

## LECTURE VII.

### THE DIRECTORY FOR THE PUBLIC WORSHIP OF GOD.

IN my last Lecture I gave you an account of the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly while it was engaged in debating the constitution of the Church, the various orders of officers who were to bear rule in it, and the gradation of courts through which that rule was to be exercised, from the lesser presbytery or session of an individual congregation, up through the greater presbytery or classis of associated neighbouring churches, and the provincial synod or meeting of the representatives of neighbouring classes, to the national Synod or Assembly of the representatives of all the presbyteries or synods of the kingdom by whose direction they proposed that in matters ecclesiastical all should be guided and controlled. In my lecture to-day I am to give you a succinct account of the Directory for Public Worship which was elaborated while these debates were going on, and which was the first of the formularies they prepared and completed in terms of their Solemn League and Covenant. In doing this I may have to some extent to recapitulate what at various

times I have already written on these subjects. Having had to discuss them more than once already I should deal as unfairly by you as by myself if I did not at times content myself with revising or expanding the materials I had previously collected.

The order to prepare such a directory was given to the Assembly by the two Houses on 12th Oct. 1643, along with the order to 'confer and treat of such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's holy word,' etc. Both orders were proceeded in simultaneously, or taken up alternately at various periods during the years 1643 and 1644. The divines, however, were far more at one with respect to the worship than with respect to the government of the Church. Whatever may have been their theoretical views of the lawfulness of strictly imposed forms or of liturgies leaving room for free prayer, all were prepared, in the interests of peace and Christian union, 'to lay aside the former liturgy,' with the many burdensome rites and ceremonies that had previously been imposed, and in place of a 'formed' liturgy to content themselves with a simple Directory as a guide and help to the minister in the various parts of the public worship. And so, though there were occasionally keen debates about certain matters of detail, as about the profession of faith to be made by a parent when presenting his child for baptism, the qualifications to be required of com-

municants and the exact position to be taken by them at or about the table in the act of communicating, the work of preparing this Directory went on more rapidly and far more smoothly than that of adjusting the 'Propositions concerning Church Government and Ordination,' and elaborating the practical Directory for church-government and ordination of ministers.

It was on the 17th October—the day after that solemn fast to which I have previously referred—when they made their first arrangements about the order in which questions of government were to be discussed, that, according to Neal,<sup>1</sup> they also empowered a committee to make arrangements for drawing up a directory for worship. This was probably the Grand Committee of divines and members of the Houses which was intrusted with the charge of all matters relating to the covenanted uniformity between the kingdoms. At a meeting of that Committee<sup>2</sup> held apparently on 16th Dec. 1643, a sub-committee of five (yet without excluding any member of committee who chose to attend) was appointed to meet with the Scottish delegates to prepare the directory and submit it to a committee, and through them to the Assembly. This sub-committee consisted of Mr. Marshall, who was chairman, and Messrs. Palmer, Goodwin, Young, and Herle, with the Scottish commissioners. To

<sup>1</sup> Vol. iii. p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Baillie's *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 117.

the latter was assigned the duty of drafting what related to public prayer and the administration of the sacraments, and to Mr. Young that of drawing up what related to the reading of the Scriptures. It was devolved on the chairman to prepare a paper on the preaching of the word, and on Mr. Palmer to prepare one on catechising. Their first meetings, according to Baillie,<sup>1</sup> were not very promising. Goodwin, who does not seem to have had any part specially assigned to him, was disposed to make trouble, and the papers prepared by Marshall and Palmer were not quite to the mind of our critical countrymen. But Goodwin was propitiated, the papers of Marshall and Palmer were handed to the Scottish Commissioners for revision, and thereafter matters seem to have made more rapid progress. The Committee was able to present its first report to the Assembly on 24th May 1644. The report, according to Lightfoot, was a large report 'concerning the Lord's day and prayer and preaching, which held the Assembly in work all the next week.'<sup>2</sup> From time to time the remaining parts of the Directory were brought forward and discussed, especially during the months of June, July, and November, and before the end of the year, after more or less of upwards of seventy sessions had been spent on it, the whole of it passed the Assembly. The first portion of it, embracing

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 117, 118, 123.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal*, p. 277.

probably the preface, the ordinary services for the Lord's day, and the order for the administration of the sacraments, was presented to the Houses on 21st November (by Dr. Burgess and several other divines), and without delay was carefully examined and revised by them. A number of verbal alterations were made chiefly by the House of Commons. The words 'both ordinary and extraordinary' were struck out of the first title, also the words 'as in the Church of Scotland' after the clause as to communicants sitting '*about* the table or at it.' The second paragraph in the section of the celebration of the Communion bearing on the qualification of communicants was re-committed to a large committee. This committee, on 30th November, reported their opinion that the paragraph given in by the Assembly should be left out,<sup>1</sup> and that in lieu thereof the words 'the ignorant and the scandalous *are not fit* to receive the sacrament of the Lord's

<sup>1</sup> *Journals of House of Commons*, vol. iii. p. 710. It is not quite clear what was the literal form of the paragraph given in by the Assembly. I have not found it in the manuscript Minutes. Under date of 6th June it is given by Lightfoot in the following shape: 'None to be admitted, but such as, being baptized, are found upon careful examination by the ministers, before the officers, to have a competent measure of knowledge of the grounds of religion, and ability to examine themselves, and who profess their willingness and promise to submit themselves to all the ordinances of Christ [or thus, *who give just grounds in the judgment of charity to conceive that there is faith and regeneration wrought in them*]. The ignorant, scandalous, etc., not to be admitted, nor strangers unless they be well known.' But he has not given the preceding paragraph *verbatim* as passed by the Assembly, and when, under date of 12th

Supper' should be substituted. This report was adopted by the House. On a subsequent day part of the section on the visitation of the sick was proposed to be left out ; but whether in fact it was so it is very difficult to determine. A few verbal alterations were suggested by the House of Lords and adopted by the Commons. The most important of them was, that to the direction in the section of singing of Psalms 'that every one that can read is to have a Psalm-book,' their Lordships proposed to add the words, 'and to have a Bible.' The Commons, improving on the suggestion, proposed to transfer the words to the section of the public reading of the Scriptures, and developed them into a paragraph similar in form to the one in the section on singing of Psalms. 'Besides public reading of the Holy Scriptures every person that can read is to be exhorted to read the Scriptures privately (and all others that cannot read, if not disabled by age or otherwise, are likewise to be exhorted to learn to read) and to have a Bible.'

November, he refers again to this one he does not insert it exactly in the same form. He omits the clause relating to baptism, which is also wanting in the corresponding paragraph of Henderson's *Government and Order of the Church*, which pretty closely resembles the above. The words within brackets suggested by Henderson as a compromise with the Independents were probably left out at the November revision, and in its practical Directory the Assembly explicitly asserted, 'Although the truth of conversion and regeneration be necessary to every worthy communicant for his own comfort and benefit, yet those only are to be by the eldership excluded . . . who are found by them ignorant or scandalous.'

The Ordinance of Parliament superseding the Book of Common Prayer, and establishing and ordering to be put in practice the Directory for Public Worship, as thus revised by the Houses, bears the date of 3d January 1644, *i.e.* according to our present reckoning, January 1645. But in reality it was not passed till the following day, when the Commons' amendments on the Lords' amendments were accepted by the Lords, nor, though ordered to be printed forthwith, was it actually proceeded with till March. The reason of this delay will immediately appear. The formulary was meant to be a common directory for the churches of the three kingdoms, and though the Scottish Commissioners had assented to it in the shape in which it passed the Assembly, yet as their General Assembly and Parliament were about to meet it was manifestly expedient that their assent also should be obtained before the book, as altered, was issued. So it was taken down to Scotland by Gillespie and Baillie, and in due form was laid before the Scottish Assembly and Parliament. On 5th March two further alterations on it were proposed at Westminster at the request (not, as some suppose, of the Independents, but) of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Neither Baillie nor Gillespie who carried it down give us any hint of this, nor does the Act of the Assembly approving it, nor the supplementary articles for

keeping of greater uniformity in accordance with it, supply the omission, unless by the statement in the Act that the Assembly had *revised* as well as examined and approved the Directory. But the entries<sup>1</sup> in the Journals of the House of Commons expressly bear that the proposed changes were desired by the Church of Scotland, and those in the Journals of the other House that the application for them had been presented through the Assembly

<sup>1</sup> That in the *Journals of the House of Commons* (vol. iv. p. 70) is: 'Mr. Tate reported from the Assembly some few alterations desired by the Church of Scotland to be made in the Directory for Public Worship; the which were read and upon the question assented unto and carried to the Lords for their concurrence.' The entry in their Journals (vol. vii. p. 264) is as usual more detailed: 'A message was brought from the House of Commons by Zouch Tate, Esq., to let their Lordships know that the House of Commons have received a paper from the Assembly of Divines, wherein they offer some alterations in the Directory to which the House of Commons have agreed, and their Lordships' concurrence is desired therein. The alterations were read as follows: (1) In the administration of the sacrament of baptism, after the word "negligent," add these words, "requiring his solemn promise for the performance of his duty." After these the words, "It is recommended to the parent to make a profession of his faith, by answering to these or the like questions," are to be left out; and these three questions following are to be left out, viz., "Dost thou believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Dost thou hold thyself bound to observe all that Christ hath commanded thee, and wilt thou endeavour so to do? Dost thou desire to have this child baptized into the faith and profession of Jesus Christ?" (2) Instead of the words in the Directory for the solemnization of marriage, "in the place of the public meeting of the congregation, in some church or chapel," these words to be inserted: "in the place appointed by authority for public worship." Agreed to. "The answer returned was that this House agrees to these alterations now brought up."'

of Divines, whose own minutes of 6th March contain only the vaguest possible reference to 'the alterations last made.' Thus the 'fascious' and sometimes 'rude and humorous opposition' of Mr. David Calderwood and some others, who were tenacious of former Scottish customs, appears to a certain extent to have been too strong to be so completely overborne even by Gillespie and Baillie, as has been long supposed. Though no noise was made in the business, and all was 'quietly and calmly' settled, yet every effort was made 'to get satisfaction to Mr. David' in most of the things to which he had objected. After consultation with his colleagues in London a draft of the Act about the Directory passed by the Scottish Assembly and ratified by the Scottish Parliament was sent down by Gillespie to the meeting of the Commission (intrusted with the printing of the minutes of the Assembly), 'having no alteration,' it is said, 'but in words, and the substance being the same, only it is thought clearer, and that it will sound better here.' This draught in the enacting clauses not only approved the preface of the Directory, but intimated that the preface expressed the intent and meaning of the Directory, and to this extent at least Gillespie pressed its adoption with special urgency. He deprecated a too strait imposition even of a Directory, holding 'that the more straitly it is imposed, it will the more breed scruples and

create controversies which wise men should do well to prevent, and the rather lest we cross the principles of the good old Nonconformists by too strait impositions of things in their own nature indifferent, such as many (though not all) be in the Directory.’<sup>1</sup> In England it had been ratified *according to the meaning and intent of the ordinance of Parliament*, which was probably meant to be pretty strictly enforced, and in fact required to be so to insure the disuse of the Book of Common Prayer. In Scotland, on the other hand, it was ratified according to the intent of the preface, which was meant to leave greater latitude, and to conserve that spirit of freedom which the tolerant rubrics of the Book of Common Order had done so much to cherish. Accordingly, while customs and practices which could plead no written law in their favour, and were not expressly sanctioned by the new Directory, were to be dropped, though lawful in themselves, not only were the Scottish usages of the communicants, in the Lord’s Supper, communicating only at the table and distributing the elements among themselves to be retained, but also other usages which could plead the authority of the Books of Discipline or of Acts of the Assembly, and were not ‘otherwise ordered’ by the Directory. Perhaps it was with a similar view that they urged even at the last moment the

<sup>1</sup> Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, vol. ii., Appendix, pp. 505, 506.

striking out of the very vague questions the southern divines had permitted to be addressed to the parent presenting his child for baptism, viz., that they might be at liberty to retain the practice sanctioned by their own Book of Common Order and various Acts of Assembly of exacting a fuller profession of faith at that time.

The first edition of the Directory published in England bears the date of 1644, but it was really printed in the month of March, which according to our present reckoning would have fallen to the year 1645. The order for printing was issued on the 13th, and appears to have been executed by the 18th of March, all having been carefully prepared for it beforehand. The Scotch edition of 1645 was printed, not from the manuscript copy submitted to the Assembly in January, but from the English printed edition, and besides a number of insignificant variations from it in the spelling of certain words, only departs from it in placing the table of contents at the beginning instead of the end of the book, substituting in place of the Act of the English Parliament the Act of the Scottish General Assembly approving the Directory and enjoining its observance, and inserting between the first and second titles of the book the Act of the Scottish Parliament ratifying it, and the Acts of the Committee of Estates and of the Commission of the Assembly authorising the

printing of it. As the latter bears the date of 27th May this edition can hardly have been printed before June 1645. It was not till August that an Act passed the Scottish Parliament for publishing it. I have before me complete copies of these original English and Scottish editions of the Directory for the Public Worship of God. The former belonged to the Rev. Immanuel Bourne, one of the ministers appointed by the English Parliament to ordain ministers for the city of London. It has prefixed to it the ordinance for the ordination of ministers, and appended in manuscript 'a speech at the sacrament March 27th, 1659,' and 'a speech after the sacrament.' The latter, which is now the property of the University of St. Andrews, appears to have belonged originally to Dr. William Moore, who was Archdeacon of St. Andrews under the second episcopacy, and left a number of valuable Puritan books to the University. A neat and accurate reprint of the original Scottish edition of the Directory, with a valuable historical introduction and copious illustrative notes, was published by the Rev. Dr. Leishman in 1868.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The spelling has been modernised, but I have noticed only three other minute deviations from the original in the reprint. These are the omission in the directory for baptism (p. 306) of 'the' before 'right use of their baptism' and 'of' before 'all other promises;' and the repetition in the directory for the celebration of the communion (p. 310) of 'one,' so that it reads,

From the tenor of the preface to the Directory as well as from the testimony of Gillespie, Baillie, and others engaged in framing it, we seem warranted to infer that it was not intended by its framers to form a new liturgy, nor to authorise or encourage the ministers of the Church to turn the help and furniture it provided into fixed and unvarying forms of prayer and exhortation. No doubt Lightfoot and one or two of the others thought it dangerous to say anything against such a practice. But while the lawfulness of stated forms of prayer was not positively denied, everything that could be prudently done was done to persuade the ministers not to rest satisfied with these. It was urged as a special ground of objection to the old liturgy that

‘He may be one with us and we one with him’ instead of ‘and we with him.’ The Acts of the Scottish Parliament ratifying the Directory, and the Acts of the Committee of Estates and of the Commission of Assembly authorising it to be printed, are not given. The illustrative notes are very interesting, but the impression they leave on the mind seems to me to be that rather more is made of the views of certain speakers than facts warrant. The extracts from speeches of members, with three or four exceptions, are wonderfully accurate. But it must always be borne in mind that these are but selections, and at best exhibit only the sentiments of the speakers, and that these sentiments were sometimes modified, sometimes passed from before the close of the discussions. The Assembly distinctly disclaimed responsibility for aught in the scribes’ books besides its own resolutions and orders as these were *ultimately* adjusted and put on record. ‘All our discourses,’ Mr. Marshall said on one occasion, ‘are recorded by the scribes so far as their pens can reach them, but not to be taken as the judgment of the Assembly.’ Nay, silence was not to be construed into assent to things uttered in debate but not ‘ordered.’

it had proved a great means 'to make and increase an idle and unedifying ministry, which contented itself with set forms made to their hands by others [and the same might be said of unvarying forms though made by themselves] without putting forth themselves to exercise the gift of prayer with which our Lord Jesus Christ pleaseth to furnish all His servants whom He calls to that office.' The framers themselves distinctly state that in providing certain materials of prayer and exhortation their meaning was only 'that there might be a consent of all the churches in those things which contain the substance of the service and worship of God, and that the ministers, *if need be*, might have some help and furniture, and yet so as they become not hereby slothful and negligent in stirring up the gifts of Christ in them, but that each one by taking heed to himself and the flock of God committed to him, and by wise observing the ways of divine providence, may be careful to furnish his heart and tongue with further and other materials of prayer and exhortation as shall be *needful* on all occasions.' Unquestionably they meant that the individuality of the minister—his growing spiritual experience, his maturity of thought, his gifts of expression and utterance—should come out in leading the devotions of the people and acting as their messenger to God, as well as in setting forth the truth as it is in Jesus,

and acting as God's messenger to them, and also that the one exercise should be to him matter of thought, meditation, preparation and prayer, as well as the other, in order that he might make full proof of his ministry and commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. No party in the Assembly, it seems to me, went more cordially or persistently in this direction than the Scottish Commissioners. It was but the carrying out of principles they had been led on to assert in 1637<sup>1</sup> and which their Smectymnuan friends<sup>2</sup> had asserted in England in 1641. The excitement which Laud's foolish action had roused in Scotland still glowed in their bosoms. They heard unmoved the importunate pleading and entreaties of their best friends in the Assembly—Burgess, Calamy, Seaman, Reynolds and Palmer, that if not from regard to their persons, yet from regard to the credit of their ministry and the whole ministry of England, they would consent to leave out from the proposed preface some of the harsher expressions against the old liturgy, and allow it to be laid aside with honour. But they thought the honour of their own country required it should be more strongly condemned than their friends were willing to allow, and Gillespie was so cruel as to tell them that Scotland would not be satisfied

<sup>1</sup> Row's *History*, pp. 398-406.

<sup>2</sup> *Answer to Humble Remonstrance*, pp. 12-14.

with less, and that its ceremonies were not, like those of the law, to be buried with honour, 'but with the burial of the uncircumcised.' Henderson, who had more to do than any other in moulding the sentences<sup>1</sup> I have quoted from the preface into the form they ultimately assumed, seems to have felt that, in the temper in which his countrymen then were, less would not be accepted by them. Gillespie said expressly that 'that man who stirs up his own gifts doth better than he that useth set forms,' and that it was 'good to hold out what is best.' That in this they expressed only the general sentiment of the Church they represented is evident from the Directions for Family Worship issued a few years later by the Scottish General Assembly. 'So many as can conceive prayer ought to make

<sup>1</sup> Neal has it (vol. iii. p. 143) that several Independents were on the committee which drew up the preface, but an addition had to be made to this Committee. The MS. minutes as well as Lightfoot's Journal, represent the several reports about the preface as given in by Marshall, the Convener of the original committee, or by Henderson who was a member of it, and took the most prominent part in getting the preface into the shape it ultimately assumed. One party, Baillie tells us, purposed 'by the preface to turn the Directory into a straight liturgy; the other to make it so loose and free that it should serve for little use; but God,' he says, 'helped us to get both these rocks eschewed.' They had to concede something, however, to both these parties—to the first, the omission of a direct prohibition to turn the Directory into one ordinary form of prayer; to the second, the change of the words 'concern the service and worship of God' into 'contain the *substance* of the service and worship of God,' so as to make it clear that the uniformity desired related not to matters of detail but only to those of substantial importance.

use of that gift of God ; albeit those who are rude and weaker may begin at a set form of prayer, but so as they be not sluggish in stirring up in themselves (according to their daily necessities) the spirit of prayer which is given to all the children of God in some measure : to which effect they ought to be more fervent and frequent in secret prayer to God, for enabling their heart to conceive and their tongues to express convenient desires to God for their family.' These directions are markedly similar in thought and expression to those I quoted from the Westminster Directory, and show unmistakeably how the Church of Scotland must have understood these and meant her ministers to carry them out. Yet nothing was further from their intentions than to encourage unpremeditated or purely extemporaneous effusions, or to represent any fluency in these as the stirring up of that gift which is given to all the children of God in some measure. As I have already said, they intended the exercise of prayer to be matter of thought, meditation, preparation and prayer, equally with the preaching of the word ; and though no doubt they deemed the arrangement of the thoughts, and the bringing of the spirit into a proper frame, to be the most essential parts of the preparation in both cases, they did not mean to prohibit the careful writing of prayers any more than of sermons. Even the Independents, to

whom some are too ready to attribute both the excesses and defects of the Assembly, had said in their Apologetical Narration,<sup>1</sup> 'Whereas there is this great controversy about the lawfulness of set forms prescribed, we practised (*without condemning others*) what all sides do allow. . . that the public prayers in our Assemblies should be framed by the meditations and study of our own ministers out of their own gifts . . . as well as their sermons use to be.' Nay, their Coryphæus, Mr. Nye, in the most important speech he made in the Assembly when this preface was under discussion, admitted there was a middle way betwixt set forms and extemporary prayers, and said, 'I plead for neither, but for *studied* prayers.'<sup>2</sup> And as he did not himself object to write his sermons, and occasionally in the delivery of them to refer to what he had written,<sup>3</sup> we can hardly suppose that he would have objected to write his prayers as well as to study them. This was the practice of some of the most godly ministers the Church of Scotland has ever had, who, though gifted with readiness of utterance and felicity of devotional expression, and satisfied if in their more private ministrations they could arrange their thoughts and prepare their hearts, yet in the stated services of the sanctuary made conscience of

<sup>1</sup> P. 12.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Minutes of Assembly, vol. ii. f. 287.

<sup>3</sup> Preaching in Edinburgh, 'he read much out of his paper book.'

writing down beforehand the substance of their prayers as well as of their sermons, though they were no more in the habit of reading the latter than the former. I have by me one of the commonplace books of John Willison of Dundee which shows that this was his usual practice even when far advanced in life. And Dr. M'Crie, the most intelligent and uncompromising defender of non-liturgical worship in later times, has not hesitated to say in explanation of this preface, 'It does not follow from our not praying by a set form that we must pray extempore. Presbyterians *at least* require premeditation and study in prayer as well as in preaching, and disapprove of mere extemporary effusions in the former as well as in the latter.' It is only by attention to this, and to the earnest counsels of the preface to our Directory, that they should be careful thus to furnish *both heart and tongue* for the services of devotion; that men of average ability and spirituality can hope to do justice to the system of free prayer therein encouraged, and to enable their people to reap from it the full spiritual benefits it was meant to confer. And were they only more careful and conscientious in doing this we should hear less about the necessity of changing our form of service, and have it more frequently acknowledged, as it has been by our beloved Sovereign in the Journal of her Highland life, that the simple fervent prayer of a Scottish

minister may touch a chord in the heart which the grandest liturgy had left unmoved.<sup>1</sup>

I know of no formulary of the same sort which is so free from minute and harassing regulations as to postures, gestures, dresses, church pomp, ceremonies, symbolism, and other 'superfluities,' as Hales terms them, which 'under pretext of order and decency' had crept into the church and more and more had restricted the liberty and burdened the consciences of its ministers. I know of none in which, throughout, so clear a distinction is kept up between what Christ and his apostles have instituted, and which may be regarded as imperative in Christian worship, and what has been authorised or recommended or permitted, under the rules of Christian prudence, by later and fallible church authorities, and the observance of which therefore is to be required or recommended or allowed, if at all, with greater reserve as well as with more consideration for the scruples even of weaker brethren. As has been well said, 'The obligation to a practice is not the same when it is described as *necessary, requisite, expedient, convenient, lawful, or sufficient*, or when it is *directed, advised, or recommended*, nor finally when it is provided 'in one place that the minister *is to, or shall*, in another

<sup>1</sup> 'The second prayer was very touching; his allusions to us were so simple, saying after his mention of us, "Bless their children." It gave me a lump in my throat, as also when he prayed for the dying, the wounded, the widow and the orphans.'

*may,*' or in another *let him,* 'do such and such things.'

The tolerant purpose of those who framed it is fully expressed in their letter to the Scottish General Assembly of 1645, in which they say, 'We have not advised any imposition which might make it unlawful to vary from it in anything; yet we hope all our reverend brethren in this kingdom and in yours also, will so far value and reverence that which upon so long debate and serious deliberation hath been agreed upon in this Assembly . . . that it shall not be the less regarded and observed. And albeit we have not expressed in the Directory every minute particular which is or might be either laid aside or retained among us as comely and useful in practice; yet we trust that none will be so tenacious of old customs not expressly forbidden, or so averse from good examples although new, in matters of lesser consequence, as to insist upon their liberty of retaining the one or refusing the other because not specified in the Directory.' The materials for prayer and exhortation provided in the Directory were not meant by its framers, as they explain in the preface, to do more than supply help and furniture, of which the officiating minister might avail himself. It was said indeed by Mr. Marshall, when he first brought in the part relating to the ordinary services for the Lord's day, that it did 'not only set down the heads of things but so

largely, as that with the altering of here and there a word a man may mould it into a prayer.' But when reminded of this some months afterwards, when he brought in the first draught of the Preface bearing a statement that this was not intended, he said, 'Some such expression did fall from my mouth ; I said as one reason why it was so large, here he might have such furniture as that with a little help he may do it. But there is no contradiction to say that we do not intend it. It is not a direct prohibition.' (MS. Minutes, vol. ii. f. 286 b.) In other words, those who conducted the ordinary services were not directly prohibited from turning the materials furnished to them into an unvarying form of prayer, keeping as near to the words of the Directory as they could ; but at the same time they were not only not restricted or counselled to do so, but they were counselled and encouraged to do something more, according to their ability and opportunities. The materials provided for the ordinary services of the Lord's day are no doubt much fuller than those provided for special and occasional services, and, being meant for the guidance of young preachers as well as of ordained ministers, they required to be so. But I confess that the more I examine them, the more I am satisfied that even they were meant to be expanded, and required to be so in order to bring out their real value, and their adaptation to the purpose

they were meant to serve. They are so packed with matter, that their full significance cannot otherwise really be brought home to the heart and conscience, nor would they without such expansion have satisfied the eager craving for lengthened services which had then set in. Much more is this the case with the occasional services and especially with those for the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In this last particularly only the barest outline is given both of the exhortations and of the prayers. The materials of the preliminary exhortation supply the outlines of one of the most complete and impressive addresses to be found in any of the Reformed Agenda ; and feelingly expanded, as men like the late Dr. Crawford were wont to expand them, could not fail to be most refreshing to every spiritually-minded communicant. They have been collected from various sources, and, like the materials of the prayers, they show that the draft of the Scotch had passed through English hands, and been greatly improved and enriched by doing so. The verbal coincidences with 'the former liturgy' both in the exhortations and prayers are too many and too marked to be accounted for in any other way, and it is the highest commendation of this part of their work that it has fused into one so much of what was best in the Knoxian and the Anglican Communion Offices. The materials of the Consecration Prayer

are taken mainly from that in Knox's Book of Common Order, which rises so immeasurably above the other prayers in his Book. But the last part of that, as well as the materials of the concluding thanksgiving, shows more affinity with English forms,<sup>1</sup> and tends to make this Directory more complete in all that such a service should embrace than any similar office either in the reformed or the ancient church. The Communion according to the Directory was frequently to be celebrated, but it was left to the minister and elders of each congregation to determine how frequently it should be so—regard being always had to their comfort and edification therein. In England, in those times of revival, it was not uncommon that the Communion should be administered monthly<sup>2</sup> in Presbyterian and

<sup>1</sup> Even with the earlier Edwardian form. The words of the prayer in it 'with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ,' along with those in the exhortation preceding, 'for us to feed upon spiritually,' 'we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we be made one with Christ and Christ with us,' reappear in slightly modified form in the Directory: 'to vouchsafe his gracious presence and the effectual working of His Spirit in us and so to sanctify these elements both of bread and wine and to bless his own ordinance that we may receive by faith the body and blood of Christ crucified for us and so feed upon him that he may be one with us and we with him, that he may live in us and we in him and to him.' Probably we owe these and other approximations to the English Communion Office to Dr. Burgess, to whom the final revision and transcription of most of the Assembly's formularies was intrusted. He had copies of both liturgies of Edward VI.

<sup>2</sup> 'Blessed be God, we have now our Christian new moons and

weekly in Independent congregations. In Scotland all attainable evidence tends to show that it was administered much more rarely, though even then the practice had begun of the more pious of the people resorting to the Communion when celebrated in neighbouring parishes as well as in their own. In some parishes during the painful contentions between engagers and non-engagers, and between resolutioners and protesters, the celebration of the communion was intermitted for two or three years. It is sad to think that men like Blair, Rutherford, and Wood should have made their differences in such minor matters a plea for withholding from the congregation of St. Andrews the comfort of this ordinance for more than a year.

Perhaps Scotland was not unprepared for the changes which the substitution of the Directory in place of the Book of Common Order involved. Those changes were not so great as some imagine. Free prayer, which from the first had been permitted and encouraged, and had latterly, if Calderwood is to be trusted, become general, was now made imperative on the minister, but 'help and furniture' in the various exercises were provided ; and that

evangelical feast of trumpets. We have not only our monthly sacrament feast to refresh our souls withal in most of our congregations . . . but our monthly fasts in which the word is preached, trading ceaseth, and sacrifices of prayer, praises, and alms are tendered up to God.'—Preface to Calamy's Sermon, 23<sup>d</sup> February 1641. The disputes as to discipline led to less frequent celebration.

no one should imagine that encouragement was thus meant to be given to ministers to engage in the public services of the sanctuary in the perfunctory manner Dr. Hammond has described, it is directed that each one 'be careful to furnish *his heart and tongue* with further or other materials of prayer and exhortation as shall be needful on all occasions.' But in England the case was far otherwise. Even inside the Puritan circle, there were not a few who would have preferred to amend rather than 'to lay aside the former liturgy,' and many more of the wisest and best, who, though their own leanings may have been in favour of a more thorough reform, knew how hard it would be to persuade a large part of the nation and of the ministry to accept it, and felt how greatly it would add to the difficulty of the task of preserving unbroken the religious unity of the nation, to proscribe that to which so many were attached by most hallowed associations and tender memories. Even the ministers generally were not nearly so well prepared for the change as those in Scotland. Dr. Hammond<sup>1</sup> makes merry over what he supposes was an ingenious device, under pretence of supplying ships which wanted a minister, to help all such idle mariners in the ship of the Church. This was a little treatise issued within two months after the Directory was published, and entitled 'A

<sup>1</sup> *View of the New Directory, etc.*, p. 80.

supply of prayer for the ships of this kingdom that want ministers to pray with them, agreeable to the Directory established by Parliament, published by authority; London, John Field, 1645.'—(E. 284, No. 16.) Such a treatise might have been as honestly issued by the Assembly at that time as the volume of 'Prayers for the use of soldiers, sailors, colonists, and sojourners in India and other persons at home and abroad, who are deprived of the ordinary services of a Christian ministry' was by the Church of Scotland in our own day, and with as little intention of encouraging an idle and unedifying ministry. But I rather incline to think the 'device' may have been a device of the enemy to burlesque their work. I cannot find any authority given by Parliament or the Assembly for the publication, and the preface or reason assigned for the work seems to me to be written in a somewhat serio-comic vein. It appeared in May and it was not till August that the Parliament took steps to enforce their ordinance as to the old liturgy.

Probably the most remarkable and not least useful part of this formulary is the section 'Of Preaching the Word.' This was a subject not usually handled in such treatises, but it was one to which Puritanism from the first attached great importance, and to which all who hold the prophetic or evangelistic in opposition to the sacerdotal theory of the Christian ministry attach

great importance still. The Puritans mourned over the paucity of preaching ministers in the Church in the reigns of the Tudors and Stuarts, and pleaded with the authorities in Church and State to take further securities for the efficient performance of their function by every parish minister. They did what they could in an unofficial way, by their prophesyings and conferences, to quicken their brethren to a sense of duty in this matter. To train them for it was one of the first objects to which they directed attention when their day of prosperity came round, and at which they laboured with a perseverance and intensity only to be accounted for by the deepest sense of its importance to the well-being of a reformed church. Not that they overlooked catechising or any means of elementary instruction, as Dr. Hammond would insinuate (for their whole history shows how earnest and successful they were in these), but that they held that even such work could not be efficiently carried on so as to promote the real quickening of the lapsed and uneducated masses by mere mechanical drill in the words of a catechism and without constant recourse to that simple expository teaching, and personal application which Archbishop Laud and his party had discouraged, but which no authority now-a-days would dream of prohibiting. Even in Cartwright's Directory, prepared in the previous century, special attention

had been drawn to the subject of preaching and some wise counsels given respecting it. But in this formulary, drawn up in the heyday of Puritanism, we have from the hand of one of the greatest masters, and revised by the ablest of the school, a summary of their thought and experience on a subject which they had made peculiarly their own, and on which if on any they may claim to give counsel still. Dr. Hammond disparages even this, but Mr. Marsden says of it :<sup>1</sup> ' Every sentence is admirable. So much good sense and deep piety, the results of great and diversified experience, and of a knowledge so profound, have probably never been gathered into so small a space on the subject of ministerial teaching. It is one that has received attention in successive ages from teachers of different schools and of various tastes and habits of mind. . . . But a brief chapter of four pages here comprises an amount of wise instruction which will not readily be found elsewhere. The Divines of Westminster were among the masters of this sacred art; whether we estimate their power by the enthusiasm of their crowded congregations, by the better test of their writings and printed sermons, or by the still higher touchstone of permanent success, . . . in turning sinners from the error of their ways, in edifying the church and fitting men for God. After a variety of lessons

<sup>1</sup> *Later Puritans*, pp. 88, 89.

marked by great judgment and good sense . . . they conclude with a series of admonitions to the preacher to look to the condition of his own heart, and to keep alive the flame of love and holiness within.' In the copy of the Directory which belonged to Immanuel Bourne the first part of this section is carefully and minutely subdivided and annotated, and special attention is directed to the sentence which counsels the preacher still to seek for further illumination of God's Spirit by prayer and a humble heart, 'resolving to admit and receive any truth not yet attained whenever God shall make it known to him.'

During the summer and autumn of 1644, while the Assembly and the House of Commons were so busily engaged in adjusting the Directories for Ordination and for Public Worship, the House of Lords had been occupied with the trial of the Archbishop of Canterbury. For more than three years he had been kept as a close prisoner in the Tower. Friends had urged him to escape while he was so long neglected, and had offered to aid him in doing so. But he had resolved calmly to abide the issue. From week to week during the greater part of this anxious year the old man came before the peers leaning on his staff, and it is said attired in black gown and cap, and yet even so not always respectfully treated by the populace. Ably and resolutely did he defend himself from the various

charges brought against him, and the peers hesitated to adjudge his offences treason. But as in the case of Strafford a bill of attainder was at length brought in and finally passed on 4th January 1644-5. Even his opponents must confess that 'nothing in life became him like the leaving it.' A pardon from the king in his favour was produced to the Houses, but it was disregarded by them. His petition, touching yet dignified, that in consideration of his age and calling, his sentence might at least be commuted, was also disregarded, and it was only after a second application that the House of Commons acceded even to his modified request that the manner of his death should be changed, and he should not be hanged but beheaded. So on Friday 10th January the aged primate was brought forth for execution on Towerhill in the presence of an immense crowd of spectators estimated in one of the newspapers of the time at more than 100,000. His last address was a sort of discourse founded on Hebrews xii. 1, etc., which was very variously reported in the royalist and parliamentary newspapers, and surely it was small wonder if, as the old man gazed on that sea of upturned hostile faces, his memory misgave him, or that even with the aid of notes he gave but imperfect utterance to his thoughts. Then came a brief but affecting prayer as to which there is no

material variation,<sup>1</sup> and with a single blow of the executioner's axe his grey head was severed from his body, and his spirit passed to its rest. The House of Lords had been far from keen in the prosecution of this last of statesmen-prelates, feeling that however grievous his errors had been, there was now but little risk of his doing further harm to the State. Several even of the Commons are said to have shown a disposition to relent. But the majority, Presbyterians as well as Independents, could not be persuaded to let the prosecution drop. The feeling of the London populace and of the more fanatical sectaries against him was very strong, and had been intensified by the many satirical pamphlets which had been put in circulation since his fall. The Assembly has been blamed for doing nothing to allay the excitement and prevent the scandal of the chief minister of the Church being doomed to such a fate. Yet neither their own minutes nor the Journals of the Houses furnish the least evidence that as a body they did

<sup>1</sup> 'Lord, I am coming as fast as I can. I know I must pass through the shadow of death, before I can come to see thee, but it is but *umbra mortis*, a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature; but thou by thy merits and passion hast broke through the jaws of death; so Lord receive my soul and have mercy upon me, and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be this effusion of Christian blood amongst them, for Jesus Christ's sake, if it be thy will.'

aught to help it on. Even as to individual members I doubt if the expressions Professor Masson has quoted from the sermons of two or three of them were meant specially to refer to him, and not rather to those who were directly responsible for the war, and had actually shed blood in it or in the Irish massacres. The most melancholy utterances in the sermons of Woodcock and Stanton reappear in several of those preached in the following year, when no such reference can be imagined, and are but the emphatic expression of the opinion then all but universally held and acted on that they who shed innocent blood could only atone for it by their own.<sup>1</sup> The Scots also have been severely blamed, but with still less occasion. They no doubt felt keenly at first and resented bitterly the sufferings his policy had entailed on them. But Baillie, who knew and did not hesitate to speak their mind, shows no such resentment. He says expressly, when intimating to his correspondent in Holland that the trial had begun, 'He is a

<sup>1</sup> The only discourse I have met with which openly vindicates the deed, and glories in it, was not preached before the Houses of Parliament nor by a member of the Assembly of Divines. Its title is 'Jehoiada's justice against Mattan, Baal's high priest,' and its spirit is as atrocious as its title. The author does not give his name, but only his initials, J. H. Even if he was the Julius Herring, still more if he was only a relative of the Julius Herring who was the subject of Laud's coarse and unfeeling joke, 'I will soon pickle that herring,' one cannot speak of his act but in terms of the strongest reprobation.

person now so contemptible that we take no notice of his process.' And at a later stage, when speaking intemperately of the 'malicious invectives' of one of the prelates of his own country, he adds, 'I could hardly consent to the hanging of Canterbury himself, or of any Jesuit, yet I could give my sentence freely against that liar's life.' The insinuation against Henderson in the Oxford royalist paper of the day, is but one of its many slanders against the man who was its ecclesiastical *bête noire* as unmistakeably, as Lord Say and Seale was its secular one. But by whomsoever the deed may have been prompted, and however it may have been excused at the time when the memory of his rigour and cruelty was fresh, it will now be all but universally admitted to have been a blunder as well as a crime. It brought deserved discredit on the Parliament, revolted not a few of its friends, exasperated a number of the best of its opponents, embittered greatly the relations between the leading clergymen on both sides, and more than almost any other single occurrence destroyed for a generation all hope of honourable compromise and cordial co-operation between them in the cause of religion, and the interests of highest concern to their common country.