



THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 5.—January, 1881.

i.

JOHN À LASCO.

THE name of John à Lasco is not so familiar to the readers of Church History, as are the names of many others who took prominent parts in the Great Reformation. There must be reasons for this, arising probably out of the nature of the places and circumstances in which he labored. He was not put by Providence so prominently before the Christendom of his day as were some others who were placed at the political and religious centres of the great nations of Europe. But not one of them was more deservedly honored and beloved by the people for whom he labored, than à Lasco was by the Reformed of East Friesland, the Refugees from Holland and France in London, or by the true Christians of Poland, whom he served in the evening of his life. If we simply look at the man, and compare him with those with whom he was associated in work for Christ's Church, whose names are familiar to, and held in grateful remembrance by, the Protestant world to-day, we shall say that he was the peer of the best of them. We need only to look candidly at the man and his work to be convinced of the monstrous injustice of assigning him to a very inferior place, or of allowing that he is forgotten because he was unworthy of remembrance. À Lasco's name and work ought not to be forgotten. He was richly furnished by nature, education, and grace with most excellent gifts. The result was a well-

III.

THE PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY OF LONDON, 1647-1660.

ONE of the most important things that the Westminster Assembly undertook to do was to reform the discipline and government of the Church of England, in accordance with the original call of June 1, 1643. On October 12, 1643, the Assembly received an order from Parliament

“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, 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 in stead and place of the present church government by archbishops, bishops, which is resolved to be taken away.”

The three committees of the Assembly went at once to work, reporting to the Assembly, which then debated the whole matter until July 4, 1645, when the draft of Church Government was sent up to Parliament entitled, “*The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now sitting by Ordinance of Parliament at Westminster, concerning Church Government.*”

August 19, 1645, Parliament passed an ordinance giving

“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 each.* The congregational Assemblies were to meet every week and the classical Assemblies every month. The Provincial Assembly was to be composed of at least two

* The I. Presb. was to have 16 churches; II., 15; III., 12; IV., 14; V., 12; VI., 13; VII., 9; VIII., 10; IX., 13; X., 9; XI., 8; XII., 8; or, in all, 139 congregational elderships.

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. Thus a uniform principle of representation was established from the lowest to the highest court. The elders were to be double in number the ministers, and each court as it received representatives from the lower court, so it sent representatives to the higher court, and indeed the same number relatively, so that all of the ecclesiastical bodies were proportionately representative.

On October 20, 1645, there was passed,

“An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, 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 as are appointed triers and judges of the ability of elders in the twelve classes within the Province of London.”

It was published on the 21st of October. This gives a list of three ministers and six others for each of the twelve Classes to be organized, except the seventh, which has two ministers for one church of Michael Basingshaw, making four ministers and six others, and the eleventh, which has five ministers and eleven others.

On November 8 was passed, and printed November 12,

“An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament for giving power to all the classical Presbyteries within their respective bounds to examine, approve, and ordain ministers for several congregations.”

March 14, 1645 (6), an ordinance was issued,

“that the classical Assemblies in each Province shall assemble themselves within one month after they shall be constituted and this ordinance published”;

but the difference between Parliament and the Assembly with regard to exclusion from the Lord's supper and the *Jus Divinum* delayed the organization of the church, so that the first meeting of the Provincial Assembly of London took place on May 3, 1647, in the convocation house of Paul's Church.

There are preserved in the library of Sion College, London, the original and apparently official minutes of the Pro-

* According to the form of Church Government, adopted by Parliament 29th of August, 1648, the National Assembly was also to have five learned and godly persons from each University.

vincial Assembly of London from May 3, 1647, until August 15, 1660. These were obtained from the library of Lazarus Seaman (one of the Westminster divines, the last Moderator of the Assembly) in 1676, and presented by Thos. Granger, September 20, 1726, to the library of Sion College. They contain besides the minutes the four papers adopted by the body. (1) "Vindication of the Presbyterian Government," published November 2, 1649. (2) "*Jus Divinum Minist. Evang.*—or, the Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry," November 2, 1653. (3) "An Exhortation to Catechizing," August 30, 1655. (4) An unfinished exhortation or circular letter. The title-page is, "Records of the Provincial Assembly of London begun by ordinance of Parliament, May 3, in the convocation house of Paul's, London, 1647." There is also in the Williams Library, Grafton Street, London, in the third volume of the Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, minutes of the Provincial Assembly of London from the third session of the eighth Assembly, November 27, 1650, until the thirteenth session of the sixteenth Assembly, April 24, 1655, in much briefer and more careless style than the one mentioned above.

There were present at the first meeting, May 3, 1647, representatives from eight out of the twelve Classes—the second, ninth, eleventh, and twelfth sending no representatives. The names of the sixteen ministers and thirty-two elders are contained in the minutes. They were as follows from the ministers: Dr. Wm. Gouge, Laz. Seaman, John Ley, Nich. Proffett, Edm. Calamy, Wm. Spurstow, Jer. Whitaker, Ant. Tuckney, thus eight, who were also prominent members of the Westminster Assembly, and eight other ministers of London, John Cardell, Ralph Robinson, John Wall, Thos. Manton, Arthur Jackson, James Cranford, Samuel Clark, and John Rawlinson. We notice also that among the elders was Dr. John Bastwick, author of "Independency not God's Ordinance," 1645, and "The utter routing of the whole army of all the Independents and Sectaries," 1646.*

* Masson, in his *Life of Milton*, Vol. III., p. 544, is in error in stating that it consisted of one hundred and eight representatives, in the proportion of three ministers and six lay elders from each. This is a calculation of nine by twelve, or the total number allotted in a later ordinance. In this error he follows Neal in his "*History of the*

These London Presbyterian ministers had been drawing closer together during the whole time of the civil commotions and were accustomed to meet at Sion College and had already acted together in an informal way in the production of several important documents. Thus, on the first of January, 1645 (6), they adopted "*A letter of the ministers of the city of London,*" against *Toleration*, which was presented to the Westminster Assembly, in which they contend that Independency is a schism, because, say they, (1) Independents do depart from our churches, being true churches, and so acknowledged by themselves; (2) They draw and seduce our members from our congregations; (3) They erect separate congregations under a separate and undiscovered government; (4) They refuse communion with our churches in the sacrament; etc. But the most important of these is the "*Jus divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici; or, the divine right of Church Government asserted and evidenced by the holy Scriptures . . . by sundry ministers of Christ within the City of London,*" published in 1646, and then revised in a second edition in 1647. This was in answer to the nine questions respecting the "*Jus divinum*" which the Parliament required the Westminster Assembly to answer on April 30, 1646.

Also on December 14, 1647, or during the sessions of the second Provincial Assembly, there was signed by "the ministers of Christ within the Province of London," "*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.*" The names of the signers are appended to the published document, including of the members of the Westminster Assembly, *Wm. Gouge, Thos. Gataker, Geo. Walker, Dan. Cawdrey, Nicholas Proffett, Ant. Tuckney, Edm. Calamy, Sim. Ashe, Thos. Case, Laz. Seaman, Stanley Gower, Hen. Wilkinson, and Ant. Burgesse*, all pastors in London (thir-

Puritans," Vol. II., p. 433, who makes this mistake in spite of his recognition of the fact that only eight Classes were yet formed at the second meeting, in quoting, p. 434, a Petition adopted to Parliament, asking (1) "That the number of the delegates to the Provincial Assembly may be enlarged, because they found it difficult sometimes to make up the number of thirty-six." (2) "That the houses would quicken the settlement of those classes [in London] that were not yet formed, which they say were four."

teen), and besides thirty-nine other pastors, including John Downname, *Arthur Jackson*, *John Wall*, Henry Robrough, *Sam. Clark*, *Jas. Cranford*, Fran. Roberts, Wm. Jenkyn, John Wallis, Chris. Love, Wm. Wickins, John Sheffield, Thos. Gouge, *Ralph Robinson*, and Thos. Watson; thus ten (whose names are in italics) out of the sixteen mentioned as members of the first Provincial Assembly.* Thus these documents must be regarded as semi-official.

The former document maintains that "there is a Church Government of divine right under the New Testament," that the *rule* of that Government is *Holy Scripture*, the fountain of it *Jesus Christ as mediator*; that it is a *spiritual power* or *authority* derived from Jesus Christ, and exercised by church *officers*, endowed by Him; that the several acts of this power are public prayer and thanksgiving, singing of Psalms, public ministry of the Word of God in the congregation, in reading the Scriptures and singing, the catechetical propounding or expounding of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, the ordination of Presbyters with imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, the authoritative discerning and judging of doctrine according to the Word of God, admonition and public rebuke of sinners; rejecting, purging out or putting away from the communion of the Church, wicked and incorrigible persons, seasonable remitting, receiving, comforting, and authoritative confirming again in the communion of the Church, those that are penitent, taking special care for relief of the necessities and distresses of the poor and afflicted members of the Church. The end of this government is the edifying of the Church of Christ. The receptacle of this power of church government is not the civil magistrate as the Erastians

* Masson, in his *Life of Milton*, Vol. III., p. 676, is in error in stating that forty-one signed the whole document, while seventeen, being members of the Assembly, abstained from signing to those matters relating to the "Confession of Faith and Directory for Church Government." The numbers are as we have given them—thirty-nine and thirteen=fifty-two in all, instead of fifty-eight as Masson states, according to three copies which we have consulted, London, 1648, printed by A. M. for Tho. Underhill at the Bible in Wood-street. In this error he also follows Neale, Vol II., p. 435. This number, fifty-two, is confirmed by John Simpson in his "second Epistle to the two and fifty parish ministers within the new Province of London, who have subscribed unto that Pamphlet, which is wickedly and unjustly called by them, '*A Testimonie to the truth of Jesus Christ, and to our solemn League and Covenant.*'" This epistle introduces his book entitled "The Perfection of Justification maintained against the Pharise," etc., etc. London, 1648.

contend, nor the *cætus fidelium* or body of the people, as presbyterated, or unpresbyterated as the Separatists and Independents pretend, but *Christ's own officers* which He hath created *jure divino* in His Church. These officers are (1) pastors and teachers; (2) ruling elders; (3) deacons. The power of the keys or proper ecclesiastical power is distributed among these church officers so that the deacons have the care of the poor, the ruling elders and pastors combined the power of jurisdiction, the pastors and teachers the preaching of the Word and administration of sacraments. The Presbytery is the body of ruling elders and pastors having this power of jurisdiction which may be the lesser Assemblies, consisting of the ministers and ruling elders in each single congregation, called the Parochial Presbytery, or congregational eldership, and the greater Assemblies consisting of church governors *sent* from several churches and united into one body for government of all those churches within their own bounds. These greater Assemblies are either Presbyterial or Synodal,—Presbyterial consisting of the ministers and elders of several adjacent or neighboring single congregations or parish churches, called the Presbytery or Classical Presbytery; Synodal consisting of ministers and elders sent from Presbyterial Assemblies to consult and conclude about matters of common and great concernment to the Church within their limits, and these are either *Provincial*, embracing ministers and elders from several Presbyteries within one Province; *National*, ministers and elders from several Provinces within one nation, and *Æcumenical*, ministers and elders from the several nations within the whole Christian world. These are all of divine right, and there is a divine right of appeals from the lower to the higher bodies, and of the subordination of the lower to the higher in the authoritative judging and determining of causes ecclesiastical.

It is sufficient in the review of this important Presbyterian document, semi-official both of the Westminster Assembly and the ministers of London, to observe the stress laid (1) on the *divine* right of Church Government not only in general and fundamental principles, but also in details in the thorough working out of the scheme; (2) the making the seat of authority in the *Presbyteries*, congregational and general,

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

and not in the *body of the people*; (3) the making of all courts above the Church session representative, each lower court sending representatives to the court higher than itself, culminating in the *Œcumenical Synod*, to which is ascribed supreme power and final arbitration of all questions; and so their scheme differs from our construction of Presbyteries as well as Synods and General Assemblies, and has in view what we are only beginning faintly to realize in the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, an *Œcumenical Assembly* of all Churches throughout the world, thus realizing and enforcing the *unity* and *catholicity* of Presbyterianism; (4) the great stress laid upon the divine right of the use of the power of the keys.

The second semi-official document, to which attention has been called, approves of the Westminster Confession of faith, and testifies for the solemn league and Covenant and against errors, heresies, and blasphemies, and the toleration of them. These errors are classified as errors against the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures; against the nature and essence of God; against the Trinity of Persons in Unity of Essence; against the Deity of the Son of God; against the Deity and divine worship of the Holy Ghost; against God's eternal decree of Election and Reprobation; about original sin; against Jesus Christ our Mediator; touching universal and general redemption; about natural man's free will, and power to good supernatural; against the true nature and ground of faith and justification; touching the state of those which are in Christ, in reference to the moral law, to sin and to the perfection of their holiness and good works in this life; against the ordinances of Christ in general; against the Lord's day Sabbath; against the Sacrament of Baptism; against lawful oaths; touching Marriage and Divorce; against the future state of men's souls after this life, denying the immortality of the soul, and the actual being of heaven or hell till the day of judgment, and of the torments of devils till then, etc.; of toleration, patronizing and promoting all other errors, heresies, and blasphemies whatsoever, under the grossly abused notion of *Liberty of Conscience*.

We note a few from the long catalogue.

“God is the author not of those actions alone, in and with which sin is, but of the

very pravity, ataxy, anomie, irregularity, and sinfulness itself which is in them. Yea God hath more hand in men's sinfulness, than they themselves." * Page 6.

"That if the love of God be limited to a few, it is farre from being infinite. He that doeth good, or sheweth mercy to one in misery, and passeth by another in the like condition, in every respect; the defect must be in his heart, or in his ability; now we know that it is not for want of ability, if God shew not mercy to all; and to ascribe it to his heart, his disposition, will or pleasure, is to blaspheme his excellent name and nature," † page 8.

"That Christ was given to undergo a shameful death, voluntarily upon the cross, to satisfie for the sin of Adam and for all the sins of all mankind," ‡ page 9.

"That as the death of Christ was extended to all, so likewise the benefits thereof, were both by the Father and Son intended for all," (*) page 9.

"That the moral law is of no use at all to a believer; no rule for him to walk by, nor to examine his life by. And that Christians are free from the mandatory power of it." — "The law cuts off a man's legs and then bids him walk." § — "The law and Christ are two contrary things, whereof the one cannot abide the other." ¶ — "He that believeth that Christ hath taken away his sin, is as clean without sin as Christ himself." ¶ — "A child of God need not, nay, ought not to ask pardon for sin, and that it is no lesse than blasphemy in him so to do." ** "The Lord hath not one sin to charge upon any elect person from the first moment of conception, till the last minute of his life, there is not so much as original sin to be laid on him." †† — "If a man by the spirit know himself to be in the state of grace though he be drunk, or commit murder, God sees no sin in him," (‡) pages 15 and 16.

These few extracts will show that not only were the errors and various opinions of later times widely prevalent, but also stated in bolder language, the quotations being in the very words of their authors. This Testimony produced a great stir in England, and was at once followed by similar ones from all parts of the land. We have seen no less than ten of them in

* This view was maintained by John Archer in his book, "Comfort for Believers about their Sins and Troubles," which was burned by the common hangman by order of Parliament at the request of the Westminster Assembly.

† These views were maintained by the author of "Fullnesse of God's Love Manifested." 1643.

‡ This is referred to "Hammond's Practical Catechism." 1646.

§ These views are ascribed to John Simpson, who wrote a book to justify himself, entitled "The Perfection of Justification maintained against the Pharisee; The Purity of Sanctification against the Stainers of it; The Unquestionableness of a Future Glorification against the Sadduce, in several sermons. Together with an Apologetical Answer to the Ministers of the new Province of London in vindication of the author against their aspersions. London, 1648."

¶ This is referred to John Eaton's book, entitled "Honiecomb of Free Justification." 1642.

¶ This is referred to John Archer in his book, "Comfort for Believers."

** This was maintained by a Mr. Randall, who is referred to by Gataker in his book, "God's Eye on Israel."

†† This was maintained by Tobias Crisp in his sermon "Our Sins are already laid on Christ."

addition to that of the London ministers, signed by as many as 700 ministers.

Dr. Wm. Gouge was chosen Moderator of the first Provincial Assembly, May 3, 1647. It met at Paul's convocation house, by act of Parliament, but they made application to Parliament, at their Second session, for liberty to remove, and it being granted, they removed at once to Sion College (Neal, II., 433). In an ordinance of 29th August, 1648, they were directed as previously so hereafter to meet at Sion College. The first Assembly drew up rules of order and appointed a committee to consider the business of the province, J. Whitaker, chairman (Neal, II., p. 433). During the sessions of this Assembly the London ministers drew up and subscribed a vindication of themselves with regard to the strife between the army and the city, which was signed by about twenty of them and presented to a Committee of Parliament, August 2, 1647 (Neal, II., p. 447).

The second Assembly met at Sion College Nov. 8, 1647, seven Classes being represented (I., III., IV., V., VI., VII., and X.), and Dr. Laz. Seaman was chosen Moderator. On Jan. 11th they presented a petition to Parliament in a body, praying that the number of delegates may be enlarged; the remaining four Classes be speedily organized; a learned ministry be provided for; sins of uncleanness be provided against, and scandalous persons excluded from the church communion (Neal, II., p. 434). There being but seven Classes represented in this Assembly out of the twelve, and there being but fourteen ministers and twenty-eight elders, if all were present, it must have been exceedingly difficult to keep up the legal quorum of twelve ministers and twenty-four elders necessary to the transaction of business.

The third Assembly met May 3, 1648, at Sion College, Dr. Whitaker, Moderator. At session fourteen of this Assembly, Oct. 26, 1648, the Moderator brought in an order of the Committee of the Lords and Commons, which concerned the increase of delegates from the several classical Presbyteries of the Provincial Assembly. Hence, at the fourth Assembly, which met Nov. 3, 1648, Dr. Calamy, Moderator, and at all subsequent Assemblies, there were three ministers and six elders from each Classis.

During the sessions of this Assembly London was greatly agitated by political events. On the 30th of November Charles I. was seized by the Cromwellians, on the 6th of December the Presbyterian members of the House of Commons were expelled to the number of 140, and the remnant, constituting the "Rump Parliament," resolved to try the king, and on January 1st nominated a Court of 150 Commissioners. The House of Lords was abolished. On the 20th of January Charles I. appeared before the Court to deny its competence, and refused to plead, and on the 30th of January, 1648 (9), he was executed. Against all these illegal proceedings the London ministers unofficially protested. On January 18th they subscribed with their names "*A serious and faithful representation of the Judgments of the ministers of the gospel within the Province of London, contained in a letter from them to the Generall and his Councill of Warre, delivered to his Excellency by some of the subscribers, January 18, 1648, published, London, January 20.*" (See also for the names [47] Neal, II., p. 535).*

Again, "*An apologetical declaration of the conscientious Presbyterians of the Province of London and of many thousands of other faithful and Covenant-keeping citizens and inhabitants within the said city and suburbs thereof, wherein their firmnesse and faithfulness to their first principles and to their solemn league and Covenant is conscientiously declared; and the Covenant-breaking and apostacy of others is disclaimed and abhorred before God and the whole world.*" Jan. 24, 1648 (9). This was also signed largely, but the names are not in the published paper.†

Also, "*A vindication of the ministers of the Gospel in and about London, from the unjust aspersions cast upon their former actings for the Parliament as if they had promoted the bringing of the king to capitall punishment, with a short exhortation to the people to keep close to their covenant engagement.*" Jan. 27, 1648 (9).‡

* Baxter in his "Penitent Confession," London, 1691, says that these men who were not restored until Monk and his Presbyterian army restored them "abhor'd the Commonwealth engagement; And so did all the ministers of my Acquaintance save Independents." p. 60.

† Neal does not mention it.

‡ Neal mentions it and gives nineteen names not signed to the previous document—making fifty-seven in all; some who signed the previous one did not sign this.

The 5th Assembly met May 3, 1649, Dr. Walker, Moderator. On Nov. 2d, at the close of this Assembly, the whole "Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry" was read, and finally passed *nemine contradicente*, and it was ordered that special thanks be returned to Mr. Calamy, for his extraordinary care and pains about the Vindication and Exhortation, as also to Mr. Taylor for his good service in this province. The Vindication is given in full in the minutes and subscribed in the name and by the approval of the Assembly, by the Moderator, Geo. Walker, the Assesors Arthur Jackson and Edm. Calamy, and the scribes Roger Drake and Elidad Blackwell. It was published, London, 1649, under the title: "*A Vindication of the Presbyteriall Government and Ministry, together with an exhortation to all the ministers, elders, and people within the bounds of the Province of London, whether joining with us, or separating from us.*" The following points are therein discussed: (1) That there is a Church Government by divine right; (2) That the magistrate is not the fountain of Church Government; (3) That the Presbyterial Government is by divine right; (4) The inconveniences of the Congregational way; (5) That the ruling elder is by divine right; (6) That it is the will of Jesus Christ that all sorts of persons should give an account of their faith to the minister and elders, before admission to the Lord's supper, together with answers to the usual objections made against it; (7) Directions to the elders for the right managing of their office; (8) Directions to such as are admitted to the Lord's supper, for the right sanctifying of God's name in that ordinance, and for their carriage one toward another; (9) Rules to preserve people from the errors of these times; (10) That separation from our churches is justly charged with schism; (11) That ministers formerly ordained by bishops, need no new ordination; (12) The necessity and usefulness of catechising. This document was all the more important now that the king had been beheaded, and Cromwell and the Sec-taries were in power and Toleration established.

From this interesting and valuable document, one extract will give the views of the Westminster divines as to two controversies of our times: the validity of Romish baptism and Romish ordination, the one agitated in this country, the other in Canada:

“ We distinguish between a defective ministrie and a false ministrie, as we do between a man that is lame or blind, and a man that is but the picture of a man. We do not deny but that the way of ministers entering into the ministrie by the bishops, had many defects in it, for which they ought to be humbled : but we add, that notwithstanding all the accidental corruptions, yet it is not substantially and essentially corrupted. As it is with baptism in the Popish Church ; all orthodox divines account it valid, though mingled with much dross, because the party baptized, is *baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost*. And, therefore, when a Papist turns Protestant, he is not baptized again, because the substance of baptism is preserved in Popery under many defects. The like and much more may be said for the ordination of our ministers by bishops. It is lawful and valid for the substance of it, though mingled with many circumstantial defects.” p. 143.*

The 6th Assembly met Nov. 3, 1649, Mr. Jackson, Mod. ; the 7th Assembly, on May 3, 1650, James Nalton, Mod. ; the 8th Assembly, on Nov. 4, 1650, Mr. Cranford, Mod. During the Sessions of this Assembly, many of the London ministers had been apprehended for conspiracy in endeavoring to raise funds for Charles II., (crowned King in Scotland, Jan. 1, 1651, and now supported by a Scotch Presbyterian army, the king having taken the solemn league and Covenant), including Dr. Drake and Messrs. Case, Watson, Heyrick, Jenkyn, Arthur Jackson, Robinson, Cawton, Nalton, Blackmore, and Chris. Love. Eight of them were sent to the Tower and two fled to Holland. [Baxter's Narrative, I, p. 67, Brook, Lives of Puritans, III., p. 122]. Chris. Love was brought before a high court of justice, June 20th, where he plead not guilty to the charges made against him. The trial lasted six days and he was condemned to death. Several parishes and upwards of fifty ministers petitioned for his life, but in vain, and on Aug. 22d he was executed. No less than seven of these men had been or were subsequently Moderators of the Provincial Assembly, and three of them were members of the Westminster Assembly. The whole Presbyterian party were outraged by this execution of one of their ablest ministers.

* The same position is taken by Laz. Seaman, in his Vindication of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines, concerning ordination and laying on of hands, London, 1647. On p. 51, he says : “ The ordination of Romish priests as priests is a mere nullity, because the priesthood itself is so ; but their ordination *ad onus Presbyterii, to preach and administer the sacraments*, is of another nature, and therefore they must not be confounded together ; the rather, because in their manner of ordaining they are really distinguished.” “ The most judicious and best approved amongst us do hold, that as baptism, so ordination, even in *Rome*, is so far forth valid, that upon separation from them and joyning with us, there needs neither new baptisme nor a new ordination.” We will see the same view more fully stated in the *Jus divinum ministerii evangelici* further on. See also Rutherford's “ Peacable and Temperate Plea for Paul's Presbyterie,” London, 1642. p. 129.

The 9th Assembly met May 3, 1651, Laz. Seaman, Mod.; the 10th Assembly, on Nov. 3, 1651, Dr. Wm. Gouge, Mod.; the 11th Assembly, on May 3, 1652, Sim. Ashe, Mod.; the 12th Assembly, on Nov. 3, 1652, Mr. Case, Mod.; the 13th Assembly, on May 3, 1653, Dr. Drake, Mod. The Assemblies during the whole time from the 8th Assembly to the 13th Assembly, Session nineteen, Nov. 2d, the closing meeting, discussed, the "*Jus divinum ministerii evangelici, or the divine right of the Gospel ministry,*" which was finally at that date completed, the whole book passed and ordered to be published, signed by the Moderator, Assessors, and Scribes, and thanks were given to Mr. Calamy and Mr. Cranford "for their great pains on the book." It was not published until the following year, under the above title.

They could do nothing with Cromwell and make no progress in Presbyterian organization of the Provinces, but they were all the more determined to assert and explain Presbyterian principles. This important document, signed by Roger Drake, Moderator, Samuel Balmford and Allen Geer, Assessors, and Matthew Pool and John Seabrook, Scribes, is divided into two parts, the first containing a justification of the gospel ministry in general, the necessity of ordination thereunto by imposition of hands, and the unlawfulness of private men's assuming to themselves either the office or work of the ministry without a lawful call and ordination; the second part containing a justification of the present ministers of England, both such as were ordained during the prevalency of Episcopacy from the foul aspersions of Anti-christianism, and those who have been ordained since its abolition, from the unjust imputation of novelty; proving that a Bishop and Presbyter are all one in Scripture, and that ordination by Presbyters is most agreeable to the Scripture pattern.

We note in the epistle to the reader the following division of parties in England at the time :

- "(1). Such as are against the very office of the ministry, and that affirm, that there is no such office instituted by Christ to be perpetual in his Church. We look upon this assertion as destructive unto Christian Religion and to the souls of Christians.
- (2). Such as say, that it is lawful for any men that suppose themselves gifted (though neither ordained, nor approved by able men) to assume unto themselves a power to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments. This opinion we judge to be the highway to all disorder and confusion, an inlet to errors and heresies, and a door

opened for priests and Jesuites to broach their Popish and Anti-christian doctrine. (3). Such as hold, that the ministry of *England* is Anti-christian, that our churches are no true churches, but synagogues of Satan, and that there is no communion to be held with us. This opinion we conceive to be not only false and uncharitable, but contradictory to Peace and Unity. (4). Such as say, that Episcopacy is an higher order of ministry above Presbytery by divine right, that Christ hath given the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction unto Bishops; and that ordination of ministers is so appropriated to them by the Gospel, that all ordinations by single Presbyters are null and void, and that sacraments by them administered are no sacraments. These assertions we look upon not only as groundlesse and unscriptural, but as cruel, and utterly overthrowing all the Protestant Reformed Churches and ministers. Now, though we hope we can truly say, that we have with all meekness and Christian moderation managed the debate with these four sorts of Adversaries, and shall be ready to exercise all offices of Christian love and affection towards them, and by requiting good for evil, labour to heap coals of fire upon their heads; yet notwithstanding such is the great distance between them and us in judgment and practice, and such is the bitterness of their spirits in their opposition against us, that we have little hope for the present (till the Lord be pleased to work a happy change of judgment in them) of any real and hearty accord and agreement with them. (5). A fifth sort are our reverend brethren of *New* and *Old England* of the Congregational way, who hold our churches to be true churches, and our ministers true ministers, though they differ from us in some lesser things. We have been necessitated to fall upon some things, wherein they and we disagree, and have represented the reasons of our dissent. But yet we here profess, that this disagreement shall not hinder us from any Christian accord with them in affection. That we can willingly write upon our study doors that motto which Mr. Jer. Burroughes (who a little before his death did ambitiously endeavour after Union amongst brethren, as some of us can testify) persuades all scholars unto, *opinionum varietas, et opinantium unitas non sunt opposita*. And that we shall be willing to entertain any sincere motion (as we have also formerly declared in our printed vindication) that shall further a happy accommodation between us. (6). The last sort are the moderate, godly episcopal men, that hold ordination by Presbyters to be lawful and valid; that a Bishop and a Presbyter are one and the same order of ministry, that are orthodox in doctrinal truths and yet hold, that the government of the Church by a perpetual Moderatur is most agreeable to Scripture pattern. Though herein we differ from them, yet we are farr from thinking that this difference should hinder a happy union between them and us. Nay, we crave leave to profess to the world, that it will never (as we humbly conceive) be well with *England* till there be an Union endeavoured and effected between all those that are orthodox in doctrine though differing among themselves in some circumstances about Church government." *

* So Richard Baxter in his "Church Concord," London, 1691, in his Preface: "The ministers of the churches were then (as is usual) of divers opinions about Church Government; (1) Some were for our Diocesane Episcopacy as stated by the Reformation. (2) Some were for a more Reformed Episcopacy, described by Bucer, . . . Usher, etc. (3) Some were for Diocesans in a higher strain, as subject to a foreign Jurisdiction . . . the pope being *principium Unitatis*. (4). Some were for National and Classical Government by Presbyters only, without Bishops. (5). And some were for a parity of Ministers and Churches, without any superior Bishops, or Synods, or Gouverneurs; but to have every Congregation to have all governing power in their proper pastors. (6). And some were for each Congregation to be governed by the major vote of the people; the Pastor being but to gather and declare their vote; Among all these the 3rd sort, the Foreigners, were utterly unreconcilable; and of the 6th we had no great hopes. But with the other four we attempted such a measure of agreement as we might be useful in a loose, unsettled time. . . . The most laborious ministers took the hint, and seconded us in many counties: first and chiefly in Westmoreland and Cumberland, and then in Dorsetshire, Wiltshire, Hampshire, and Essex. . . . But when it came to closest practice, As the Foreigners (Prelatists) and Popular called Brownists, kept

In this statement we see the roots of the differences of opinion which have continued until the present, and the true Presbyterian spirit of dealing with them, which would be heartily endorsed by the Presbyterian Church of the present day.

The following is an analysis of this valuable work: Part I. The justification of the ministry in general. 1. That the office of the ministry of the Word and sacraments is necessary in the Church by divine institution. 2. That the office of the ministry is perpetually necessary. Under this head there is an interesting chapter answering the objection of the loss of the ministry under Antichrist, in which, whilst regarding Antichrist not "as an individual person,—but the state and succession of men which with one and the self-same spirit oppose Christ," and finding it in the Papacy, yet shows that the Lord "had his Church in *Babylon* during the rise and growth and reign and continuance of Antichrist." "It was in and among them (the Romanists) though it was not of them."

"So he raised up his ministers, who, in their severall successive ages in severall places testified against the spiritual whoredomes, idolatrous worships, and deceiving frauds of Antichrist." . . . "The Lamb had a remnant with him who were *called and chosen and faithful*, even an afflicted poor remnant of Pastors as well as of people, reserved in the midst of *Babylon*, who did trust in the name of the Lord, and these godly, pious priests were both obedient unto and bold in the faith of Jesus." p. 50.

These were indeed the two witnesses of Rev. xi., who

"were not two individual persons, . . . but a succession of holy men stirred up all that time to testify the truth of Christ against Antichrist, as our learned men prove."

The forty-two months are interpreted as one thousand two hundred and sixty years; the time when they began being regarded as doubtful, and whether or not they have ended being also doubtful. An interesting catalogue of witnesses is then given.

3. That none ought to take upon him the office of the ministry without a call, and none may do the work of the ministry without ordination.

off, so but few of the rigid Presbyterians or Independents joynd with us; (and indeed Worcestershire and the adjoining Counties had but few of either sort). But the main body of our Association were men that thought the Episcopal, Presbyterians, and Independents, had each of them some good in which they excelled the other two parties, and each of them some mistakes; and that to select out of all three the best part, and leave the worst, was the most desirable (and ancient) Form of Government."

4. Concerning the several ways and means of calling men to the ministry. There is an immediate call to the ministry from God.

“They that are immediately called to the ministry are endued by God, either with the gift of miracles, or with some other testimony of the Spirit, by which they are enabled to give proof of their immediate call.” p. 116.

“Now, as we are not to expect in our daies such extraordinary officers as Apostles, Evangelists, and Prophets, no more are we to expect such an extraordinary way of calling as they had, but as our officers are ordinary, so the calling we are to expect is ordinary.” p. 120.

The ordinary call is *mediate*. It was so even with Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin. “The mediate call is when a man is called to the ministry by men lawfully deputed thereunto,” p. 125. It is “by election and ordination,” p. 126. A strong argument is made for the necessity of *ordination* in order to the office of the ministry—(1) that ordination is an ordinance of Christ; (2) that the essence of the ministerial call consisteth in ordination; (3) that ordination ought to be with prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands; (4) that ordination ought to be by the Presbytery.

In Part II. it is argued, first, that the call to the office of the ministry during the prevalency of Episcopacy was lawful and valid.

“There are some amongst us that refuse to hear our ministers because they were ordained (as they say) by Antichristian bishops, and think they are bound in conscience to renounce our ministry till we have renounced our ordination. And as the Anti-pædobaptists would re-baptize all that are baptized amongst us: so the Brownist would re-ordain all that are ordained amongst us. For our parts we are confident that there is neither warrant out of the word of God for re-baptization nor re-ordination.” II, p. 1.

We note under this head the following important statement:

“We say that all that live within the same parish, being baptized persons and making profession of Christianity, may claime admission into the society of Christians within those bounds and enjoy the priviledges and ordinances there dispensed, if by their scandalous lives they make not themselves unworthy. For we believe that all baptized persons are members of the Church general visible, and have a right unto all the ordinances of Christ as the circumcised *Jew* had, and wheresoever they come to fix their dwellings, may require an orderly admission unto the ordinances there dispensed, unlesse by their sins they have disinherited themselves.” II., p. 10.

The validity of Episcopal ordination is thus argued:

“Ordination is an act of office received from Christ, and is not Antichristian, though executed by one that is in other things Antichristian. We do not re-baptize them that were baptized by a popish priest, because the power of God’s ordinance depends not on the person that does execute the same, but upon an higher foundation, the institution of Christ. Ministerial acts are not vitiated or made null, though they passe

through the hands of bad men ; but stand good to all intents and purposes to such as receive them aright, by virtue of there office authoritatively derived from the first institution. A Bishop in his Presbyterian capacity hath divine right to ordain, and therefore his ordination is valid, though it be granted that he is Antichristian in his Episcopal capacity." II., p. 29.

The validity of Roman Catholic ordination is argued in chapter iii. :

"We say that ordination of ministers by ministers is no *Romish* institution, but instituted by the Lord Jesus himself long before Antichrist was ; that our ministry is descended to us from Christ *through* the Apostate Church of *Rome*, but not *from* the Apostate church of *Rome*." II., p. 33. "It is certain that the church of *Rome* was a true church in the apostles days, when the faith of it was spread throughout the world, and it is as certain that afterwards, by little and little, it apostatized, till at last Antichrist set up his throne in that church. And yet still we must distinguish between the church and the apostasie of it ; between the corn and the tares that are in it." II., p. 38. "When the Protestant Churches did separate they did not erect a new church, but reformed a corrupt church. And, therefore, ours is called the Protestant Reformed Religion." II., p. 40. "It hath pleased God out of his infinite wisdom and providence to continue the two great ordinances of baptism and ordination sound for the substantial of them in the Church of *Rome*, even in their greatest apostacy. We deny not but they have been exceedingly bemuddled and corrupted, *Baptism*, with very many superstitious ceremonies, as of oyl, spittle, crossings, etc. ; *Ordination*, with giving power to the party ordained to make the body of Christ, etc. But yet the substantial have been preserved. Children were baptized with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost. And the parties ordained had power given them to Preach the Word of God. Now the Protestant Religion doth not teach us to renounce Baptism received in the church of *Rome*, neither is a Papist, when converted Protestant, re-baptized. Nor doth it teach us simply and absolutely to renounce ordination ; but it deals with it as the Jewes were to do with a captive maid when they had a mind to marrie her. They must shave her head and pare her nailes and put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and then take her to wife. So doth the Protestant Reformed Religion. It distinguisheth between the ordinances of God and the corruptions cleaving unto the ordinances. It washeth away all the defilements and pollutions contracted in the Church of *Rome*, both from Baptism and Ordination, but it doth not renounce either the one or the other." II., p. 41. "Our ministry is derived to us from Christ and his apostles by succession of a ministry continued in the church for 1,600 years. We have (1) a lineal succession from Christ and his Apostles ; (2) not onely a lineal succession, but that which is more, and without which the lineal is of no benefit, we have a doctrinal succession also." II., p. 45.

The second proposition of this Part is that the call to the office of the ministry, which our present (Presbyterian) ministers do now receive since the abolishing of Episcopacy, is lawful and valid. It is shown, first, that a Bishop and Presbyter are all one in the Scriptures. The pretended Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus and of the seven angels of Asia is refuted and various other arguments answered.

The Appendix then lays down propositions with reference to the antiquity of Prelacy, (1) That whatsoever may be said for Prelacy out of antiquity, yet sure we are that it hath no foundation in the Scriptures. (2) That there were many corrup-

tions which crept into the Church, in the very infancy of it, and were generally received as Apostolical traditions, which yet, notwithstanding, are not pleaded for by our Episcopal men, but many of them confessedly acknowledged to be errors and mistakes. They cite, first, the *Millenary* opinion, and second, the necessity of children's partaking of the Eucharist. (3) That after Christ's ascension into heaven, the Church of God for a certain space of time was governed by the common council of Presbyters without Bishops. (4) That *Polycarp* was made Bishop of Smyrna by the apostles (the statement of Irenæus and others), will nothing at all advance the Episcopal cause, unless it can be proved that by the word Bishop is meant a Bishop as distinct from Presbyter. (5) That, when the distinction between a Bishop and Presbyter first began in the Church of Christ, it was not grounded upon a *Jus Divinum*, but upon prudential reasons and arguments. (6) That there is a wide and vast difference between the bishops of the primitive times and the bishops of later times, as much as between ancient *Rome* and *Rome* at this day. (7) That the great argument that is brought for Episcopacy from the lineal succession of bishops from the Apostles days to our days hath not that validity in it that is imagined. (8) That, whatsoever may be said of Episcopacy out of antiquity, yet, notwithstanding it is an opinion generally received by the learned in all ages, that there are but two orders of ministers in the Church of Christ—Bishops and Deacons. There are also several propositions declaring the judgment and practice of the ancient Church about ordination of ministers.

The 14th Assembly met Nov. 3, 1653, Mr. Taylor, Mod.; and the 15th Assembly on May 3, 1654, Mr. Clarke, Mod. On July 17th the attention of the Assembly was called to Dr. Hammond's book: "*Vindication of the Dissertations concerning Episcopacy from the answers or exceptions offered against them by the London Ministers in their Jus Divinum Min. Evang.*, 1654," and it was resolved:

"(1) That it be fit Dr. Hammond's book be answered; (2) That it is the opinion of the Committee that it is not fit that it should be answered by the Province; (3) That Mr. Calamy be requested to answer it."

It does not appear, however, that Mr. Calamy ever fulfilled the task assigned him.

The 16th Assembly met Nov. 3, 1654, Mr. Robinson, Mod.; the 17th Assembly on May 3, 1655, Mr. Balmford, Mod. This Assembly, on Aug. 30th, adopted an important paper entitled: "*An Exhortation to Catechizing: the long neglect whereof is sadly lamented, and the speedy reviving as earnestly desired.*" It is signed by Ed. Calamy, Moderator, and Wm. Harrison and Wm. Blackmore, scribes.

From it we make the following interesting extracts:

"The consideration hereof doth little lesse than amaze us, when we observe how some of our *people* in whom (be it spoken without offence) we never discerned any extraordinary measure of spiritual knowledge, beyond the common size of their neighbours' attainments, do overly reject this exercise of catechizing, and hold it unworthy of such wise ones as themselves, to vouchsafe their presence at it. We had thought the *strongest* men among us needed not have disdained to taste some few spoonfuls of *milk*. We are sure that that which they please to slight as but *milk*, costs us more the dressing than any other provisions wherewith they can expect to be entertained. The lowest *principles* of Christianity are the highest *mysteries*. Those are the greatest *stones* which are laid in the *foundations*. These are they which support all the rest of the *building*. These are they which bear the greatest brunt of *opposition*. What controversies ever troubled the church of God, like those about the *corner-stone*? The conclusions of our Religion are for the more part beyond *contradiction*; all the greatest quarrels have been against our *principles*." p. 8.

"So farre are we from *straining* the grace of God, that we allow no *bounds* or *barres* to be set to the *invincible efficacie* of it. We indeed set bounds to *nature*, none to *grace*; as acknowledging a sufficiency of the *grace of God* to conquer all the oppositions which can be made by the *corruptions of man*; denying a sufficiency in *man* to the least spiritual work, without a blessed super-addition of *God's special grace*. In the meantime we deny that *God decreed to punish* any of the *sonnes of men*, but for their *sinnes*; onely we affirm that he bare not *such good will to the greater part of men*, as to decree to give them his *special grace*, and that without *this*, no man how *innocent, blameless*, and spotlesse soever his conversation may seeme to *men*, is no other than a desperate *enemy* against God. Nor yet do we preach this as a branch of the *Gospel*, but onely maintaine it as a part of the *counsel* of God, revealed in the Scriptures, not repugnant unto it." p. 16.

"We are farre from saying what we are shamelessly reported to do, *that the elect, though they prove the first sonnes of Belial, yet may be true beleivers*, namely, while they continue such; we onely say the *elect* are many of them all as wicked, as any of the *reprobates*. till by the *grace of God* they be brought to *beleeve*; and that though after they beleeve, they may possibly fall into horrible abominations, yet God out of his unchangeable love in which he *elects* them from all eternity, mercifully preserves his seed though miserably withered in their souls, and will in his good time graciously *quicken* it, infallibly reduce them to a hearty *repentance*, and bring them in *repentance to salvation*. We never dreamed of an *impossibility* of the *saints falling* as of *themselves*, nor of a *possibility* of their being *saved* without *repentance* through the *grace of God*." p. 17.

The Provincial Assembly in its exhortation gave the six following directions to the Classes and Churches: (1) Preach on the importance of catechizing; (2) Use the shorter Cate-

THE PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY OF LONDON.

chism; (3) Catechize children and servants not yet admitted to the Lord's Supper; (4) The time—afternoon, before the sermon; (5) That the Catechism be briefly explained at the first going over it; (6) That Catechisms be provided for the poor.

Lastly, It was directed "that an accompt in writing be returned from the Classes to the Provincial Assembly within forty days after the receipt hereof."

The 18th Assembly met Nov. 3, 1655, Wm. Jenkyn, Mod.

" 19th " " May 3, 1656, Mr. Wickins, "

" 20th " " Nov. 3, 1656, Mr. Fuller, "

" 21st " " May 3, 1657, Mr. Blackmore, "

" 22d " " Nov. 3, 1657, Mr. Offspring, "

" 23d " " May 3, 1658, Mr. Spurstow, "

During the sessions of this Assembly Oliver Cromwell, the Protector, died, on the 3d of September, 1658, and his son Richard took his place, and the reaction began. A new House of Commons met in January, 1658 (9), which was so strongly reactionary that the Council of Officers of the army compelled Richard to dissolve it. In place of it, in May the "Rump Parliament" re-assembled, but even this quarrelled with the officers, and chaos was the result. Gen. Monk entered London with his army on the 3d of February, 1659 (60). The Presbyterian members of the Long Parliament who had been expelled returned, and at once resolved on a dissolution, and the election of a new House of Commons. On the 25th of April the new House assembled and took the solemn league and Covenant, being thoroughly Presbyterian, and its influence was at once felt in the Provincial Assembly which met on May 3d.

The 24th Assembly met Nov. 3, 1658, Mr. Clarkson, Sen. Mod.

" 25th " " May 3, 1659, Mr. Smalwood, "

" 26th " " Nov. 3, 1659, Mr. Jacomb, "

Here, for the first time, are representatives of the Eleventh Classis.

The 27th Assembly met May 3, 1660, Dr. Laz. Seaman, Mod.

Here, for the first time, are representatives of the 12th Classis.

Gen. Monk had already anticipated Parliament in making terms with Charles II., whose declaration from Breda of general pardon, religious toleration, etc., was received with such national

enthusiasm that the king was at once invited to take possession of his kingdom, and on May 25th he landed at Dover, and entered London May 29th.

On the 15th of August, 1660, the Assembly adjourned till the 3d of September, and there is nothing to show that any other meeting was held. The Minutes of the Sion College Library came from the library of Laz. Scaman, the last Moderator of this body. The course of political events, indeed, rendered any further meeting impossible, or at least unadvisable. The king, Charles II., had made his public entry into London on May 29, 1660, and it was soon understood that Presbyterian government would no longer exist in England, but that the most that could be attained would be a combination of moderate Presbyterians with moderate Episcopalians on the basis of Archbishop Ussher's model. The Presbyterians at once divided into two parties—the one under the leadership of Laz. Seaman and Wm. Jenkyn refused to compromise Presbyterian principles; the other, under the leadership of Calamy, Reynolds, Ashe, and Manton, with most of the London ministers, sought, with Baxter and others, to compromise. These latter met at Sion College, in an informal manner, in accordance with the direction of the king, and after over a three weeks' discussion, adopted an address to the king and proposals as to Church Government on the basis of Ussher's "*Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government received in the ancient church,*" thus abandoning the Presbyterian organization as represented in the Provincial Assembly. After some time the bishops answered the proposals without compromise or yielding, and nothing was accomplished. The extreme party had the upper hand and proposed to use their power to destroy Presbyterianism and reëstablish High Church Episcopacy. This was responded to by "A defence of our Proposals to his Majesty for agreement in Matters of Religion." Finally, on Sept. 4th, the Lord Chancellor sent them a copy of "a declaration of his Majesty to all his loving subjects . . . concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs." They responded to this with a petition to the king for further concessions. A conference was also held with the bishops' party, but without success, and a further paper was sent to the king with reference to alterations of the Declaration, and finally both parties appeared before the king, and

after a long discussion, a Committee of Conference was appointed composed of Bishops Morley and Hinchman, on the one side, and Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Calamy on the other, with the Earl of Anglesey and Lord Hollis to decide in case of disagreement. An agreement was thus reached, and the Declaration was published as amended, and on Nov. 16th the most of the London ministers signed an "*humble and grateful acknowledgment of many ministers of the gospel in and about the city of London, to his royal Majesty for his gracious concessions in his Majesty's late declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs.*" Among the signers we note Thos. Case, Sam. Clark, Jno. Rawlinson, Jo. Sheffield, Thos. Gouge, W. Whitaker, Tho. Jacomb, Joh. Jackson, Wm. Bates, and Math. Poole. It was printed, with his Majesty's approbation, at the close of 1660. Dr. Reynolds was appointed Bishop, and the bishopric was offered to Calamy and to Baxter, but refused by both of them. The Presbyterian organization of the Provincial Assembly now ceased, as a matter of course. On the 25th of March, 1661, the king called the Conference of Savoy to revise the Prayer Book, composed of the Anglican bishops on the one side, with alternates, and on the other Dr. Reynolds (now bishop), Ant. Tuckney, John Conant, Wm. Spurstow, John Wallis, Thos. Manton, Edm. Calamy, Arthur Jackson, Thos. Case, Sam. Clark, and Matth. Newcommen, with alternates. Of these eleven, eight had been members of the Westminster Assembly, Wallis, one of its clerks; and Manton and Clark were London ministers.

The Conference at Savoy assembled April 13, 1661, and the Presbyterians were required to bring in their exceptions and complaints against the Liturgy in writing, with their additional forms and amendments (see Baxter, II., p. 305, and Neal, III., p. 86*), which they did, after some time, together with a petition for peace. There was then a debate, with three on each side, which ended in Baxter, Bates, and Jacomb drawing up a paper, making eight points, against the Prayer Book; with which it was sinful to comply. The debate ended July 25, without having accomplished anything but to intensify the difference, and

* See also "An account of all the proceedings of the Commissioners of both Persuasions appointed by his sacred majesty according to letters patents, for the Review of the Book of Common Prayer, etc." London, 1661.

each party appealed to the king. The Presbyterians presented their case by Bishop Reynolds, Dr. Bates, Dr. Manton, and Mr. Baxter, but received no answer (Neal, III., p. 91).

Without waiting for the results of the Savoy Conference, a Convocation was called, and the London ministers assembled on May 2d, at Christ's Church, to choose clerks. Many of the Presbyterians had already been ejected from their charges, and many others would not attend. Nevertheless, the Presbyterians prevailed by three votes, and chose Dr. Calamy and Mr. Baxter as their clerks, but this action was nullified by the Bishop of London. On the 7th of May the London ministers assembled at Sion College to choose a president and assistants for the year, but the Prelatists prevailed and gained possession of Sion College and kept it afterwards (Baxter, I., p. 334).

On the 22d of May, by order of the new Parliament entirely in the interest of the bishops, the national league and Covenant was burnt in the street by the hands of a common hangman (Baxter, I., p. 334).

No wonder the Presbyterians were more and more depressed and the bishops more and more intolerant and the Savoy Conference fruitless. The Convocation which had assembled by order of the king, on Nov. 20, began to review the Book of Common Prayer, and continued at it till Dec. 20th, when sundry modifications were made, but not in the line to satisfy or remove Presbyterian objections. These were approved by the king and both houses, March 15, 1661 (2). May 19th, the Act of Uniformity was passed: "enacting that after Aug. 24, 1662, (St. Bartholomew's day) no one should be a minister of the Church of England, or should administer the sacrament, who had not by that time, whatever his previous ordination or calling, received due Episcopal ordination," also that "all clergymen of every rank, etc., should before that time subscribe a formula embracing: (1) The non-resistance or passive obedience oath; (2) An oath of conformity to the Liturgy; and (3) An oath renouncing the Covenant." This could not be done by the Presbyterian party, or any of the dissenters without a seeming sacrifice of principle. Accordingly on Sunday, Aug. 24, 1662, more than two thousand ministers were ejected from their charges, or one-fifth of the entire body of the Church of England; and the nation was divided into two

parties which have continued ever since, the Conformists and Nonconformists.*

Of the four-fifths who conformed, were a large number of very moderate Presbyterians like Bishop Reynolds and Francis Roberts, and a still larger number of weaker men who were convinced of their errors by the force of circumstances, and the Latitudinarians generally, and the whole class of Cambridge men, or new Platonists such as Benj. Whichcote, Ralph Cudworth, Henry More, who were rapidly increasing among the more learned young men of Presbyterian families (Baxter, I., p. 390 sq. † These carried on the Puritan conflict within the Church of England, and subsequently produced Methodism and the Low Church, or Evangelical party, and the Broad Church, or Comprehensive party, continuing the ancient struggle until the present day. King Charles subsequently endeavored to secure an Act of Toleration, to include the Roman Catholics. On Dec. 26 he made a "*Declaration of a New Home Policy*," to this effect (Masson, VI., p. 242), but Parliament refused to sanction it, and instead of it soon after issued the "*Conventicles Act*," May 17, 1664, and "*the Five Miles Act*," Oct. 31, 1665. Thus Presbyterianism as an organized body died in England at the Restoration. The Presbyterian churches that remained among the Nonconformists, were only such in name and as local churches, or congregational elderships. There was no

* Richard Baxter and his associates, with sad and weary hearts, submitted to this harsh law, many of them conforming to the Established Church by attendance upon its worship and discouraging the organization of separating churches. Toward the close of his life, in the Preface to his "Penitent Confession," London, 1691, he says: "O how little would it have cost your Church-men in 1660 and 1661 to have prevented the calamitous and dangerous Divisions of this Land, and our common dangers thereby, and the hurt that many hundred thousands souls have received by it? And how little would it cost them *yet to prevent the continuance of it?*"

† This is more fully explained by Baxter in the Preface to his "Church Concord," thus: "The most of our ministers were young men bred at the Universities during the Wars, and engaged in no faction, nor studied much in such kind of controversies; but of solid judgment and zealous preachers, and eminently prudent, pious and peaceable: And with them there joynd many that had conformed, and thought both the Common Prayer and the Directory, Episcopacy and Presbytery tolerable: And these in 1660 did conform; but most of the rest were ejected and silenced. Though of near ten thousand that the Parliament left in possession, there were but two thousand cast out by the Prelates, we strongly conjectured beforehand who those would be." Again in his "Penitent Confession," p. 64, he says that of the ten thousand that conformed, eight thousand had conformed to the Directory of the Presbyterian Parliament, and on p. 79, he intimates that this is a low estimate considering the number of Chapels, curacies, and Chaplains in addition to the near ten thousand Parish Churches.

higher body with authority, such as Presbytery or Synod, and thus when in subsequent times a few leading men became Unitarians, the whole body gradually passed over, so that Presbyterianism and Unitarianism in England became synonymous terms. The present Presbyterian Church of England is in no historical connection with the older Presbyterianism, but is of Scotch origin (see Lorimer in Presb. Ch. of England's Memorial of Union, p. 21; also James' "History of the Litigation and Legislation respecting Presbyterian Chapels," London, 1867, p. 15 sq.).

The last document contained in the minutes of the Provincial Assembly is a bitter, hopeless wail, appointing a meeting, but without inserting the date. It is as follows:

“It cannot be unknown that our fathers, men of renown for piety and learning many of them suffered not a little under tyrannie and superstition, even to imprisonment and exile. The burdens that were then, made them that found God even with strong cries and tears, to pour out their souls before him, that God would breake the yoke and let them go free, and that they might go and serve God according to his own will, and bee in subjection to his anointed, even under the rod of his discipline. God hearkened and heard, and in great furie, and with an outstretched arme, came down to deliver, the yoke was broken and we were delivered; then prayers came down upon our heads and we saw the desirable day in which God did shake terribly the earth, tyrannie and superstition swept away in blood, a foundation of far better things laid even in troublesome times, and we then cried grace, grace, unto it, when true doctrine, pure worship, right discipline, were established by law, we enjoyed in the light thereof for a season, and by *assuming forwardness* raised a great expectation in standers by, that now would run up the *wals* thereof, and soone make Zion a perfection of beautie. But, alas! alas! how are we fallen, tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Ascalon, let it not be known abroad for shame. By our hearing what was lewd, our loathing what we formerly delighted in, our not touching with the finger what we then thought both shoulders not sufficient for, the government stands in its strength, but we fall by our remissness, we may doe but will not, what we may, yea, lay the fault on others but see not, owne not, mind not the fault in ourselves. We crie out of the people, when the good people crie out of us, we are ready to laud the magistrate when how might he upbraid us. It's come to that much through our unworthiness that both our people and ourselves are generally without all government, and know noe other rule but our owne wills, our owne interest, our owne ease, yea, sometimes our owne passion, we may well with sadness look upon our breaches in lesser and greater assemblies only so much remaining us to tell, how once were such things, for which is great thoughts of heart, some saying, surely it is not of God, it's blasted as soone as grown up,—others, we were better in former times; others do think it is better for any man to doe what seemes good in his own eyes than to be subject to any bonds of order: oh, who hath cast this reproach, to say not blasphemie, upon the ways of God? can it be occasioned by the ministers of God? have they caused the sacrifice of God to be abhorred? With what sadness of heart should this bee reflected on! We know not how better to cleare ourselves but by manifesting to all the world that we yet retain our first love, and will doe our first works, yea, and our last shall be more than our first. Oh, that there were such a spirit in us, that laying aside the sins that so easily beset us, we would run the race that is set before us with more alacritie, that we would be up and be doing with all our might, why should we cry alas! a lion and bear in the way, were there once but such thoughts of heart, such resolutions in our breast, it

could not bee wee should call fast after fast and (in fear?) regard it, that there should bee more companies of private Christians upon private occasions, than elders of God's church for the great concernments of Zion. Surely we should not need to be hauled to worke with cable, enmity would not prevail with us to a grosser neglect of duty. Surely we should not be found downright enemies to that our fathers prayed for, and yesterday we embraced with thanksgiving. But are we totally apostatized, is our backsliding incurable? are we become like the deaf adder that cannot be charmed? Oh, that you by any means now might be provoked, have we not examples enough for us, who is not zealous for God and his way, only the Presbyterians seeme to say of his, it is not worth asking for—dear bretheren, let's be awakened out of sleepe; let's come to resolutions becoming the watchmen of God and guides of his flock, and take hold of the (yet?) opportunities while we may, and gather together and seeke pardon and direction, seriously consult what is to be done and resolve just now under the oath and covenant of God, vigourously to prosecute in our severall places the work of reformation, establishing and executing of government, then would our shame be taken away, the hearts of many made again to live, iniquity should stop her mouth, they about us would clap their hands for joy, ordinances would regain their due lustre, and the generations to come would stand up in the enjoyment of heavenly things and bless God.

“That things, therefore, may not totally and irreparably fall to the ground, but that some speedy undertakings may be made effectual to attaining so happy ends, it is the earnest desire of the Provincial Assembly that you would at least be persuaded to give them a meeting together with other of the bretheren at —.”

Thus the Provincial Assembly of London, which was the Westminster model for all the Provinces of England, and which was designed to grow into a world-wide Presbyterian organization, passed away. Its aims in doctrines, morals, and discipline were too high for its times. It strove to realize them with a spirit of intolerance, which, however much in accordance with the times, yet provoked the bitter opposition and hatred of both the Sectaries of the Commonwealth army and the royalist Prelatists, so that their work was paralyzed in its beginning by the accession of Cromwell, and blasted by the Restoration of Charles. It is only in our own day that Westminster Presbyterianism has regained a firm foothold in England, and has attained a bright hope for the future; and in a round about way, through the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, their scheme for an Ecumenical Synod is gradually realizing itself.

C. A. BRIGGS.