, who appointed a sub-committee to receive the advice of the Assembly. August 11th the Assembly appointed a large committee to confer with them.

(Appendix to the Confession of Faith, London, 1658.) Subsequent action on this subject was as follows: August 15th Mr. Rous brought in the business of ordination, resolved upon by the Houses, asking the naming of twenty-three ministers to be the ordainers. September 16th the matter of ordination came from the Houses perfected, and nothing wanting but the nomination of twenty-three divines in London to put it in practice, which was referred to a committee (Dr. Burgess chairman), who reported September 18th, naming ten divines from the Assembly and twenty-three from the city. October 2d the ordinance was adopted and printed: "*An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament after advice with the Assembly of Divines for the ordination of ministers pro tempore,*" October 2, 1644. August 19, 1645, Parliament ordered to be printed: "*Directions of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, after advice had with the Assembly of Divines, for the electing and choosing of Ruling Elders in all the Congregations and in the Classical Assemblies for the cities of London and Westminster, and the several counties of the Kingdom, for the speedy settling of the Presbyterian Government.*" This ordinance divided the Province of London into twelve classical elderships, composed of from eight to sixteen churches in each. The congregational Assemblies were to meet every week, the classical Assemblies every month; the Provincial Assembly was to be composed of at least two ministers and four ruling elders out of every classis. The National Assembly was to be composed of two ministers and four ruling elders from each Provincial Assembly, and to meet when summoned by Parliament. The question of suspension from the sacrament now became an important one to the Assembly, for on October 20th there was issued: "*An ordinance of the Lords and Commons, . . . together with rules and directions concerning suspension from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in cases of ignorance and scandall: Also the names of such ministers and others that are appointed Triers and Judges of the ability of Elders in the twelve Classes within the Province of London.*" These rules were not satisfactory to the Assembly, as Mr. Marshall said on the 23d: "It is too short in some things, that, according to my present light, we shall not be able to proceed in our ministry with a good

conscience. If you do intend to petition the Honorable Houses to consider further this business, we can never do it more seasonably than now." A committee was appointed (Mr. Marshall chairman), who reported the same day, and the subject was debated for several days. On the 30th an order from the Commons was received for a further enumeration of scandalous sins, and a committee of fourteen were appointed, and the debate continued for some time.

An additional ordinance was passed by the Lords and Commons, and ordered to be printed November 10, 1645, "*For giving power to all the classical Presbyteries within their respective bounds to examine, approve, and ordain ministers for severall congregations.*" March 14, 1645[6], an ordinance of the Lords and Commons was issued, "*For keeping of scandalous persons from the sacrament of the Lord's supper, the enabling of congregations for the choice of elders, and supplying of defects in former ordinances and directions of Parliament concerning Church Government.*"

It was herein ordained :

"that there be forthwith a choice made of elders throughout the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales; . . . that the classical Assemblies in each Province shall assemble themselves within one month after they shall be constituted and this ordinance published; . . . that out of every congregational eldership there shall be two elders or more, not exceeding the number of four, and one minister, sent to every classis.

This was not satisfactory to the Assembly, and on the 20th Mr. Marshall moved, "that since there were some things in that ordinance which did lie very heavy upon his conscience and the consciences of many of his brethren, that the Assembly would consider what is fit to be done in the business." *

After debate a committee (Mr. Marshall chairman) was appointed to draw up a petition, which was adopted and sent up to Parliament. This was the occasion of sore trouble to the Assembly, for April 30th a committee of the House of Commons, headed by Sir John Evelyn, came to the Assembly to inform them that they had broken the privileges of Parliament in the late petition, and delivered to the Assembly nine

* See also Baillie, ii. 361 and 362; and Masson's *Life of Milton*, Vol. III. p. 406 f. The difficulty was chiefly on the question of exclusion from the sacrament of improper persons.

questions respecting the *Jus Divinum* (Minutes, p. 225), which they required to be answered. The Assembly at once entered on the consideration of these by the three committees, and continued at work upon them until July 22d,* when they were ordered by the Commons to lay aside other business and apply themselves to the Confession of Faith and Catechism (Minutes, p. 558; Masson, iii. p. 426). The question was resumed after the conclusion of the confession and catechism, but never finished by the Assembly. The answer then had been made in the *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, . . . by sundry ministers of Christ within the City of London; London, 1646. A further ordinance of Parliament was issued January 29, 1647[8], "*For the speedy dividing and settling the severall counties of this kingdom into distinct classical Presbyteries and congregational elderships*"; and on the 29th of August, 1648, "*The form of Church Government to be used in the Church of England and Ireland: agreed upon by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, after advice had with the Assembly of Divines.*"

In this ordinance it was ordered :

"that there be forthwith a choice made of elders throughout the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales. . . . There shall be out of every congregational eldership two elders or more, not exceeding the number of four, and one minister, sent to every classis. . . . That the number of the members sent from every classis shall be so proportioned as that the Provincial Assembly may be more in number than any classical Presbyterie, and to that end there shall be at the least two ministers and foure ruling elders out of every classis. . . . The National Assembly shall be constituted of members chosen by, and sent from, the severall Provincial Assemblies aforesaid; the number of the members from each Province to the National Assembly shall be two ministers, foure ruling elders, and five learned and godly persons from each Universitie.† That the National Assembly shall meete when they shall be summoned by Parliament, to sit and continue as the Parliament shall order, and not otherwise."

The Provincial Assembly of London had already met, in accordance with the previous ordinance, holding their first meeting May 3, 1647, in St. Paul's Church, Dr. Gouge, being modera-

* May 19th an order of the Commons was received for a further enumeration of scandalous offences for suspension from the Lord's supper, and a committee was appointed (Marshall chairman), who reported, and after debate the former vote was reaffirmed and sundry additional offences named, and the whole sent up May 22d. This tended to remove the difficulty between the Assembly and Parliament.

† It will be noticed that the Westminster plan was for synodical representation in the National Assembly, a plan which is now in some quarters so strenuously opposed as unpresbyterian.

tor. The Provincial Assembly of Lancaster held its first meeting August, 1648, James Hyett being moderator. (See *Lancashire: its Puritanism and Nonconformity*. By Robert Halley. Second edition. London: 1872.) These were the only Provincial Assemblies, so far as we know, that were organized in accordance with the ordinance, although the other counties were taking the preliminary steps.

The third great work of the Assembly was the preparation of the

DIRECTORY FOR WORSHIP.

Friday, May 24, 1644, the committee appointed for the purpose reported concerning the Lord's Day, Prayer and Preaching, and the debate on the Directory for Worship began. Gillespie's minutes fail us here, giving nothing from May 14th until September 4th. Lightfoot is frequently absent at his charge at Munden. But the Williams Library Minutes fill up the gap with important information. Thus Lightfoot was absent May 24th to June 3d, during the discussion of the Sabbath and Prayer (Williams Library Minutes, fol. 84a-89a), and again, June 24th-28th, during part of the discussion on the Communicants sitting at the table, and also the week beginning July 15th, during part of the debate on Baptism (Williams Library Minutes, fol. 130a-136a), and so on. Oct. 25th an order was received from the Commons calling for the Directory, and on November 12th it was finished and ordered to be sent up; but there was a delay about the Preface, so that it was sent for again on the 18th, and also on the 20th, when "the whole Preface and Directory were ordered up to-morrow" by a committee (Dr. Burgess chairman), which was done (Lightfoot, p. 335). December 2d an order was received for hastening the Directory for Marriage and Burial, "for that the house intends to lay by the Book of Common Prayer, and cannot do it until these be finished" (Lightfoot, p. 337). These, with the Directory for Public Thanksgiving and Singing of Psalms, were finished and sent up December 27th; and on January 3d the Directory passed the Commons, and was ordered to be printed March 13, 1644[5], under the title: "*A Directory for the Publique Worship of God throughout the three Kingdomes of England, Scotland, and Ireland, together with an ordinance of Parlia-*

ment for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and observing of this present Directory throughout the Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales."*

The fourth undertaking of the Westminster Assembly was the composition of the

CONFESSION OF FAITH.

August 20, 1644, Herbert Palmer reported from the grand committee, desiring that the Assembly appoint a committee to join with the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland to draw up a Confession of Faith. Nine were named: Dr. Gouge, Mr. Gataker, Mr. Arrowsmith, Dr. Temple, Mr. Burroughs, Dr. Burgess, Mr. Vines, Mr. Goodwin, and Dr. Hoyle (Lightfoot, p. 305; Williams Library Minutes, Vol. II., Session 269). September 4th Dr. Temple, chairman of the committee, desired that they might be augmented, which was done (Lightfoot, p. 308); and Mr. Palmer, Mr. Newcommen, Mr. Herle, Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Tuckney, Dr. Smith, Mr. Young, Mr. Ley, and Mr. Sedgewick were added.

May 12th the report of the committee on the Confession of Faith was read and debated, and it was resolved that the first draft of the confession shall be drawn by a committee of a few. The minutes here give two parallel lists:

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| (1.) DR. GOUGE, | (2.) MR. GATAKER, |
| MR. REYNOLDS, | MR. HARRIS, |
| MR. VINES, | DR. TEMPLE, |
| MR. TUCKNEY, | MR. BURGESS, |
| DR. HOYLE, | MR. REYNOLDS, |
| MR. HERLE, | DR. HOYLE, |
| MR. GATAKER, | MR. HERLE. |

* August 23, 1645, a further ordinance was printed, "*For the more effectual putting in execution the Directory for Public Worship in all parish churches and chappels within the Kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales.*" It ordained: "that if any person or persons whatsoever shall at any time or times hereafter use or cause the aforesaid Booke of Common Prayer to be used in any church, chappel, or publique place of worship, or in any private place of family worship, . . . every such person . . . shall for the first offence forfeit and pay the sum of five pounds, . . . for the second offence the sum of ten pounds, and for the third offence shall suffer one whole year imprisonment without baile or mainprize. And it is further hereby ordained . . . that the severall and respective ministers of all parishes, churches, and chappels . . . shall respectively from time to time, and at all times hereafter, . . . pursue and observe the Directory for Publique Worship established by ordinance of Parliament, according to the true intent and meaning thereof."

The first list is enclosed in brackets. It is also stated: "Ordered Mr. Tuckney and Mr. Vines be exchanged for Dr. Temple and Mr. Burgess, Mr. Harris be for Mr. Palmer," and "the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland are desired to be assisting to this committee." As Dr. Temple made report on July 7th, we infer that the second is the true list. These names in both lists were taken from the original committee, with the exception of Mr. Harris (see also Mitchell's Westminster Standards, in Johnson's Cyclopædia, iv., 1369).

July 7th, 1645, Dr. Temple made report "of that part of the Confession of Faith touching the Scriptures," and the debate began. July 8th Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Herle, and Mr. Newcomen,* also of the original committee, were desired

"to take care of the wording of the Confession of Faith, as it is voted in the Assembly from time to time, and to report to the Assembly when they think fit there should be any alteration in the words. They are first to consult with the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland before they report to the Assembly."

July 11th it was ordered to divide the body of the Confession of Faith to the three committees.

The committee for the confession met on the 14th, and on the 16th reported some heads, which were then distributed to the committee. To the first committee: God and the Holy Trinity, God's Decrees, Predestination, Election, etc., the Works of Creation and Providence, Man's Fall. To the second committee: Sin and the Punishment thereof, Free Will, the Covenant of Grace, Christ our Mediator. To the third committee: Effectual Vocation, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification. These committees reported, as they prepared their material, and their reports were fully discussed, amended, sometimes recommitted, until all had been gone over and adopted. If now we compare these heads with the heads of the Irish Articles and the Confession as subsequently adopted, we cannot but be satisfied that Prof. Mitchell is correct in stating: "In these Articles, as it humbly appears to me, we have the main source of our Confession of Faith, and almost its exact prototype in the statement of all the more important and essential doctrines

* Mr. Arrowsmith was added to this committee June 15 1646, and Mr. Cawdrey September 1, 1646.

of Christianity" (Minutes, p. xlvii.; see also his lecture on the Westminster Confession, Edin., 1866).

IRISH ARTICLES.	HEADS OF THE COMMITTEE.	WESTMINSTER CONFSSION.
I. Of the Holy Scripture and the Three Creeds.	The Scriptures.	I. Of the Holy Scripture.
II. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.	God and the Holy Trinity.	II. Of God and of the Holy Trinity.
III. Of God's Eternal Decree and Predestination.	God's Decrees, Predestination, Election, etc.	III. Of God's Eternal Decree.
IV. Of the Creation and Government of all things.	The Works of Creation and Providence.	IV. Of Creation. V. Of Providence.
V. Of the Fall of Man, Original Sin, and the State of Man before Justification.	Man's Fall, Sin, and the Punishment thereof, Free Will.	VI. Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment thereof.—IX. Of Free Will.
VI. Of Christ the Mediator of the Second Covenant.	The Covenant of Grace. Christ our Mediator.	VII. Of God's Covenant with Man.—VIII. Of Christ the Mediator.
VII. Of the Communicating of the Grace of Christ.	Effectual Vocation.	X. Of Effectual Calling.
VIII. Of Justification and Faith.	Justification, Adoption.	XI. Of Justification. — XII. Of Adoption.
IX. Of Sanctification and Good Works.	Sanctification.	XIII. Of Sanctification.

The heads of the committee as at first assigned show a transition from the Irish Articles to the Assembly's Confession. The remaining heads were subsequently distributed and might be compared, but the above are sufficient for our purpose. June 15, 1646, the committee for perfecting the confession reported, and the Assembly went over carefully and finally ten chapters by the 30th. July 22d an order was received from the Commons for hastening the perfecting of the Confession of Faith and Catechism. Accordingly they went on steadily until September 18th, when another order for haste was received from the Commons. On the 21st Dr. Burgess made report of the confession, "transcribed, so much of it as the Assembly had perfected." It was then decided to call the heads chapters and distinguish the sections by figures. On the 24th Dr. Burgess was ordered to prepare a title. This he reported the next day, and also chapters 15–19, and it was resolved to send them up by a committee (Dr. Burgess chairman). On

November 26th the confession was finished, and by "order of the Assembly the prolocutor gave thanks, in the name of the Assembly, to the committee that had taken so great pains in the perfecting of the Confession of Faith;" and it was ordered that "the whole Confession of Faith shall be transcribed and read in the Assembly, and sent up to both Houses of Parliament." However, the Preface and several Articles were debated and modified until December 4th, when "thanks were given to the assessor, Dr. Burgess, for his great pains in transcribing the Confession of Faith," by the prolocutor; and it was resolved to present it to both Houses of Parliament by the whole Assembly. This was done on the same day to the Commons, and on the 7th to the Lords. (Mitchell, p. 308.) Six hundred copies were at once struck off for the use of both Houses and the Assembly, under the title: "*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Confession of Faith presented by them lately to both Houses of Parliament.*" It is signed by Charles Herle, prolocutor, Cornelius Burgess and Herbert Palmer, assessors, and Henry Roborough and Adoniram Byfield, scribes, and is without Scripture proofs, having thirty-three chapters on fifty-four pages. On January 6, 1646[7], Mr. Wilson, Mr. Byfield, and Mr. Gower were appointed a committee to prepare Scriptures for the Confession of Faith. Debate upon them began on the 7th and continued until April 5th (the fourth section of chap. xx. giving them the most trouble), when they were finished. It was, however, reviewed by the three committees, and not finally completed unto the 26th, when a large committee (Dr. Smith chairman) were appointed to carry them up to both Houses (Mitchell, p. 354). Six hundred copies were ordered to be printed for the use of the Houses and the Assembly, under the title: "*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Confession of Faith; with the Quotations and Texts of Scripture Annexed.* London, 1647." The texts are in the margin; there are thirty-three chapters on fifty-six pages. It is signed by the same persons as the first edition without Scriptures. They were not finally adopted by Parliament until June 20, 1648.

Chapters xxx. and xxxi., on Church Censures, and Synods and Councils, were stricken out; and the two closing Articles were numbered chap. xxx., Of the State of Man After Death and Resurrection of the Dead; and chap. xxxi. The Last Judgment.*

They were then printed under the title: "*Articles of Christian Religion approved and passed by both Houses of Parliament after Advice had with the Assembly of Divines by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster.* London, June 27, 1648."

The last and greatest work of the Assembly was upon the

CATECHISMS.

We have not been able to discover the first appointment of a committee on this subject; but on February 7, 1644[5], it was ordered "that Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Delny be added to the committee for the catechism," and May 12th, "that the committee for the catechism do meet this afternoon." On the 13th the committee reported, and there was a long debate, in the course of which Gillespie said (Mitchell, p. 92): "I like well the form offered to you, the capital questions by themselves, and particular questions by aye and no, both put together in the body of the catechism. . . . When we were lately in Scotland, in conference, we had occasion to speak of this way, and showed them the example of it, and they all liked it very well." Mr. Herle said: "I would have aye and no to be expressed, but not distinct. It should be the first word of the answer." Mr. Palmer said: "If I had not a peculiar interest in this I should have spoken more." This peculiar interest of Herbert Palmer was in his being chairman of the committee, and that it was his catechism that was under discussion as a basis. There is a copy of it in the McAlpin collection of Union Theological Seminary, entitled: "*An Endeavor of making the Principles of Christian Religion, namely, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments, plaine and easie.* By Herbert Palmer. Sixth

* Besides these changes, chap. xxiv., Of Marriage and Divorce, was made to close with section 4—"as these persons may live together as man and wife." The rest of the section and sections 5 and 6 are entirely omitted.

impression. London, 1645." From this we quote a few specimens, to show that it was really under debate at this time :

1. *What is a man's greatest business in this world?*

Is it to follow the world, and live as he list?

Or, is it to glorifie God, and save his owne soule?

A. A man's greatest business in this world is to glorifie God, and save his owne soul. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Cor. x. 31; Matt. xvi. 26.

No.

Yes.

2. *How shall a man come to glorifie God and save his own soul?*

Can they do so that are ignorant?

Or, They that do not believe in God?

Or, Doe not serve him?

Or, Must they not needs learn to know God? and believe in him, and serve him?

A. They that will glorifie God, and save their owne soules, must needs learn to know God, and believe in him, and serve him. 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; 2 Thes. i. 7, 8; Rom. iv. 20; Heb. x. 39; Deut. x. 12; Rom. vi. 22.

No.

No.

No.

Yes.

Q. *Say the Articles of the Believe.*

3. *What is it to believe in God?*

Is it not first to be persuaded that there is a God?

And, Is that enough without trusting in him as my God?

Or, Is it enough to trust in him at some time only?

Or, To trust in him and not according to his Word?

Or, Is it to trust in him as my God, at all times, according to his Word?

A. I believe in God, etc.

A. To believe in God is to be persuaded that there is a God, and to trust in him as my God at all times, according to his word. Heb. xi. 6; Ps. lxxviii. 22; Dan. vi. 23; Ps. lxii. 8; Ps. lvi. 4, 10, 11.

Yes.

No.

No.

No.

Yes.

That this catechism was under consideration at the time will appear further from a comparison of it with the subsequent debates.* On August 1, 1645, Mr. Palmer made report of the catechism, and it was debated, and on the 4th there was "a debate about the creed to be expressed." As we see above, the creed occurs after the second question. Then on the 5th there was a "debate about the catechism concerning God," the third question above. August 20th, there was another debate

* Prof. Mitchell (Minutes, p. lxxxvi) states: "The catechism which Baillie reports to have been drawn up and near agreed on in the end of 1644, was, of course, neither of the two ultimately adopted, but either that which had been almost completed, and to a considerable extent passed, in the Assembly (pp. 281, 282, etc.), before it was resolved to have two; or it may be that it was that catechism still preserved in Ms. in the Library of the University of Edinburgh, and ascribed to Samuel Rutherford." This statement is correct as to the first part, but the conjecture as to the catechism of Rutherford cannot be true, as we shall see in the course of our comparison, unless that really be a Ms. copy of the catechism of Palmer or one based on it by the committee. The words of Gillespie quoted above look as if he might have taken Palmer's catechism with him to Scotland.

about the catechism, and it was resolved that "Mr. Palmer, Dr. Stanton, and Mr. Young draw up the whole draught of the catechism with all convenient speed and make report to this Assembly."* These were selected from the larger committee, which probably included Mr. Guibon and Mr. Caudrey as well as Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Delmy, above mentioned as added to the committee, as we should judge from the erasures and a comparison with a similar course with reference to the Confession of Faith, where a small committee was chosen from the larger one for the first draught.

September 14th, 1646, Mr. Palmer reported for the first, and there was again a "debate of reciting the creed. This left till the end of the catechism, the Assembly now only considering of the materials." The Assembly then for some time went over the catechism question by question. This debate we will compare with Herbert Palmer's catechism on the one side and the debate subsequently on the Larger Catechism on the other, that it may be shown how, through this double debate and work of committees, Herbert Palmer's catechism passed over into the Westminster catechisms. We have space only for the answers to the questions, emphasizing the changes.

PALMER'S CATECHISM.	MINUTES OF FIRST DEBATE ON THE CATECHISM.	MINUTES OF DEBATE ON THE LARGER CATECHISM.
4. God is a being, infinite in all perfection.	6. God is a <i>most glorious</i> being, infinite in all perfections.	7. God is a spirit, infinite in being and perfection.
5. There is but one God.	7. There is but one God.	8. There is but one only, <i>the living and true God.</i>
6. There are three Persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, yet still there is but one God.	8. There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, <i>and these three</i> are but one God.	10. There be three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one true, <i>eternal God, equal in substance, power, and glory.</i>
7. Jesus Christ is God.	9. The Son of God, who is the only begotten of the Father <i>from all eternity, is true God, equal with the Father.</i>	11. It is <i>proper to the Father to beget the Son</i> , and to the Son to be begotten of the Father, and to the Holy Ghost to proceed from the
8. Jesus Christ is God the Son, the only begotten of the Father.		

† July 23, 1646, Mr. Ward was added to the committee. December 1st, Mr. Whitaker, Mr. Nye, Mr. Byfield, and the brethren that methodized the Confession of Faith; July 15, 1647, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Sedgwick, Mr. Bond, Mr. Bolton and Mr. Chambers; August 9th, Mr. Calamy and Mr. Gower; September 8th, Mr. Wilson.

PALMER'S CATECHISM.

9. The Holy Ghost is God, equal with the Father and the Son.

10. God hath his being only from himself.

11. God is a spirit, and hath no body.

13. God is invisible.

14. God is not like a man or anything to be seen in the world.

12. God is everywhere and in all places.

15. God is almighty, and can do all things.

16. God is most wise, knowing all things, and doth all things most wisely.

17. God is most perfect, holy, and alloweth not any to sin.

18. God is always most just, and in all things; whether he punish or spare good or bad, punishing all sin either in the sinner or in Christ the surety.

19. God is most merciful, both in giving and forgiving beyond desert.

20. God's mercy only forgiveth those that repent of their sins, and believe in Christ.

21. God is eternal, from everlasting to everlasting, having no beginning nor end.

22. God is unchangeably the same forever, notwithstanding the changes he makes in all other things.

23. God is most true, and it is not possible for him to lie.

MINUTES OF FIRST DEBATE ON THE CATECHISM.

10. The Holy Ghost, *who from all eternity proceeds from the Father and the Son*, is also *true* God, equal with the Father and the Son.

11. God is a spirit, invisible, without body, or *bodily parts*, not like a man or any other *creature*.

12. God is everywhere, and *fills both heaven and earth*, and *yet is not contained in any place*.

12. God is almighty, and can do all things; *nothing is too hard for him*.

14. God is most wise, knowing all things *past, present, and to come*, even *the secrets of all hearts*, and cannot be *deceived*.

15. God is most perfectly holy, and *neither causeth, nor alloweth any to sin*.

16. God is always most just, and in all things, punishing all sin, either in the sinner or in Christ the surety.

17. God is *infinitely good* and merciful, both in giving and forgiving *freely*.

18. God is eternal, from everlasting to everlasting, having no beginning or end.

19. God is *always* the same unchangeably, notwithstanding the changes in all other things.

20. God is most true *in all his words, particularly in his promises and threatenings*, and it is not possible for him to lie.

MINUTES OF DEBATE ON THE LARGER CATECHISM.

Father and the Son from all eternity.

9. God is almighty, all-sufficient, eternal, unchangeable, everywhere present, knowing all things, most wise, most holy, most just, most merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth.

(This is a summary of 9-24 of Palmer, and 11-21 of first debate.)

PALMER'S CATECHISM.

24. God is in himself most blessed every way and forever.

25. I am sure there is a God, because neither of myself nor anything in the world could make me or preserve me, or order things that befall me without God.

35. Mankind is now naturally in a very miserable condition.

36. Man's misery is, that they are now all sinners, and subject to punishment for sin; and that is my condition as well as others.

37. Sin is any transgression of God's law, be it but in words or thoughts.

38. Mankind became miserable by sinning all with our first parents, Adam and Eve, in eating the forbidden fruit: and I sinned among them.

40. All mankind are altogether corrupted with sin, and that in every part, both of soul and body; and so am I.

41. All men are inclined to all sins, and untoward to any good; and I as much as any other by nature.

42. All children that are conceived a natural way, are conceived and borne in sin; and so was I too.

MINUTES OF FIRST DEBATE
ON THE CATECHISM.

21. God is in himself most blessed every way, and forever, *neither can any creature add to his happiness or take anything from it.*

22. I am sure there is a God, because the *things that are in the world* could neither have their being nor their preservation, nor be ordered as they are without God.

29. Man is now naturally in a very miserable condition, by reason of sin and punishment for sin.

30. Sin is the transgression of God's law.

31. By the first man's eating the forbidden fruit all mankind became *sinful; being all conceived and born in sin.*

32. All men *have lost the image of God*, and are by nature wholly corrupted with sin, both in soul and body being inclined to all evil, and *enemies* to all good.

MINUTES OF DEBATE ON
THE LARGER CATECHISM.

25. Sin is *any want of conformity unto*, and transgression of, the law of God, *given as a rule to the reasonable creature.*

26. The sinfulness of that state whereunto man fell, consisteth in *the guilt of Adam's first sin*, the want of that original righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly *indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good*, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually; *which is commonly called original sin*, and from which do proceed all *actual transgressions.*

27. Original sin is *conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation*, so as all that proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin.

This last question brings us to an important discussion on September 24, 1646 (we quote from the minutes): "The Assembly proceeded in debate of the catechism. The next question

and answer, viz.: *Q.* Are children also thus guilty of sin and corrupted with it? *A.* All children conceived in a natural way are conceived and born in sin, and so was I too, was waived." The next question and answer in Palmer is: "43. *Q.* You say all mankind are altogether corrupted: how then came any to be of a better mind or behaviour than others? *A.* God's grace is onely that that makes one man better than another." The minutes, p. 289, record: "Resolved upon: this question and answer, viz.: *Q.* If all mankind be thus corrupted, how comes any one to be better than another? *A.* It is God's grace onely that makes one man better than another, restraining all and sanctifying some, shall be waived in this place."

They did not get beyond question 35 on that day, but devoted themselves to the confession until November 27th, when they again took up the catechism, and debated as far as the fifty-eighth question of Palmer, when the other questions concerning the death of Christ were referred to the committee, "that something might be added concerning the active obedience of Christ and His suffering in soul." On the 30th they began with the seventy-fourth question of Palmer, which was passed in almost identical terms. On December 2d they debated the forty-eighth to the fiftieth questions of Palmer, on the 7th the seventy-second and third. On December 2d they came to the second part of Palmer's Catechism on the Commandments, and began with his opening question: "How do they live here, who partake of Christ and all his benefits?" which they put thus: "How are they bound to lead their lives, who do believe in Christ?" after which they took up the commandments in their order until January 4, 1646, when they came to the fourth. Here they again left off to attend to the Confession of Faith. January 14, 1646, on motion of Mr. Vines, it was ordered "that the committee for the catechism do prepare a draught of two catechisms, one more large and another more brief, in which they are to have an eye to the Confession of Faith, and to the matter of the catechism already begun." On Thursday, April 15, 1647, the Assembly began the debate on the Larger Catechism, and went on regularly until June 23, when the commandments were referred to eleven committees, and it was ordered "that report be brought in to-morrow sevensight to the committee of whom Mr. Tuckney is in the chair." Mr. Tuckney from

this time forth seems to be the moving spirit in making report about the Larger Catechism, especially the commandments.

September 10, 1647, the last questions of the Larger Catechism were reported, and the Assembly then went to work, reviewing the whole, Mr. Tuckney reporting until it was completed October 15th, and ordered to be sent to both Houses. A minute was made on motion of Mr. Rutherford that :

“the Assembly hath enjoyed the assistance of the honorable, reverend and learned Commissioners from 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 Government, and Catechism, some of the reverend and learned divines, Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, have been present in and assisting to the Assembly.”

On the 22d the Larger Catechism was ordered to be sent up by the prolocutor, attended with the whole Assembly. Six hundred copies were ordered to be printed, under the title : *“The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Larger Catechism. London, 1647.”*

The Assembly now went to work upon the Shorter Catechism. Already, August 5, 1647, they had resolved : “The Shorter Catechism shall be gone in hand with presently by a committee now to be chosen. Ordered : Mr. Prolocutor, Mr. Palmer, Dr. Temple, Mr. Lightfoot, Mr. Green, Mr. Delmy, shall be this committee, and Mr. Palmer to take care of it.” August 9th Mr. Palmer made a preliminary report, and this is the last we hear of his presence in the Assembly. He was taken sick and died before the close of the year. October 13th, the Assembly sent for the papers that were in his charge, and November 2d a motion was made to appoint an assessor in his place. Dr. Temple made a second preliminary report on the 10th. Having finished the Larger Catechism, it was ordered, October 19, 1647, that Mr. Tuckney, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Ward prepare the Short Catechism.” Mr. Tuckney began to report on the 21st, and proceeded rapidly with it. On the 8th of November it was resolved to add the Commandments, Lord’s Prayer, and Creed to it. On the 9th Mr. Burgess and Mr. Caudry were added to the committee for the review of the catechism, Mr. Wallis to attend it”—that is, as chairman of the committee for the review. Mr. Tuckney made his final report November 16, 1647, and it was ordered to be sent up to both

Houses. After some minor additions and the preparation of the Preface, it was carried up by the prolocutor on the 25th. It was ordered to be printed under the title: "*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster, concerning a Shorter Catechism.* London, 1647." November 26th, in accordance with the directions of Parliament, a committee was appointed, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Gower, Mr. Byfield, Mr. Strickland, Mr. Hickes, Mr. Rayner, to prepare the Scriptures for both catechisms. The debate began on the 30th, and continued until December 23d, when Mr. Prophet, Mr. Tuckney, Mr. Burges, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Ash, Mr. Thorowgood, were appointed to review the Scriptures for the catechism, Mr. Prophet chairman. Mr. Whitaker was added January 19, 1647(8), and Mr. Sedgewicke, Mr. Caudrey, Mr. Scudder, Mr. Valentine, Mr. Strong, Mr. Rayner, Mr. Lightfoot, and Mr. Green on February 9th. On the 10th the three committees were ordered to meet and prepare the Scriptures. March 13th Dr. Stanton and Mr. Caudrey were added to the committee. April 12th the Scriptures were completed, and ordered to be taken up by the prolocutor with the Assembly. Six hundred copies were ordered to be printed. The titles are: "*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines now by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Larger Catechism presented by them lately to both Houses of Parliament, with the proofs thereof out of the Scriptures.* London, 1648," and as finally adopted, "*The Ground and Principles of Religion contained in a Shorter Catechism (according to the Advice of the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster), to be used throughout the Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales*" (Mitchell, p. 513).

There was nothing more to be done by the Assembly but to answer the nine queries. For this they had little heart, as they could expect nothing but opposition from Parliament in this particular, and indeed the work had already been done for them by their brethren, the London ministers. They felt more at home in the freer atmosphere of the Provincial Assembly of London, at Sion College, to which many of them belonged; so that the Assembly gradually melted away, the Provincial Assembly taking up its work in preparing those invaluable Presbyterian documents: "*A Vindication of the Presbyterian*

Government, 1649," and the "*Jus divinum ministerii evangelici, or the divine right of the Gospel Ministry, 1653,*" and so on.

Looking at the Westminster Assembly as a whole, it is safe to say that there never was a body of divines who labored more conscientiously, carefully, and faithfully, produced more important documents, or a richer theological literature, than that remarkably learned, able, and pious body, who sat for so many trying years in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey.

C. A. BRIGGS.