

## LECTURE X.

### THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH OR ARTICLES OF CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

*Part I.—Introductory history of doctrine, and detailed account of the preparation of the Confession.*

IN my last Lecture I gave you a full account of the controversies on the autonomy of the Church, which engaged the attention of the Assembly in 1646, and interrupted for a time the preparation of its doctrinal standards. In to-day's Lecture I shall endeavour to give a succinct account of the preparation of that Confession of Faith which is regarded in most Presbyterian Churches as the principal, and in some as the sole doctrinal standard. As I promised in a former lecture (p. 54), however, I must first advert to the previous history of doctrine in the British Churches. I have already explained that the differences between the Puritans<sup>1</sup> and their opponents at first seemed

<sup>1</sup> 'Albeit the Puritans disquieted our Church about their conceived discipline, yet they never moved any quarrel against the doctrine of our Church. . . It was then the open confession, both of the

to be few in number, and of minor importance, just because so much of what afterwards came to be named puritanic was then accepted and valued by almost all who favoured the principles of the Reformation. I stated that this was especially the case with respect to that system of doctrine known as Augustinian or Calvinistic, the holders of which, by the time of Archbishop Laud, had come to be nicknamed doctrinal Puritans. As the movement which culminated in the Westminster Assembly was designed above all to be a protest against the misrepresentation this involved, and if possible to restore Augustinianism and the theology of the English reformation to its old place of honour in the Church, I must now revert to this subject, and give at least a brief outline of the history of this theology in the British Churches.

There was perhaps no branch of the mediæval Church where the system of doctrine developed by Augustine had so unquestionably retained its old supremacy to the last as the Anglo-Norman. The system of its greatest theologians, Anselm and Bradwardine, appropriated by Wyclif and the Lollards, continued or revived by Tyndale, Frith, Barnes, and their coadjutors, may be said to

Bishops and of the Puritans, that both parties embraced a mutual consent in doctrine.'—Bishop Carleton's *Examination of Bishop Montague's Appeal*, p. 5.

have formed the substratum of the Reformed teaching, even while it was least affected by influences from abroad. Such influences, however, were early brought to bear on that teaching, and it has long seemed to me that the effect of these upon it, and their ready assimilation, were largely due to the hold Augustinianism had already gained, that it was through the teaching of Anselm, Bradwardine, Wyclif, and Tyndale, rather than from 'fascination of the calm, clear intellect of Calvin,' they were first attracted towards him and the later predestinarian school. With the full sanction of Cranmer and the Privy Council of Edward VI., Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr were in 1548 invited to England, and soon after their arrival were installed as professors or lecturers in divinity in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, to imbue with the theology of the Reformation the future ministers of the English Church. Their published commentaries on the Ephesians and the Romans embody the substance of the lectures they delivered in the years 1550 and 1551, and show clearly that their teaching on predestination and other related subjects was in thorough accordance with that of Augustine and Anselm, as well as with that of Calvin. The following is Bucer's definition of election :—'Est itaque electio destinatio et certa Dei miseratio ab æterno ante mundum constitutum, qua Deus eos, quorum vult

misereri, ex universo perditorum hominum genere ad vitam æternam secernit, ex plane liberali misericordia, priusquam quicquam possint boni aut mali facere. Certa, inquam, est et immutabilis, per Jesum Christum unigenitum filium Dei et nostrum mediatorem, ab æterno destinatum caput ecclesiæ ac reconciliatorem, secundum æternum et immutabile propositum suum, ut nos adoptaret in filios et hæredes et in novam vitam regeneraret, ut sancti essemus et irreprehensibiles coram ipso ad gloriam gratiæ suæ.<sup>1</sup> Martyr's definition is:— 'Dico igitur prædestinationem esse sapientissimum propositum Dei, quo ante omnem æternitatem decrevit constanter, eos, quos dilexit in Christo, vocare ad adoptionem filiorum, ad justificationem ex fide et tandem ad gloriam per bona opera, quo conformes fiant imagini Filii Dei, utque in illis declaretur gloria et misericordia Creatoris.'<sup>2</sup> Noteworthy as these definitions are when viewed by themselves, they are still more noteworthy when we view them in connection with the XVIIth of the Edwardian Articles which were drawn up about the same time. Had we known no more

<sup>1</sup> Praellectiones. . . D. Martini Buceri habitæ Cantabridgiæ in Anglia, anno 1550 et 1551, pp. 22, 23.

<sup>2</sup> In Epistolam S. Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos D. Petri Martyris commentarii, p. 411, folio edition, 1558. The work was not published till after he left England, but we learn from the preface that it had been written out by 1552, and the *schedæ* circulated among his friends there, and from his letters we learn it was ready for publication when he left in 1553.

than that these two divines were held in high regard by Cranmer and the advisers of the king, and were consulted by them on the revision of the liturgy, we would have known enough to warrant us carefully to compare their teaching with that of this Article, to ascertain whether the one was not to a certain extent reflected in the other, and calculated to aid us in tracing its sources and character. But we know further, that after the death of Bucer, Martyr continued to be consulted and cherished by the Primate, and have positive testimony that he was one of those associated with him, not only in the commission of thirty-two for the reformation of the ecclesiastical laws, but also in some smaller committee<sup>1</sup> (of that commission, or of Convocation) which was occupied especially with purity of doctrine. He paid repeated and lengthened visits to Lambeth in the fall of the year 1551 and the spring of 1552, on the business of that committee, and his friend and amanuensis, John ab Ulmis, had in 1550 translated from German into Latin, for the

<sup>1</sup> 'The Convocation began to be held . . . on the 12th of December by most excellent and learned men who are to deliberate and consult about a proper moral discipline, and the *purity of doctrine*. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and Peter Martyr, the Archbishop of York, and the Bishop of London, together with the newly appointed Chancellor of England . . . Bishop of Ely and our friend Skinner . . . are to form a select committee on these points.'—John ab Ulmis to Bullinger, in *Original Letters relating to the Reformation*, Parker Society edition, pp. 444, 503.

Primate, the Confession of Strasburg.<sup>1</sup> He was named by Cranmer in 1553 in his *Purgation*<sup>2</sup> as one with whose help he would be ready to defend 'all the doctrine' set forth in the reign of Edward VI.; and still later he seems to be referred to by the Archbishop in his final examination as one whose advice he had taken about the Articles.<sup>3</sup> We feel, therefore, not merely warranted, but even bound to compare them with his doctrinal teaching ere we venture, with any approach to confidence, to pronounce on the sources from which they have been taken, or the exact shade of meaning they were meant to convey. I have given above the definition of predestination by Martyr as it is

<sup>1</sup> John ab Ulmis, *Original Letters*, Parker Soc. ed., p. 404.

<sup>2</sup> 'I with the said Master Peter Martyr and other four or five, which I shall choose, will by God's grace take upon us to defend not only the common prayers of the Church, the ministration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, but also all the doctrine and religion set out by our sovereign lord King Edward the Sixth.'—Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. vi. p. 539.

<sup>3</sup> Foxe (viii. p. 58) represents Cranmer as saying that 'as for the catechism and the book of articles . . . he granted the same to be his doings,' but the formal *Processus contra Thomam Cranmer* (Works, Parker Society's edition, vol. ii. p. 545), gives a very different representation: 'Ad septimum fatetur se edidisse librum . . . *A defence of the true and Catholic faith*, etc.—et negat se edidisse librum, in eodem articulo etiam mentionatum, vocatum—*A discourse of Peter Martyr*—et quoad tertium librum vocatum, *A discourse of the Lord's Supper* [by Peter Martyr] negat se illum edidisse, tamen credit hujusmodi liber est bonus et catholicus, et quoad catechismum et articulos in eodem fatetur se adhibuisse *ejus* consilium circa editionem ejusdem.' The word *ejus* can refer only to Martyr. Archdeacon Hardwick, by quoting merely the last clause, has failed to bring out this, though correcting Foxe.

exhibited on p. 411 of the folio edition of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Let me now place this opposite to the first part of the Edwardian Article, inserting here and there within brackets the analogous phrases which Martyr uses when more fully explaining his definition, that it may be seen how very closely his ideas and modes of expression appear to be reproduced in the Latin form of that Article :—

MARTYR'S DEFINITION.

Dico igitur prædestinationem esse sapientissimum propositum Dei, quo ante omnem æternitatem (*ante jacta fundamenta mundi*, 411) decrevit constanter (*suo consilio licet nobis occulto*, 459) eos quos dilexit in Christo (*a calamitate liberare*, 431 [atque ut] *vasa in honorem facta*, 428) ad felicitatem (*æternam salutem*, 433) per Christum adducere, 431.

(*tanto Dei beneficio*, 344, *donatos*, 343) vocare ad adoptionem filiorum (*justo tempore*, 473) (*vocatione*, quam Augustinus ex Pauli phrasi vocat, *secundum propositum*, 426) ad justificationem ex fide (*gratis* per Christum *justificare* ut *efficiantur conformes imagini*

LATIN ARTICLE OF 1553.

Prædestinatio ad vitam est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit eos quos [ ] elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque ut vasa in honorem efficta, per Christum ad æternam salutem adducere.

Unde qui tam præclaro beneficio sunt donati, illi Spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur, vocationi per gratiam parent (credunt A) justificantur gratis, adoptantur in filios unigeniti Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes, in bonis operibus

fili Dei, . . . utque *ambulent in bonis operibus*, 421, utque in illis declaretur gloria et *misericordia* Creatoris, (*ad vitam æternam (æternam felicitatem*, 431) *electos adducit*, 434.) sancte ambulant, et demum ex Dei misericordia pertinent ad sempiternam felicitatem.

The definition of Martyr is more brief than that of the Articles, but even so it contains the words *in Christo*, which were only inserted in the Article in 1563, and are generally to be found in the Reformed Confessions. It is only when we take account of the analogous phrases in which Martyr explains his definition, that the full coincidence in meaning and phraseology between him and the Article is brought out. In fact, there are but two phrases wanting to make the verbal parallel complete, and they are both found in the definition of Bucer: *ex universo perditorum hominum genere*, and *unigeniti filii*.

The parallel, therefore, so far as the positive statement of doctrine is concerned, is complete, and whatever wider meaning we may deem ourselves warranted to read into the Article, we can never surely be warranted to exclude that which Martyr held and meant to teach. Even the subsequent part of the Article is far more nearly in verbal agreement with his teaching than with that of any other. There is no such resemblance to the phraseology and teaching of Melancthon

after he ceased to be an Augustinian and became a Synergist. There is in a few instances, as Dr. Burton (Bishop Short's *History*, p. 487) had pointed out, a verbal coincidence with the phraseology and teaching of Luther in his treatise on the Epistle to the Romans. But that treatise was written while both Luther and Melancthon were Augustinians, and teaches distinctly Augustinian doctrine; and as it was never formally disavowed by Luther, there was considerable temptation to those who maintained that doctrine to use the testimony of the master against his disciples. Still, however, in this second part of the Article, as in the first, the resemblance to the teaching of Martyr is closer.

I insert below these further coincidences, as also a few between the phraseology of Calvin in the 1543 edition of his *Institutions*, and the concluding part of the Article, because it comes so close to that of the Article and of Luther. Some suppose that part was inconsistent with his doctrine, but if so, neither he nor the Westminster divines seem to have been aware of the inconsistency:—

Non igitur ad desperationem adigimur hac doctrina sed multo potius magnam ex ea consolationem accipimus (407). De perseverantia nullo modo dubitandum est, et præsertim cum in cordibus nostris habemus Spiritum Sanctum nobis ferentem præ-

Quemadmodum prædestinationis et electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suavis et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis, et his qui sentiunt in se vim Spiritus Christi facta carnis et membra quæ adhuc sunt super terram, mortifi-

clarum de ea testimonium (124). Habent enim Spiritum Christi quo et vivunt et . . . mortificant facta carnis (*in præfatione*). Dei Spiritus qui datur piis . . . miram consolationem his affert quos afflaverit (electis *in margine*) (476).

Cum scribit de prædestinatione eo semper spectat ut nostram fiduciam confirmet (419) (ad stabiliendam fiduciam *Cal.* 361). Qui in animo vere sentiat se gratis a Deo electum esse propter Christum . . . mirabiliter haud dubie accendetur ad Deum redamandum (419). Curiosuli illi habentis coercendi sunt qui antequam Christum . . . discant abyssum illam prædestinationis scrutantur, et num prædestinati sint necne frustra investigant. Nam hi haud dubie in confusionem conscientiae aut desperationem suam hac inepta curiositate ducent et præcipitabunt seipsos.—Lutherus *in Ep. ad Romanos*. Traduntur Satanæ decipiendi et præcipitandi (475).—Martyr.

Quemadmodum in exitialem abyssum se ingurgitant, (in ultimum mortis præcipitium ruunt, (364) in majorem hebetudinem trudentur, (366) solutam carnis securitatem, (363)

canthem, animumque ad celestia et superna rapientem, tum quia fidem nostram de æternâ salute consequendâ per Christum, plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit.—ARTICULUS XVII.

Ubi crucem et tribulationem expertus fueris; tum primum dulcescit necessitas hæc prædestinationis, tum primum senties . . . quam plena consolationis sit prædestinatio.—Lutherus *in Ep. ad Romanos*.

Ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus et Spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari prædestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos diabolus protrudit vel in desperationem vel in æque perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem.—ART. XVII.

quasi desperata nequitia volutabuntur in flagitia (365) qui ut de suâ electione fiant certiores, æternum Dei consilium, sine verbo, percontantur : ita qui recte atque ordine eam investigant, qualiter in verbo continetur eximium inde referunt consolationis fructum (Calv. *Inst.* 361).

Hic docere oportet, fidelium esse promissiones Dei generaliter accipere, ut nobis in sacris literis a Spiritu Sancto traditæ sunt, neque oportere de arcana Dei voluntate esse sollicitos (Martyr, p. 194). Ut cum aliquid velint suscipere, consilium . . . ex voluntate Dei revelata, *i. e.* e sacra scriptura petant, non autem ex arcano divinæ prædestinationis (p. 422).

In rebus agendis ea est nobis perspicienda voluntas quam verbo suo declarat. Id requirit unum Deus a nobis quod præcipit (Calv. 370).

Deinde, licet prædestinationis decreta sunt nobis ignota, promissiones tamen divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositæ sunt ; et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus revelatam.—ART. XVII.

The resemblances between the Anglican formulary and the Augsburg and Würtemberg Confessions arose in part out of earlier historical relations. But all of them, as a matter of fact, occur in Articles which were held in common by the Lutherans and the Reformed. Martyr had signed the Augsburg Confession when at Strasburg, and was ready to do so on his return, while some of his colleagues who remained did not object to sign the Confession of Würtemberg. But neither of these, nor any other of the early

Lutheran Confessions, as Dorner admits, has an Article on Predestination. By the insertion of such an Article, as well as by the terms in which they expressed it, the English Reformers must be regarded as indicating their leaning towards the Reformed rather than the Lutheran Churches. The same leaning is clearly apparent in the group of Articles on the sacraments, and especially in the one on the Lord's Supper. This last, in the form in which it was set forth in 1553, shows verbal coincidences not only with Martyr's writings but also with the *Formula Consensus Tigurini*,<sup>1</sup> copies of which had been sent into England by Bullinger soon after it was framed.

Few Continental authors were during the long reign of Elizabeth more highly esteemed or more widely read in England than Calvin, Bullinger, and Martyr. The *Institutions* of Calvin were used as a text-book in the universities, and they and several of his commentaries were translated into English. The *Decades* or sermons of Bullinger were commended by Convocation to the study of the clergy, and were also translated. The voluminous *Loci Communes* of Martyr were published in London as well as on the Continent, and he was repeatedly and earnestly invited to return to his former chair. In a word, the leading bishops and theologians of that reign drew more closely to the

<sup>1</sup> For particulars see Appendix, Note M.

Reformed than to the Lutheran Churches.<sup>1</sup> Even those of them who, like Cranmer and Ridley in the earlier time, were very mild Augustinians themselves agreed more with the teaching of the Reformed than of the Lutheran doctors on the few subjects on which there was difference between them, though the distinct testimony against the ubiquity of Christ's human nature was withdrawn from the Articles of 1563. Becon, Jewel, Nowell, Sandys, Pilkington, as well as Humphreys, Sampson, and Foxe, were certainly more pronounced Augustinians, and, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary, did mention election for other purposes than to warn people against trusting in it;<sup>2</sup> and their teaching supplies us with the first and perhaps fairest commentary on the meaning of the xviii<sup>th</sup> Article ere differences of opinion had arisen respecting it. Whitgift, Hutton, Overall, Cartwright, Whitaker, Reynolds, and many of the bishops and theologians in the reign of Elizabeth's successor, held and taught the same Augustinian doctrines. It was towards the close of her reign, about the year 1595, that we first hear

<sup>1</sup> 'I am well assured that the learned bishops who were in the reformation of our Church in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign did so much honour St. Augustine that in the collecting of the Articles and Homilies and other things in that reformation, they had an especial respect unto St. Augustine's doctrines.'—Bishop Carleton's *Examination*, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> See especially Sandys' *Sermons*, p. 190; Pilkington's *Works*, p. 673; and Jewel's *Commentary* on 1 Thess. i. 4, 5 and ii. 13.

of the distinct enunciation of opposite views in the University of Cambridge by Barret, a Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, who is said soon after to have turned Papist, and Dr. Baro, a Frenchman who had long been Margaret Professor of Divinity, and had previously given utterance to sentiments on other topics which were deemed not to be in strict harmony with the predominant opinions. To quiet the disturbances thus occasioned Archbishop Whitgift, with the approval of the Archbishop of York and some other prelates, drew up (or accepted, with a few changes as drawn up by another), and sent down to the University a series of Articles, henceforth to be known as the Lambeth Articles, which were not only predestinarian in tendency but more strongly so than would be relished by moderate Calvinists still. The Articles were not indeed confirmed by royal authority, but they were acted on by the authorities of the University, and at any rate they are of value as a distinct testimony to the views of their framers and as a clear indication of the opinions on these abstruse subjects which were then widely prevalent in the Church. Dr. Reynolds asked at the Hampton Court Conference that these 'orthodox assertions' should be added to the Articles not as altering their meaning but simply as more clearly expressing it. This was not granted, his Majesty deeming it better 'not to stuff the book [of the

Articles] with all conclusions theological,' but 'to punish the broachers of false doctrine as occasion should be offered, for were the Articles never so many and sound, who can prevent the contrary opinions of men till they be heard?' Overall, the Dean of St. Paul's, expressed himself in substantial agreement with Dr. Reynolds as to the meaning of the xvith and xviiith Articles, and the King also made more than one 'speech of predestination and reprobation,' in the course of which he admitted that predestination and election depended 'not upon any qualities, actions, or works of man *which be mutable, but upon God's eternal and immutable decree and purpose.*' So much we learn from Barlow's *Sum of the Conference* (p. 43). From Bishop Carleton's Examination of Bishop Montague's notorious *Appeal unto Cæsar* (p. 94), we further learn: 'The plain truth is that Dr. Reynolds repeated the Article, and professed that the meaning of the Article was sound.' He only desired that to the end of the clause 'we may depart from grace' the words 'yet not totally nor finally' might be added. 'Against this no man spake then; but for it. . . Dr. Overall did speak so much as directly confirmed that which Dr. Reynolds had moved, . . . adding hereunto that those who were called and justified according to the purpose of God's election, however they might and did fall into grievous sins, . . . yet did never

fall either totally from all graces of God to be utterly destitute of all the parts and seed thereof, nor finally from justification.'

What had been refused to the Puritans in 1603 was granted to the Irish Convocation in 1615. It was allowed to incorporate the Lambeth Articles among those fuller Augustinian Articles, which, with the sanction of the Viceroy, it then adopted and enjoined to be subscribed by all preachers as articles not to be contradicted by them in their public teaching. In 1618, when deputies were, with the approval of Archbishop Abbot, sent by King James to the Synod of Dort, it is said that they took these Lambeth Articles with them to the Synod as evidence of the faith professed in England. The deputies, who were all men of high standing<sup>1</sup> in the Church, took an active part in the proceedings of the Synod, acquiesced in the condemnation of the Arminians, and in the various papers drafted by them gave representations of the doctrine of their Church which would have been quite unwarrantable if the prevailing interpretation of her Articles down to that date had not been decidedly Augustinian. The most notable of the divines who in the later years of Queen Elizabeth's reign defended the constitution of the English Church so resolutely against the assaults of the

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Carleton, Drs. Goad, Ward, Davenant, and Hall, with Dr. Balcanquhal for Scotland.

more decided Puritans, held to the Augustinian system of doctrine, as Archbishop Whitgift, Richard Hooker, and Thomas Rogers. The last named was chaplain to Whitgift's successor, and, so far as I know, the first to publish a formal exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, under the title of *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England*. This treatise, dedicated first to Whitgift and then to Bancroft, was well known to Toplady, though ignored by recent expositors. It passed unchallenged through several editions, and affords conclusive evidence that, till near the close of James's reign, the Augustinian interpretation of them was the prevailing one.

Even in 1626 Bishop Carleton resolutely claimed that it had been so, and reproved Bishop Montague for reviving the doctrines of Barret and Baro, and venturing to speak of those who maintained the doctrines of the Lambeth Articles as Puritans. Ussher, Downname, Davenant, and Hall were all in accord with Carleton. But the fashion then begun soon spread rapidly. Nominally to hold the balance even between the contending parties, but really, as was alleged by the predestinarian school, to impede and silence them while almost openly favouring their opponents, a royal declaration was prefixed to the Articles prohibiting the imposing any other than the grammatical sense on them, or preaching on the controverted topics. 'Then began

that wonderful decade which, regard it as we may, was in truth a period almost equally exceptional with that which followed under the Commonwealth. It was not indeed a government without church and king, but it was a government of a king without a parliament, and of a church in which all doctrines except those of the dominant party were proscribed and silenced by the strong hand—a virtual tyranny under honoured forms and names.’ ‘The system made its way very rapidly among University men and with a section of the upper classes generally; two of its most prominent tenets, viz., the divine right of kings and the divine right of bishops, expressed concurrently and with every conceivable form of argument, forcibly commended the rest of the doctrine to the pedant king and his courtiers, and it came to be identified almost from its commencement with the political repression of the popular liberties, the suspension of Parliaments, and the disgrace of the country at home and abroad.’<sup>1</sup> In the eyes of its supporters it was a revulsion from what their successors in our own time have nicknamed Ultra-Protestantism—not an exchange of modern Calvinism for the more modern Arminianism, but a return to the theology of the Greek Fathers in preference to that of Augustine, the great doctor of the West.

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to *Register of Visitors of the University of Oxford*, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658, pp. xx., xxiv.

Down to the time of Archbishop Laud there had been almost a continuous succession of Augustinian Professors of Divinity in the Universities<sup>1</sup>—Humphrey, Holland, Walward, Reynolds, Abbot, Prideaux, at Oxford; Whitgift, Cartwright, Hutton, Overall, Whitaker, Davenant, and Ward at Cambridge; and Travers, Ussher, and Hoyle at Dublin. Besides these there was a whole host of men who preached the same theology from the pulpits or expounded it through the press. Foreign theologians, even of extensive learning and high repute, almost, with the single exception of Heppe, seem to think that through all this time the divines of Britain were doing nothing for their science, either in their own country or on the Continent. There could not be a greater mistake. Just because it was a time of considerable restraint, it was a time of earnest study and of great literary activity, and was singularly fruitful not only in catechisms and other popular works intended to convey much prized truth to the humblest who could read, but also in more learned treatises, which, though now much forgotten, were in their own day highly

<sup>1</sup> 'Calvin's enormous influence was felt quite as much within the Church as without it, and indeed the idea of separation was not as yet entertained by any large body of men. It was not till the fatal violence of the Laudian School had been fully developed, that separation began to present itself as a serious duty to masses of churchmen, and nonconformity or dissent, as we now know it, to have a history.'—Introduction to *Register of Visitors of the University of Oxford*, p. xvii.

valued by the learned in Holland as well as in England—quite as much so perhaps as the writings of any contemporary continental authors. Questions in controversy with the Romanists were discussed by Fulke, Whitaker, Cartwright, and Reynolds with a thoroughness and learning which were not excelled, perhaps not equalled, abroad. Commentaries on separate books of Scripture, both more systematic and more practical, were issued in great abundance, and some of them were even translated into Latin and printed on the Continent. The doctrine of the Covenants was developed in this country quite as much as in Holland, particularly in its historical aspect as bearing on the progress of God's revelation to mankind, and it was generally combined with the more liberal Augustinian views of Davenant. Learned and exhaustive treatises were written in defence of the great Protestant doctrines of the supremacy of Scripture and of justification by faith, the formal and material principles of the Reformation, while the writings of Perkins, Davenant, Ussher, Amesius, and Twisse, on the more abstruse doctrines of the Augustinian system, were not less thorough nor less highly valued abroad than at home. Twisse as well as Amesius was invited to occupy a chair in Holland, and for his defence of the Augustinian and reformed teaching against the *scientia media* of the Jesuits, Bishop Hall characterised him as 'a

man so eminent in school divinity that the Jesuits have felt, and for aught I see, shrunk under his strength.'

Hoyle, Tuckney, and Arrowsmith, who, after the reformation of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, became Professors of Divinity there, served themselves heirs to their Augustinian predecessors, and professed their determination to teach on the same lines, so that, as a modern historian has expressed it, 'they deemed their mission to be to restore and confirm, not to revolutionise.' To a large proportion of those university men into whose hands the task was committed, we are told by the present Chichele Professor of History, in his able and impartial introduction to *The Register of the Parliamentary Visitation*, lately printed for the Camden Society, 'this government on so-called Puritanical principles appeared very much in the light of a return to better days which had passed away not so very long before, . . . a natural reaction, though perhaps carried too far, from an extreme direction into which the course of their beloved University had been betrayed, a recovery from a disease which, during the process of recovery, must necessarily exhibit some abnormal symptoms.' As Dr. Arrowsmith, in his introductory lecture at Cambridge, professed himself an admiring pupil of Davenant, and sought to link on his teaching to that of his great predecessors, so

Dr. Hoyle 'devoted a large part of his inaugural lecture at Oxford to the earnest commendation of Bishop Prideaux, and Dr. Conant, who succeeded him, was avowedly of Prideaux's school on all essential points' (pp. xxix., xxx.).

Turning now to our own part of Britain, let me endeavour as succinctly as possible to trace the development of theology in Scotland. So far as we had a theology before the Reformation, it was probably less pronouncedly Augustinian than that of the southern division of the island. No doubt there were in the Augustinian and Dominican monasteries not a few who clung to the teaching of the great doctor of the West, and ultimately found a congenial home in the Reformed Church. There are not wanting some traces of the same teaching in the one catechism the pre-reformation Church of Scotland ventured to issue. The works of St. Thomas Aquinas were, by the Council of 1549, recommended to the students and teachers of speculative theology, but it could not be that those of his rival should be altogether neglected in the land of his birth. John Major, its most distinguished theological teacher in the first half of the sixteenth century, if one may venture to express an opinion from a cursory examination of his commentaries on the Gospels, appears to have far more in common with Scotus than with Aquinas or Augustine. But among those who

favoured the Reformation, the tendency was decidedly in the opposite direction. It has been said, indeed, that our earliest Protestant theology was 'of the milder Lutheran type.' But at the time when Patrick Hamilton was brought into contact with it, Lutheranism was not yet of the milder type it ultimately assumed. Luther and Melancthon were at that date predestinarians and pronounced Augustinians; and Tyndale, Frith, and Lambert, with whom during his stay at Marburg, Hamilton had held familiar intercourse, were also decided adherents of the same school of theological thought. Those with whom Wishart was brought into contact in Switzerland and Strasburg belonged to the same school, and he told his countrymen, when he translated for their use the earlier Helvetic Confession, that it was in the Church of Switzerland that 'all godliness is received, and the word had in most reverence.' The position of Knox, Winram, and their coadjutors is sufficiently determined by the fact that the several confessions they composed or sanctioned were all of the Calvinistic type, and in part were borrowed from the earlier editions of the *Institutes* of Calvin, or from the confessions drawn up by him.<sup>1</sup> It is also conclusively determined by the fact that in 1566, at the request of Beza, they gave their approbation to the later Helvetic Confession, to testify their

<sup>1</sup> *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for 1872, pp. 92-95.

agreement in doctrine and polity with the Reformed Churches on the Continent who adhered to the teaching of Calvin and Bullinger. From the pen of our great Reformer we have a treatise 'Of Predestination,' and a preface to a treatise by his friend Balnaves on justification, and both treatises are in harmony with the teaching of the Genevan school. The most eminent of the early theological teachers of the Reformed Church of Scotland was undoubtedly Andrew Melville, who was successively Principal of the College of Glasgow and of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. From his known temperament, it might have been supposed that he would have taken up an extreme position in regard to the distinctive teaching of the school to which he belonged. But from his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, it appears that his views on the mysterious subject of predestination were, like his views on justification, of a more moderate type than those of Beza. He seems to have imbued his more distinguished pupils to a large extent with his own infralapsarian views. Robert Bruce, to whom the more zealous section of them looked up with reverence and affection, certainly held and taught the same type of doctrine as his teacher. Principal Rollock, of Edinburgh, the leader of the more compliant section, did the same. His commentaries were published, some of them repeatedly, on the Continent as well

as in his own country, and his views on the subject of the covenants and of justification appear to agree generally with those of the Herborne school. Robert Howie, who succeeded Andrew Melville in St. Mary's College, as his early and close connections with the liberal theologians of Herborne and Basle leads one to expect, belonged to the same infralapsarian school. Several of his theological tractates were published at Basle—the most important being that *De reconciliatione hominis cum Deo*. He was largely consulted in the preparation of that Confession of Faith by which, in 1616, it appears to have been intended to supersede both the Confession of 1560, and the so-called negative Confession of 1581. Melville, before he was translated to St. Andrews, taught theology in Glasgow, and was succeeded in his office there by Principal Smeton, a man almost as learned and quite as moderate in his views—to whom we are indebted for a brief but able defence of the Protestant idea of the Church and a vindication of the personal character of Knox, in reply to the bitter and one-sided treatise of Archibald Hamilton, *De confusione Calvinianæ Sectæ*. Smeton was succeeded in 1585 by Patrick Scharpe, and he, in 1615, by Robert Boyd, who had taught in France, and was the author of a learned commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, in which predestinarian views are clearly

enunciated, and Augustine, Ambrose, Prosper, Fulgentius, and Bernard are more frequently appealed to than Calvin and the Reformers. Boyd, on his translation to Edinburgh, was succeeded by John Cameron, the Camero of the Continent, who was born in the Saltmarket ; was first a regent at Glasgow, then at Sedan ; then, along with his countryman Primrose, pastor of the Church at Bordeaux ; after that a Professor of Theology at Saumur, then Principal in Glasgow College. In little more than a year he returned to France, and died there at the age of forty-six. He was greatly esteemed both in England and France. He was one of the earliest defenders of that theory of the will which was afterwards espoused by Jonathan Edwards, and, after Bullinger, he was the most active assertor of that milder system of predestinarianism which early in the seventeenth century found considerable acceptance both in France and in England. It was earnestly advocated in the former by Amyraut (with whose name it has been associated), and in the latter by Overall, Davenant, Ussher, and many others. Several of his treatises were published separately ; one at least, in defence of the Protestant idea of the Church against the Romish, was translated into English and published at Oxford. At the request of a synod of the French Reformed Church, his works were collected and edited by Capellus

and Amyraut, and passed through three editions. Principal Strang seems to have followed somewhat in the wake of Cameron ; at least he was charged with ' withdrawing from the divine decree the act and entity of sin ; ' but even the cautious Baillie, who thought ' he swayed too much to one side, ' prized the man's ' ingyne and learning, ' and was disposed to regard him as one of the best scholars in the Reformed Church. Dr. John Forbes, the learned Professor of Theology in King's College, Aberdeen, almost continuously, from 1620 to 1643, taught the same system of moderate predestinarianism, and, like Boyd, appealed to Augustine and Prosper quite as much as to Calvin. His doctrinal teaching was very highly approved in Holland, and, so far as I know, was never called in question in his own country, but he was ultimately deposed for refusing to take the Covenant. Dr. John Sharp, or Scharpius, who in 1606 had been banished for taking part in the Assembly at Aberdeen, taught theology for a number of years at Die in Dauphiné. In 1610 he published a treatise on justification, and, in 1618, a system of theology under the title of *Cursus Theologicus*. It was dedicated to King James, and, having made his peace with him or with Charles, he was in 1630 appointed Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh, in succession to James Fairley, afterwards Bishop of

Argyll, and was in all probability the chief theological teacher of Robert Leighton, whose father's opinions in his early life he had shared. Dr. Sharp continued to hold his office through these unquiet times up to 1647, when he died. He seems to have taken a keen interest in the changes which took place on the restoration of Presbytery, and to have contributed largely towards the support of the Scotch army in England. His *Cursus Theologicus* passed through at least three editions, all of which were published on the Continent. His *Symphonia Prophetarum et Apostolorum* was also published abroad, and passed through two or more editions.

In their revulsion from the Arminianism and sacerdotalism of the younger bishops who had been so zealously patronised by Laud, the Covenanting ministers of Scotland generally favoured a more decided Calvinism than that of Cameron, Forbes, and Strang, or than that of Davenant, Ussher, and their Puritan disciples in the south. Some of them, like Rutherford, even favoured the supralapsarian view, and resolutely defended it, though they granted that the questions in which they differed from their brethren were questions to be discussed in the schools rather than to be determined in a Confession of Faith.<sup>1</sup> A very

<sup>1</sup> Baillie's *Letters*, vol. iii. p. 6; *Minutes of Westminster Assembly*, p. lv.

remarkable discussion on Arminianism occurred in the Glasgow Assembly in 1638.<sup>1</sup> The ablest and most fully reported speech was that of Mr. David Dick or Dickson, afterwards Professor of Divinity, first at Glasgow and then at Edinburgh. If any one comes to the conclusion that there is a wide difference between the tone and temper in which the controversy is treated in the works of the theologians above referred to and in the speech of Mr. Andrew Ramsay, he may be asked to bear in mind that he as well as they had been a professor under the episcopal *régime*, and remained to the last but an indifferent Covenanter.

Besides the contributions of these scholars to the illustration and defence of the doctrines of grace and to the exposition of the Scriptures in accordance with the principles of Augustine and Calvin, there were several Scotch divines who distinguished themselves by their works in the department of Church history and Church constitution. I mention first the family of the Symsons, five of whom were ministers of the Church, one of whom, while a minister in France, published a brief but interesting tractate on the spuriousness of the so-called Clementine Epistle to James; another, larger treatises on the internal and external history of the Church, the latter of which was recast and republished in

<sup>1</sup> Peterkin's *Records of the Kirk*, pp. 156-159.

London; a third, besides other works, compiled a chronicle on the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, which has never yet seen the light. These Symsons were the nephews, and the church historian was also the name-son, of Patrick Adamson, of St. Andrews, the accomplished scholar whose sad story is one of the most mournful episodes in the history of the Scottish Church. Even one who regards his policy as a blunder and his compliance with the humour of the Court as a huge mistake, cannot but feel sorry for the great scholar, who had given to the Church an elegant Latin prose version of the Confession of 1560, and a much-lauded metrical Latin version of Calvin's catechism, and who in old age was so heartlessly abandoned by the sovereign he had sacrificed so much to serve. In the department of Church constitution, David Calderwood stands decidedly pre-eminent. His *Altare Damascenum* — the great armoury from which the Presbyterians after 1637—Gillespie, Rutherford, and Baillie—drew their weapons for the conflict with prelatists and sectaries, is by far the most exhaustive and learned defence of Presbytery which Scotland has produced, and is said, by its massive learning and calm reasoning, to have drawn a tribute of reluctant admiration from King James himself. The first draft of it was published in English in 1621, but it was carefully revised and very greatly

enlarged, and published in Latin in Holland, in 1623. A second edition of it was published in 1708, and it was not less valued by the learned divines of Holland than by his own countrymen. Most of the works previously referred to, it will be observed, were also published in Latin, and so, while accessible to the educated in their own country, they appealed to a far wider public, and circulated in all the Reformed Churches of the period. The native Scottish dialect, as it had prevailed before the Reformation, received a rude shock by that event. The long residence of Knox in England, and with a congregation of English exiles on the Continent, had necessitated to a considerable extent his adoption of the 'southern tongue,' and the influence of this was apparent in all the formularies he prepared for the Scottish Church. The circulation of the English Bible tended still more than these formularies to give a certain currency to southern forms of speech. Southern influence had told on Willock and some others of the early Reformed teachers, and though somewhat later there was a reaction for a time, and, under the Melvilles especially, a purer Scottish dialect was fostered, yet with the accession of James to the English throne disintegrating influences were revived and intensified. The native Scottish, though then and for long after used as the vehicle of oral instruction, was not

cultivated as a fit vehicle for literary work, and Scottish divines who wished to appeal to an educated public in literary form preferred to make use of the Latin tongue. Many of these divines besides, by their long residence abroad, had, like Buchanan, become more at home in it than in the unsettled native dialect. During the 16th and 17th centuries, as Professor Veitch has lately told us, 'there was hardly a University on the continent of Europe which did not contain, we might almost say was not made famous by, the Scottish regent, or Professor of Philosophy, who had learned his dialectic in his native University.' Not a few of these, in Protestant Universities, rose from being regents in philosophy to be professors of theology, and naturally published in the Latin, in which they were first composed, their *theses*, *cursus*, and commentaries. Several of them ultimately returned to adorn the theological chairs in the Universities of Scotland, as Melville, Smeton, Johnston, Howie, Boyd, Sharp, Weemse, and the Colvilles, though they still continued to maintain friendly intercourse with the theologians of the various schools where they had studied or taught, on the Continent, and to solicit their counsel and aid in the publication of their works.

To restore the faith held by both Churches in common at the era of the Reformation, and to replace Augustinianism in its old post of honour,

was the main object intended to be effected by the Westminster Assembly—first in revising the English Articles, and then in preparing those new doctrinal standards of its own—the Confession and Catechisms—with which the future of Presbyterianism was to be so closely linked.

And I shall now proceed to lay before you the historical details regarding the preparation of the Westminster Confession of Faith. It was on 20th August 1644, that a committee was appointed by the Assembly 'to prepare matter for a joint Confession of Faith.' This committee consisted of Drs. Gouge, Temple, and Hoyle, Messrs. Gataker, Arrowsmith, Burroughs, Burgess, Vines, and Goodwin, together with the Scotch Commissioners. A fortnight later, Dr. Smith and Messrs. Palmer, Newcomen, Herle, Reynolds, Wilson, Tuckney, Young, Ley, and Sedgewick were added to the committee, or constituted an additional committee. Probably the subjects of some of the chapters, or part of the matter which was ultimately embodied in the Confession, was selected or prepared by these committees.<sup>1</sup> But the digesting of the material collected into more formal shape—a draft, as it was technically

<sup>1</sup> Under date of 25th April, Baillie writes, 'The Catechise and Confession of Faith are put in the hands of several committees,' some reports are made to the Assembly concerning both, and on 4th May he adds, 'upon both which we have already made some entrance.'

termed—was on 12th May 1645 intrusted to a smaller committee, consisting apparently of Drs. Temple and Hoyle, Messrs. Gataker, Harris, Burgess, Reynolds, Herle, and the Scotch Commissioners. On the 7th July, 'Dr. Temple made report of that part of the Confession of Faith touching the Scriptures. It was read and debated,' and the debate was continued in several subsequent sessions of the Assembly. On the following day Messrs. Reynolds, Herle, and Newcomen (to whom, on December 8th, were joined Messrs. Tuckney and Whitaker, and, on 17th July 1646, Mr. Arrowsmith)<sup>1</sup> were appointed a committee, 'to take care of the wording of the Confession,' as its Articles should be voted in the several sessions of the Assembly, but according to understood rule they were to communicate with the Scotch Commissioners and to report to the Assembly any changes in the wording of the sentences which they deemed necessary, as new propositions were added on to those previously passed. On the 11th July it was ordered that the body of the Confession, as it is then termed, the heads of the Confession as it is subsequently entitled, should be divided among the three committees—that is, as I suppose, that the material prepared by the previous small committee should be handed over to these larger committees, and

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes of Assembly*, pp. 110, 168, 470.

further discussed and elaborated by them before being brought into the Assembly. This order was carried out on the 16th. To the first committee were referred the materials on the heads, 'God and the Holy Trinity; God's decrees, predestination, election, etc.; the works of creation and providence; and man's fall.' To the second committee were referred the materials on the heads of 'Sin and the punishment thereof; free will, the covenant of grace, and Christ our Mediator.' To the third committee were assigned the materials on the heads of 'Effectual vocation, justification, adoption, and sanctification.' The committees were directed, if they saw fit to leave out any of these heads or to add any other, to report the matter to the Assembly.<sup>1</sup> A further distribution of heads or materials was made on 18th November 1645, on the motion of Mr. Whitaker. To the first committee were referred the heads on perseverance [of the saints], Christian liberty, the Church, and the communion of saints; to the second those on the officers and censures of the Church, on councils or synods, the sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper; and to the third, those on the law of God, on religion, and worship. A final distribution was made on 23d February 1645-6, when there were referred to the first committee the heads on the Christian Sabbath, the

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes of the Assembly*, pp. 112, 114.

civil magistrate, marriage and divorce; to the second those on the certainty of salvation, lies and equivocation,<sup>1</sup> and the state of the soul after death; and to the third, those on the resurrection, the last judgment, and life eternal.

The report on the draft of the committee concerning God was brought in and debated on the 18th and 23d July 1645. On the latter day the report on the subject of the Trinity was also brought in. On 29th August, the first committee brought in their report 'of God's decree' and the second theirs 'of Christ the Mediator.' The discussion on the former began at once, and was prosecuted at intervals afterwards very fully.<sup>2</sup> The latter was taken up on 2d September, and at a number of the subsequent sessions. On 8th September, the quorum of each of the three committees was reduced to six, as difficulty had been experienced in securing a larger attendance at their meetings. The next day Mr. Prophet brought in the report of the third committee of effectual calling, and the discussions on that and the two previous reports extended through the month of September. Before the close of November reports appear to have been given in from

<sup>1</sup> This was probably merged in § 4 of the chapter of lawful oaths and vows.

<sup>2</sup> See the notes of these memorable debates from 20th to 24th October in the printed *Minutes of the Assembly*, pp. 150 to 160, and remarks on these in Introduction, p. liii., etc.

the first Committee 'of creation and providence,' from the second 'of the fall of man, of sin and the punishment thereof,' and from the third 'of adoption and sanctification.' In the beginning of December, Mr. Cheynell brought in the report of justification, and Dr. Stanton and the second committee those on the sacraments in general, and on baptism and the Lord's supper in particular, and these were debated and adjusted during that month and the one following. On 15th December, Dr. Gouge brought in the report 'of free will,' and, probably on the 19th, from the same committee, that 'of perseverance.' A notable debate about the 'grace of baptism' took place on the 5th and 6th January. The report from the third committee 'of the law of God' was given in by Dr. Wincop on 1st January 1645-6, and was discussed at several sessions in the course of that month. The reports 'of lawful oaths and vows, of Christian liberty, and of church officers' were all brought in before the close of January. That on Christian liberty formed the main subject of discussion during February. During that month the report 'of the communion of saints' was also brought in. That and the article 'of the Church,' and especially the paragraph on the headship of Christ and the autonomy of his Church, formed the main subject of debate throughout the months of March and April. The

reports 'of religious worship, and the Sabbath day,' and 'of the civil magistrate' were given in and discussed during the same months, and the article on Christian liberty was also made the subject of further debate.

During the whole of the summer and autumn of 1646, the completion of the Confession had been retarded by the differences which had arisen between the Houses of Parliament and the Assembly, regarding the right of the office-bearers of the Church to keep back from the communion those whom they deemed ignorant or scandalous, and by the differences which arose among themselves on matters of detail, when they set themselves to prepare full answers to the Queries of the House of Commons respecting the *jus divinum* of church-government. The greater part of their time during the month of May, and the first half of the months of June and July, was devoted to the preparation of these answers. On 17th June, they resolved to go over the Confession again, as it had now been digested and arranged by the committee appointed to methodise the several articles, and to revise and perfect the wording of them. That their review might be the more thorough it was resolved that it should be made, not by attempting to read the whole over at once, but by reading it again 'in parts.' To do this formed the main work of the Assembly till 4th December

1646. With respect to most of the heads or articles thus reviewed, the minutes simply bear that they were 'debated and ordered, and are as follows,' though in the MS. minutes the words as finally adjusted do not follow. But in regard to the heads of marriage, the civil magistrate, faith, repentance, good works, certainty of salvation, synods and councils, the resurrection, judgment, and life eternal, which in all probability had only been elaborated and brought in for the first time after the review began, pretty full details are embodied in the minutes. So far as appears from the minutes, the various articles of the Confession were passed by the Assembly all but unanimously. On some occasions, when dissent was indicated even by one or two of the members, the wording of the article they objected to was so modified as to satisfy them. The main occasions on which this policy was not followed were on 4th September 1645, with regard to Dr. Burgess's dissent from the resolution of the Assembly to leave out the word 'Blessed,' retained both in the English and Irish Articles, before the name of the Virgin mother of our Lord; on 23d September 1646, with regard to Mr. Whitaker's dissent from the words 'fore-ordained to everlasting death;' and on 21st October 1646, with regard to the dissent of several of the Independents from the insertion in a Confession of Faith of certain parts of § 3, chap. xxiii. In

regard to matters of detail, some close divisions seem to have taken place. Three such divisions appear to have taken place in the single session of 20th November 1646. The only one, however, of the slightest importance was the first, in which, by 21 votes against 17, an addition concerning praises and thanksgiving, proposed by Dr. Burgess, and probably intended to be introduced after § 4 of chap. xxi., was peremptorily rejected. At the final reading of the Confession, before it was sent up to the Houses, at the urgent request of Gillespie, the word 'God' was substituted for 'Christ' in three places in the chapter on the civil magistrate, which otherwise might have been said incidentally to determine the question that he held his office from Christ as Mediator. Dr. Burgess, who maintained that view, dissented from the change, and a special *memorandum* was entered in their minutes that the Assembly did not mean by the change 'to determine the controversy about the subordination of the civil magistrate to Christ as Mediator,'<sup>1</sup> but simply to leave it open and both parties free to hold their respective opinions upon it. On 17th August, on the other hand, the following proposition had been affirmed to be true, though it was resolved it should not be inserted in the Confession of Faith: 'Synods or councils, made up of ministers

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes*, p. 308.

and other ruling officers of the Church, have not only a directive power in things ecclesiastical, but a corrective power also, and may rescind an evil sentence if adhered unto in any inferior Assembly, and excommunicate such persons as are otherwise incorrigible.<sup>1</sup>

While this review of the Confession was going on, various Orders were sent down from the Houses for hastening the completion of it, and particularly one on 22nd July 1646, 'desiring the Assembly to hasten the perfecting of the Confession of Faith and the Catechism, because of the great use there may be of them in the Kingdom, both for the suppressing of errors and heresies and for informing the ignorance of the people.' This Order was accepted by the Assembly as an indirect release from the task of preparing elaborate answers to the queries of the House of Commons, and, leaving that work meantime to be unofficially done by the authors of the *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, they returned with promptitude to the preparation of the Confession of Faith. On 18th September there came a further Order from the House to send to them the Confession of Faith, or so much thereof as they have perfected. Accordingly, by the 25th September, after the 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th chapters had been finally passed, it was resolved that the first nineteen heads or

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes*, p. 269.

chapters,<sup>1</sup> as ultimately passed, be sent up to the House of Commons. This was done by a small committee the same day, and on 1st October a duplicate was sent to the House of Lords.<sup>2</sup> On 9th October the House of Commons had what had been sent up read over, and ordered 500 copies of it to be printed for the use of the Houses, and of the Assembly. In the following month the House of Lords had not only read over but passed, apparently without debate, what had been sent up to them, and urged the House of Commons to do the same, 'that the Protestant Churches abroad as well as the people at home may have knowledge how that the Parliament did never intend to innovate in matters of faith'—in other words, they looked on the new Confession as in substantial harmony with the old Articles. By the 4th December 1646 the Confession of Faith was finished,<sup>3</sup> and on that day it was presented by the whole Assembly to the House of Commons, and on the 7th in the same way to the House of Lords. Thanks were returned by both Houses to the Assembly 'for their great pains' in the matter,

<sup>1</sup> On the 21st it was resolved that 'the several heads of the Confession of Faith shall be called by the name of chapters, and that the several sections be distinguished by figures only.'—*Minutes*, p. 286.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 291; *Commons' Journals*, vol. iv. p. 677; *Lords' Journals*, vol. viii. p. 505.

<sup>3</sup> It was deemed so on 26th Nov., but changes were made after.

and authority was given to them to print 600 copies of the whole treatise for the service of the two Houses and of the Assembly. Shortly after, a new Order was made by the House of Commons that 'Scripture proofs should be added ;'<sup>1</sup> and, on 29th April 1647, a committee of the Assembly further presented to both the Houses the Confession of Faith with the Scripture proofs inserted in the margin ; and of this also 600 copies were ordered to be printed. These three impressions were *printed*, not published, as—'THE HUMBLE ADVICE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES NOW BY AUTHORITY OF PARLIAMENT SITTING AT WESTMINSTER' (with the additions respectively following) '*Concerning a part of a Confession of Faith*'—

<sup>1</sup> The inserting of these proofs, which contributed so much to give the doctrinal standards of the Assembly such a firm hold on the minds of the lay members of the Church, was urged by the House of Commons. Their motives, however, were suspected, and the Order was complied with by the divines somewhat reluctantly. The following copy of their Petition to the House of Commons, in answer to their Order, is preserved in a recently recovered volume of the records of the Commission of the Scottish Assembly :—

'The Assemblie of Divines having received an Order from this hon<sup>ble</sup> house, bearing date the 9th of October, that five hundred copies of the advice of the Assemblie of Divines, concerning part of a Confession of Faith brought into this house and no more, be forthwith printed for the use of the members of both houses only, and that the Divines be desired to put in the margent the proofs out of Scripture, to confirme what they have offered to the house in such places as they shall think most necessarie, Do humblie represent that they are willing and ready to obey that Order. Nevertheless, they humblie desire this hon<sup>ble</sup> house to consider that the reason why the Assembly have not annexed any texts of

*'Concerning a Confession of Faith'*—and *'Concerning a Confession of Faith, with the quotations and texts of Scripture annexed.'* It was in Scotland, in the autumn or before the close of the year 1647, that the first edition of the Confession, bearing the title by which it has continued to be known, was issued to the public, and attempts seem to have been made to reprint this in England. It was not till the summer of the following year that the Confession, with the exceptions of chapters XXX. and XXXI. and certain portions of chapters XX. and XXIV., was approved by the English Parliament, and was published in London with the title, *'Articles of Christian Religion approved and passed*

Scripture to the several branches of the Confession w<sup>ch</sup> are sent up, wer not only because the former Articles of the Church of England have not any, but principally because the Confession being large, and, as we conceive, requisite so to be, to settle the orthodox doctrine according to the word of God, and the confessions of the best reformed churches, so as to meet with common errors, if the Scriptures should have bene alleadged, it would have required a volume. As also because most of the particulars, being received truths among all churches, there was seldome any debate about the truth or falsehood of any article or clause, but rather about the manner of expression or the fitness to have it put into the Confession. Whereupon q<sup>n</sup> y<sup>r</sup> wer any texts debated in the Assembly, they were never put to the vote. And therefor everie text now to be annexed must be not only debated, but also, voted in the Assembly; and it is free for everie one to offer what texts he thinks fitt to be debated, and to urge the annexing of Scriptures to such or such a branch, as he thinks necessary w<sup>ch</sup> is lyke to be a work of great length. So that we humblie conceive, if it be the pleasure of this honourable House that we should annexe Scriptures, it is not possible that we should forthwith proceed to the printing of the Confession.'

by both Houses of Parliament after advice had with the Assembly of Divines.' This title was adopted because it was in nearer agreement with that of the Thirty-nine Articles, and also because the treatise was not in the direct form of a Confession, *i.e.* with the words 'I confess,' or some similar expression, at the beginning of the several chapters or sections, as in the old Scotch and several of the Continental Confessions.<sup>1</sup>

Before the debates on the Confession came to a close, Twisse and Henderson, who had been able to take but little part in them, were called to join the general assembly and church of the first-born above. The former died on the morning of Sunday, 19th July, and was buried in Westminster Abbey on the 24th, but his body was removed from its place of honourable sepulture at the Restoration. The latter died on the 19th August, worn out with anxieties and incessant labours more than by old age; as glad, he said, to be released as ever school-boy was to return from school to his father's house. He had done a work which his countrymen were not to let die. But his departure left them for the time 'dark, feeble, and deploring.'

<sup>1</sup> Further details respecting the Confession and the proceedings of the English and Scottish Parliaments on it will be found in the notes appended to various passages of the printed volume of the *Minutes of the Assembly*, and particularly in that on pp. 412-423.