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CHAPTER IV.

OF THE SEVERAL PARTIES IN THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES,— PRESBYTERIANS, ERASTIANS, INDEPENDENTS. THEIR PROCEEDINGS ABOUT ORDINATION, AND THE DIRECTORY FOR DIVINE WORSHIP. THE RISE, PROGRESS, AND SUFFERINGS OF THE ENGLISH ANTI-PÆDOBAPTISTS.

Before we proceed to the debates of the assembly of divines, it will be proper to distinguish the several parties of which it was constituted.[[1]](#footnote-1) The episcopal clergy had entirely deserted it before the bringing in of the covenant, so that the establishment was left without a single advocate. All who remained were for taking down the main pillars of the hierarchy, before they had agreed what sort of building to erect in its room.

The majority at first intended only the reducing episcopacy to the standard of the first or second age, but for the sake of the Scots alliance, they were prevailed with to lay aside the name and function of bishops, and attempt the establishing a presbyterial form, which at length they advanced into *jus* *divinum,* or a divine institution, derived expressly from Christ and his apostles. This engaged them in so many controversies, as prevented their laying the top stone of the building, so that it fell to pieces before it was perfected. The chief patrons of presbytery in the house of commons, were, Denzil Hollis, esq. sir William Waller, sir Philip Stapleton, sir John Clotworthy, sir Benjamin Rudyard, serjeant Maynard, colonel Massey, colonel Harley, John Glynn, esq. and a few others.

The Erastians formed another branch of the assembly, so called from Erastus, a German divine of the sixteenth century. The pastoral office according to him was only persuasive, like a professor of the sciences over his students, without any power of the keys annexed.[[2]](#footnote-2) The Lord’s Supper, and other ordinances of the gospel, were to be free and open to all. The minister might dissuade the vicious and unqualified from the communion, but might not refuse it, or inflict any kind of censure; the punishment of all offences, either of a civil or religious nature, being reserved to the magistrate. The pretended advantage of this scheme was, that it avoided the erecting *imperium in imperio,* or two different powers in the same civil government; it effectually destroyed all that spiritual jurisdiction and coercive power over the consciences of men, which had been challenged by popes, prelates, presbyteries, &c. and made the government of the church a creature of the state. Most of our first reformers were so far in these sentiments, as to maintain that no one form of church-government is prescribed in Scripture as an invariable rule for future ages; as, Cranmer, Redmayn, Cox, &c. and archbishop Whitgift, in his controversy with Cartwright, delivers the same opinion; “I deny (says he) that the Scripture has set down any one certain form of church-government to be perpetual.”—Again, “It is well known, that the manner and form of government expressed in the Scriptures, neither is now, nor can, nor ought to be, observed, either touching persons or functions.—The charge of this is left to the magistrate, so that nothing be contrary to the word of God. The government of the church must be according to the form of government in the commonwealth.” The chief patrons of this scheme in the assembly were, Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Colman, Mr. Selden, Mr. Whitelocke; and in the house of commons, besides Selden and Whitelocke, Oliver St. John, esq. sir Thomas Widdrington, John Crew, esq. sir John Hipsley, and others of the greatest names.

The Independents, or congregational brethren, composed a third party, and made a bold stand against the proceedings of the high Presbyterians; their numbers were small at first, though they increased prodigiously in a few years, and grew to a considerable figure under the protectorship of Oliver Cromwell.

We have already related their original, and carried on their history till they appeared in public about the latter end of the year 1640. The divines who passed under this denomination in the assembly, had fled their country in the late times, and formed societies according to their own model in Holland, upon the States allowing them the use of their churches, after their own service was ended, with liberty of ringing a bell to public worship. Here, as they declare, they set themselves to consult the Holy Scriptures as impartially as they could, in order to find out the discipline that the apostles themselves practised in the very first age of the church; the condition they were in, and the melancholy prospect of their affairs affording no temptation to any particular bias. The rest of their history, with their distinguishing opinions, I shall draw from their Apologetical Narration, published in 1643, and presented to the house of commons.

“As to the church of England (say they) we profess, before God and the world, that we do apprehend a great deal of defilement in their way of worship, and a great deal of unwarranted power exercised by their church-governors, yet we allow multitudes of their parochial churches to be true churches, and their ministers true ministers. In the late times, when we had no hopes of returning to our own country, we held communion with them, and offered to receive to the Lord’s supper some that came to visit us in our exile, whom we knew to be godly, upon that relation and membership they held in their parish-churches in England, they professing themselves to be members thereof, and belonging thereto. The same charitable disposition we maintained towards the Dutch churches among whom we lived. We mutually gave and received the right hand of fellowship, holding a brotherly correspondence with their divines, and admitting some of the members of their churches to communion in the sacrament, and other ordinances, by virtue of their relation to those churches.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

The scheme they embraced was a middle way between Brownism and Presbytery, viz. that “every particular congregation of Christians has an entire and complete power of jurisdiction over its members, to be exercised by the elders thereof within itself. This they are sure must have been the form of government in the primitive church, before the numbers of Christians in any city were multiplied so far as to divide into many congregations, which it is dubious, whether it was the fact in the apostles’ times.[[4]](#footnote-4)

“Not that they claim an entire independency with regard to other churches, for they agree that in all cases of offence, the offending church is to submit to an open examination, by other neighbouring churches, and on their persisting in their error of miscarriage, they then are to renounce all Christian communion with them, till they repent, which is all the authority or ecclesiastical power that one church may exercise over another, unless they call in the civil magistrate, for which they find no authority in Scripture.[[5]](#footnote-5)

“Their method of public worship in Holland was the same with other Protestants; they read the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament in their assemblies, and expounded them on proper occasions; they offered up public and solemn prayers for kings, and all in authority; and though they did not approve of a prescribed form, they admitted that public prayer in their assemblies ought to be framed by the meditation and study of their ministers, as well as their sermons; the word of God was constantly preached; the two sacraments, of baptism to infants, and the Lord’s supper, were frequently administered; to which was added, singing of psalms, and a collection for the poor every Lord’s day.

“They profess their agreement in doctrine with the articles of the church of England, and other reformed churches.

“Their officers, and public rulers in the church, were pastors, teachers, ruling elders (not lay, but ecclesiastical persons, separated to that service,) and deacons.

“They practised no church-censures but admonition; and excommunication upon obstinate and impenitent offenders, which latter they apprehended should not be pronounced but for crimes of the last importance, and which may be reasonably supposed to be committed contrary to the light and conviction of the person’s conscience.

“In conclusion, they call God and man to witness, that out of a regard to the public peace they had forbore to publish their peculiar opinions, either from the pulpit or press, or to improve the present disposition of the people to the increase of their party; nor should they have published that apology to the world, had not their silence been interpreted as an acknowledgment of those reproaches and calumnies that have been cast upon them by their adversaries; but should have waited for a free and open debate of their sentiments in the present assembly of divines, though they are sensible they shall have the disadvantage with regard to numbers, learning, and the stream of public interest; however, they are determined in all debates to yield to the utmost latitude of their consciences, professing it to be as high a point of religion to acknowledge their mistakes when they are convinced of them, as to hold fast the truth; and when matters are brought to the nearest agreement, to promote such a temper as may tend to union, as well as truth.[[6]](#footnote-6)

“They therefore beseech the honourable houses of parliament, not to look upon them as disturbers of the public peace, but to consider them as persons that differ but little from their brethren; yea, far less than they do from what themselves practised three years ago. They beseech them likewise to have some regard to their past exile and present sufferings, and upon these accounts to allow them to continue in their native country, with the enjoyment of the ordinances of Christ, and an indulgence in some lesser differences, as long as they continue peaceable subjects.

“Signed by,

“Thos. Goodwin, Sydrach Simpson, Philip Nye,

Jer. Burroughs, William Bridge.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

The reverend Mr. Herle, afterward prolocutor of the assembly, in his *imprimatur* to this Apology, calls it a performance full of peaceableness, modesty, and candour; and though he wrote against it, yet in his preface to his book entitled “The independency upon Scripture of the independency of churches,” says, “The difference between us and our brethren who are for independency, is nothing so great as some may conceive; at most it does but ruffle the fringe, not any way rend the garment, of Christ; it is so far from being a fundamental, that it is scarce a material difference.” The more rigid Presbyterians attacked the Apology with greater severity; swarms of pamphlets were published against it in a few months, some reflecting on the persons of the apologists, and others on their principles, as tending to break the uniformity of the church, under the pretence of liberty of conscience. The most furious adversaries were, Dr. Bastwick, old Mr. Vicars, and Mr. Edwards, minister of Christ-church, London, who printed an Antapologia, of three hundred pages in quarto, full of such bitter invectives, that the pacific Mr. Burroughs said, “he questioned whether any good man ever vented so much malice against others, whom he acknowledged to be pious and religious persons.” But we shall have occasion to remember this gentleman hereafter.

Lord Clarendon and Mr. Echard represent the Independents as ignorant and illiterate enthusiasts; and though Mr. Rapin confesses,[[8]](#footnote-8) he knew nothing of their rise and progress, he has painted them out in the most disadvantageous colours, affirming “that their principles were exceeding proper to put the kingdom into a flame; that they abhorred monarchy, and approved of none but a republican government, and that as to religion, their principles were contrary to all the rest of the world; that they would not endure ordinary ministers in the church, but every one among them prayed, preached, admonished, and interpreted Scripture, without any other call than what himself drew from his supposed gifts and the approbation of his hearers.”

It is surprising so accurate an historian should take such liberties with men whose principles he was so little acquainted with, as to say, the Independents abhorred monarchy, and approved of none but a republican government; whereas they assure the world in their Apology, that they prayed publicly for kings, and all in authority. This was no point of controversy between them and the Presbyterians, for when they had the king in their custody they served him on the knee, and in all probability would have restored him to the honours of his crown, if he had complied with their proposals. When they were reproached with being enemies to magistracy, a declaration was published by the congregational societies in and about London, in the year 1647, wherein they declare, “that as magistracy and government in general are the ordinance of God, they do not disapprove of any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge, that a kingly government, bounded by just and wholesome laws, is both allowed by God, and a good accommodation unto men.”[[9]](#footnote-9) And if we may believe Dr. Welwood,[[10]](#footnote-10) when the army resolved to set aside the present king, the governing party would have advanced the duke of Gloucester to the throne, if they could have done it with safety. With regard to religion, Rapin adds, their principles were contrary to all the rest of the world; and yet they gave their consent to all the doctrinal articles of the assembly’s confession of faith, and declared in their Apology their agreement with the doctrinal articles of the church of England, and with all the Protestant reformed churches in their Harmony of Confessions, differing only about the jurisdiction of classes, synods, and convocations, and the point of liberty of conscience.—Our historian adds, that “they were not only averse to episcopacy, but would not endure so much as ordinary ministers in the church. They maintained, that every man might pray in public, exhort his brethren, and interpret Scripture, without any other call than what himself drew from his zeal and supposed gifts, and without any other authority than the approbation of his hearers.” Here his annotator Mr. Tindal rightly observes, that he has mistaken the Independents for the Brownists; the Independents had their stated officers in the church for public prayer, preaching, and administering the sacraments, as pastors, teachers, and elders (who were ecclesiastics,) and deacons to take care of the poor; nor did they admit of persons unordained to any office, to exercise their gifts publicly, except as probationers, in order to their devoting themselves to the ministry. The words of their confession are, “The work of preaching is not so peculiarly confined to pastors and teachers, but that others also gifted, and fitted by the Holy Ghost for it, and approved (being by lawful ways and means, by the providence of God, called thereunto,) may publicly, ordinarily, and constantly, perform it, so that they give themselves up thereunto.”[[11]](#footnote-11) It is necessary the reader should make these remarks, to rectify a train of mistakes which runs through this part of Mr. Rapin’s history, and to convince him, that the king’s death was not owing to the distinguishing tenets of any sect or party of Christians. There were indeed some republicans and levellers in the army, whose numbers increased after they despaired of bringing the king into their measures, and it is well known that at their first appearance, Cromwell by his personal valour suppressed them with the hazard of his life. These were chiefly Anabaptists, and proved as great enemies to the protector as they had been to the king. But there is nothing in the principles of the Presbyterians, Independents, or Anabaptists, as far as I can learn, inconsistent with monarchy, or that had a natural tendency to put the kingdom into a flame.

Mr. Baxter, who was no friend to the Independents, and knew them much better than the above-mentioned writers, admits, “that most of them were zealous, and very many learned, discreet, and pious, capable of being very serviceable to the church, and searchers into Scripture and antiquity;”[[12]](#footnote-12) though he blames them on other occasions, for making too light of ordination; for their too great strictness in the qualification of church-members; for their popular form of church-government; and their too much exploding of synods and councils; and then adds, “I saw commendable care of serious holiness and discipline in most of the Independent churches; and I found that some episcopal men, of whom archbishop Usher was one, agreed with them in this, that every bishop was independent, and that synods and councils were not so much for government as concord.” And I may venture to declare, that these are the sentiments of almost all the Protestant Nonconformists in England at this day.

There was not one professed Anti-pædobaptist in the assembly, though their sentiments began to spread wonderfully without doors. Their teachers were for the most part illiterate, yet Mr. Baxter says,[[13]](#footnote-13) “he found many of them sober, godly, and zealous, not differing from their brethren but as to infant baptism.” These joining with the Independents in the points of discipline and toleration, made them the more considerable, and encouraged their opposition to the Presbyterians, who were for establishing their own discipline, without regard to such as differed from them.

It is not to be wondered, that so many parties with different views should entangle the proceedings of this venerable body, and protract the intended union with the Scots; though as soon as the covenant was taken, they entered upon that affair, the parliament having sent them the following order, dated October 12, 1643.

“Upon serious consideration of the present state of affairs, the lords and commons assembled in this present parliament do order, that the assembly of divines and others do forthwith confer, and treat among themselves, of such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God’s holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the church at home, and a nearer agreement with the church of Scotland, &c. to be settled in this church instead of the present church-government by archbishops, bishops, &c. which it is resolved to take away; and to deliver their advice touching the same to both bouses of parliament with all convenient speed.”

Hereupon the assembly set themselves to inquire into the constitution of the primitive church, in the days of the apostles, which, being founded upon the model of the Jewish synagogues, gave the Lightfoots, the Seldens, the Colmans, and other masters of Jewish antiquities, an opportunity of displaying their superior learning, by new and unheard-of interpretations of Scripture, whereby they frequently disconcerted the warmer Presbyterians, whose plan of discipline they had no mind should receive the stamp of an apostolic sanction in the church of England.[[14]](#footnote-14)

It was undoubtedly a capital mistake in the proceedings of parliament, to destroy one building before they were agreed upon another. The ancient order of worship and discipline in the church of England was set aside above twelve months before any other form was appointed; during which time, no wonder sects and divisions arrived to such a pitch, that it was not in their power afterward to destroy them. Committees indeed were appointed to prepare materials for the debate of the assembly, some for discipline, and others for worship, which were debated in order, and then laid aside without being perfected, or sent up to parliament to be framed into a law. Nothing can be alleged in excuse of this, but their backwardness to unite with the Scots, or the prospect the parliament might yet have of an agreement with the king.

The first point that came upon the carpet was the ordination of ministers; which was the more necessary, because the bishops refused to ordain any who were not[[15]](#footnote-15) in the interest of the crown: this gave occasion to inquire into the ancient right of presbyters to ordain without a bishop, which meeting with some opposition, the committee proposed a temporary provision till the matter should be settled, and offered these two queries:

First, “Whether in extraordinary cases, something extraordinary may not be admitted, till a settled order can be fixed, yet keeping as near to the rule as possible?

Secondly, “Whether certain ministers of this city may not be appointed to ordain ministers in the city and neighbourhood, for a certain time, *jure fraternitatis?*”

To the last of which, the Independents entered their dissent, unless the ordination was attended with the previous election of some church. New difficulties being continually started, upon this and some other heads, the Scots commissioners were out of all patience, and applied to the city-ministers to petition the parliament to call for the advice of the assembly. The petition was presented September 18, 1644, in which, having reminded the commons of their remonstrance, wherein they declare, it was not their intention to let loose the golden reins of discipline; and of their national covenant, wherein they had engaged to the most high God, to settle a uniformity in the church; they add, “Give us leave, we beseech you, in pursuance of our national covenant, to sigh out our sorrows at the foot of this honourable senate. Through many erroneous opinions, ruinating schisms, and damnable heresies, unhappily fomented in this city and country, the orthodox ministry is neglected, the people are seduced, congregations torn asunder, families distracted, rights and duties of relations, national, civil, and spiritual, scandalously violated, the power of godliness decayed, parliamentary authority undermined, fearful confusions introduced, imminent destruction threatened, and in part inflicted upon us lately in the west. May it therefore please your wisdoms, as a sovereign remedy for the removal of our present miseries, and preventing their farther progress, to expedite a directory for public worship, to accelerate the establishment of a pure discipline and government, according to the word of God, and the example of the best reformed churches, and to take away all obstructions that may impede and retard our humble desires.”[[16]](#footnote-16) Upon this the assembly were ordered to send up their humble advice upon this head: which was to the following effect [September 22], viz. that in this present exigency, while there were no Presbyterians, yet it being necessary that ministers should be ordained for the army and navy, and for the service of many destitute congregations, by some who, having been ordained themselves, have power to join in the setting apart of others: they advise,

(1.) That an association of some godly ministers in and about the city of London be appointed by public authority, to ordain ministers for the city and the neighbouring parts, keeping as near to the rule as may be.

(2.) That the like associations be made by the same authority in great towns and neighbouring parishes in the several counties, which are at present quiet and undisturbed.

(3.) That such as are chosen, or appointed for the service of the army or navy, being well recommended, be ordained as aforesaid, by the associated ministers of London, or some others in the country; and the like for any other congregations that want a minister.[[17]](#footnote-17)

According to this advice the two houses passed an ordinance, October 2, for the ordination of ministers *pro tempore,* which appoints the following ten persons, being presbyters, and members of the assembly, to examine and ordain, by imposition of hands, all those whom they shall judge qualified to be admitted into the sacred ministry, viz.

Dr. Cornelius Burges, assessor. Mr. Daniel Cawdry. Mr. John Ley.

Dr. William Gouge. Mr. Starkey Gower. Mr. George Walker.

Mr. Edmund Calamy. Mr. Henry Roborough. Mr. John Conant. Mr.Humphrey Chambers.

And the following thirteen, being presbyters of the city of London, but not members of the assembly, viz.

Rev. Mr. John Downham. Rev. Mr. Cha. Offspring. Rev. Mr. Leon. Cooke.

Mr. Tim. Dod. Mr. James Cranford. Mr. Richard Lee.

Mr. Tho. Clendon. Mr. Sam. Clarke. Mr. Tho. Horton.

Mr. Em. Bourne. Mr. Fulk Billers. Mr. Arthur Jackson.

Mr. Fr. Roberts.

And seven or more to be a quorum, and all persons so ordained to be reputed ministers of the church of England, sufficiently authorised for any office or employment therein, and capable of all advantages appertaining to the same. Their rules for examination, and trial of candidates, will be seen the next year, when this affair was fully settled. In the meantime another ordinance passed the houses, for the benefit of the county of Lancaster, whereby the reverend Mr. Charles Herle, Mr. Richard Herrick, Mr. Hyet, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Isaac Ambrose, and others, to the number of twenty-one, had full power given them to ordain *pro tempore* in the county of Lancaster. And to obviate the reproaches of the Oxford divines, the following clause was added: “That if any person do publicly preach, or otherwise exercise any ministerial office, who shall not be ordained, or thereunto allowed by seven of the said ministers, their names shall be returned to both houses of parliament, to be dealt with as they in their wisdom shall think fit.” It was voted farther, that “no minister be allowed to preach, unless he has a certificate of his ordination, or at least of his being examined and approved by the assembly.”[[18]](#footnote-18) And February 16, at a conference between the two houses, it was agreed, that the assembly of divines be desired to admit none into their pulpits, except such whose doctrine they would be answerable for. Such was the concern of the parliament in these distracted times, to have a sober and well-regulated clergy.

Next to the providing for a succession of ministers by ordination, the assembly consulted about a form of devotion. The old liturgy being laid aside, there were no public officers in the church: a committee was therefore appointed, October 17, 1643, to agree upon certain general heads, for the direction of the minister in the discharge of his office, which, having passed through the assembly, were sent into Scotland for the approbation of the general assembly, and then established by an ordinance of parliament bearing date January 3, 1644–5, under the title of “A Directory for Public Worship.”

The reasons which induced the parliament to discard the old liturgy, and form a new plan for the devotion of the church, I shall transcribe from their own preface. “It is evident (say they), after long and sad experience, that the liturgy used in the church of England, notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers, has proved an offence to many of the godly at home, and to the reformed churches abroad. The enjoining the reading all the prayers heightened the grievances; and the many unprofitable and burdensome ceremonies have occasioned much mischief, by disquieting the consciences of many, who could not yield to them. Sundry good people have by this means been kept from the Lord’s table, and many faithful ministers debarred from the exercise of their ministry, to the ruin of them and their families. The prelates and their faction have raised their estimation of it to such a height, as if God could be worshipped no other way but by the service-book; in consequence of which the preaching of the word has been depreciated, and in some places entirely neglected.

“In the meantime the Papists have made their advantage this way, boasting that the Common Prayer-book came up to a compliance with a great part of their service; by which means they were not a little confirmed in their idolatry and superstition, especially of late, when new ceremonies were daily obtruded on the church.

“Besides, the liturgy has given great encouragement to an idle and unedifying ministry, who chose rather to confine themselves to forms made to their hands, than to exert themselves in the exercise of the gift of prayer, with which our Saviour furnishes all those whom he calls to that office.

“For these and many other weighty considerations, relating to the book in general, besides divers particulars which are a just ground of offence, it is thought advisable to set aside the former liturgy, with the many rites and ceremonies formerly used in the worship of God, not out of any affectation of novelty, nor with an intention to disparage our first reformers, but that we may answer in some measure the gracious providence of God which now calls upon us for a farther reformation; that we may satisfy our own consciences; answer the expectations of other reformed churches; ease the consciences of many godly persons among ourselves; and give a public testimony of our endeavours after a uniformity in divine worship, pursuant to what we had promised in our solemn league and covenant.”

It has been observed, that the Directory is not an absolute form of devotion, but, agreeably to its title, contains only some general directions, taken partly from the word of God, and partly from rules of Christian prudence; it points out the heads of public prayer, of preaching, and other parts of the pastoral function, leaving the minister a discretionary latitude to fill up the vacancies according to his abilities. It is divided into several chapters, and being a book of a public nature, comprehending all the peculiarities of the Presbyterian reformation, I have given it a place in the appendix.[[19]](#footnote-19) Mr. Fuller observes,[[20]](#footnote-20) that the Independents, in the assembly were hardly persuaded to consent to it, for fear of infringing the liberty of prayer, yet being admitted to qualify some things in the preface, they complied. The committee who composed the preface were Mr. Nye, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Burges, Mr. Thomas Goodwin, all Independents; Mr. Vines, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Marshal, and Dr. Temple, with the Scots commissioners.

The Directory passed the assembly with great unanimity; those who were for set forms of prayer resolving to confine themselves to the very words of the Directory, while others made use of them only as heads for their enlargement.

It may not be improper in this place to advise the reader of the following variations introduced into the service of the church upon this occasion. Instead of one prescribed form of prayer, the Directory only points out certain topics on which the minister might enlarge. The whole Apocrypha is rejected; private and lay baptism, with the use of godfathers and godmothers, and the sign of the cross, are discontinued.[[21]](#footnote-21) In the sacrament of the Lord’s supper no mention is made of private communion, or administering it to the sick. The altar with rails is changed into a communion-table, to be placed in the body of the church, about which the people might stand or sit, kneeling not being thought so proper a posture. The Presbyterians were for giving the power of the keys into the hands of the ministers and elders, as the Independents were to the whole brotherhood; but Lightfoot, Selden, Colman, and others, were for an open communion, to whom the parliament were most inclinable, for all they would yield was, that “the minister immediately before the communion should warn, in the name of Christ, all such as are ignorant, scandalous, profane, or that live in any sin or offence against their knowledge or conscience, that they presume not to come to that holy table, showing them that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.” The prohibition of marriage in Lent, and the use of the ring, are laid aside. In the visitation of the sick, no mention is made of private confession, or authoritative absolution. No service is appointed for the burial of the dead. All particular vestments for priests or ministers, and all saints’ days, are discarded. It has been reckoned a considerable omission, that the Directory does not enjoin reading the Apostles’ creed and the ten commandments; lord Clarendon reports,[[22]](#footnote-22) that when this was observed in private conversation at the treaty of Uxbridge, the earl of Pembroke said, he was sorry for the omission, but that upon a debate in the house of commons, it was carried in the negative by eight or nine voices. Which made many smile, says his lordship; but the jest will be lost, when the reader is informed, that the question in the house was not, whether the creed should be received or rejected, but whether it should be printed with the Directory for worship; it being apprehended more proper for a confession of faith; and accordingly the creed and ten commandments were added to the assembly’s confession, published a year or two forwards. The ordinance for establishing the Directory repeals and makes void the acts of Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth, by which the old liturgy was established, and forbids the use of it within any church, chapel, or place of public worship, in England or Wales, appointing the use of the Directory in its room; and thus it continued till the restoration of king Charles II. when the constitution being restored, the old liturgy took place again, the ordinance for its repeal having never obtained the royal assent.

It was a considerable time before this great revolution in the form of public worship took place over the whole kingdom. In some parts of the country the churchwardens could not procure a Directory, and in others they despised it, and continued the old Common Prayer-book: some would read no form, and others would use one of their own. In order, therefore, to give life to the Directory, the parliament next summer called in all Common Prayer-books, and imposed a fine upon those ministers who should read any other form than that contained in the Directory. The ordinance is dated August 23, 1645, and enacts, that “the knights and burgesses of the several counties of England and Wales, shall send printed books of the Directory fairly bound to the committee of parliament in their several counties, who shall deliver them to the officers of the several parishes in England and Wales, by whom they shall be delivered to the several ministers of each parish. It ordains farther, that the several ministers next Lord’s day after their receiving the book of Directory, shall read it openly in their respective churches before morning sermon.—It then forbids the use of the Common Prayer-book in any church, chapel, or place of public worship, or in any private place or family, under penalty of £5 for the first offence, £10 for the second, and for the third, a year’s imprisonment. Such ministers as do not observe the Directory in all exercises of public worship shall forfeit 40s.; and they who, with a design to bring the Directory into contempt, or to raise opposition to it, shall preach, write, or print, anything in derogation of it, shall forfeit a sum of money not under £5*.* nor more than fifty, to be given to the poor. All Common Prayerbooks remaining in parish-churches or chapels, are ordered within a month to be carried to the committee of the several counties, to be disposed of as the parliament shall direct.”[[23]](#footnote-23)

These were the first-fruits of Presbyterian uniformity, and are equally to be condemned with the severities and oppressions of the late times; for though it should be admitted, that the parliament or legislature had a right to abrogate the use of the Common Prayer-book in churches, was it not highly unreasonable to forbid the reading it in private families or closets? Surely the devotion of a private family could be no disturbance to the public; nor is it any excuse to say, that very few suffered by it, because the law is still the same, and equally injurious to the natural rights of mankind.

Though his majesty’s affairs were very desperate after the battle of Naseby, yet he had the courage to forbid the use of the new Directory, and enjoin the continuance of the Common Prayer, by a proclamation from Oxford, dated November 13, 1645, in which his majesty takes notice, that “the Book of Common Prayer, being a most excellent form of worship, grounded on the Holy Scriptures, is a great help to devotion, and tends to preserve a uniformity in the church of England; whereas the Directory gives liberty to ignorant, factious, and evil men, to broach their own fancies and conceits, and utter those things in their long prayers which no conscientious man can assent to; and be the minister never so pious, it breaks in upon the uniformity of public service. And whereas this alteration is introduced by an ordinance of parliament, inflicting penalties on offenders, which was never pretended to be in their power without our consent: now, lest our silence should be interpreted as a connivance in a matter so highly concerning the worship of God, and the established laws of the kingdom, we do therefore require and command all ministers in all cathedral and parish churches, and all other places of public worship, that the said Book of Common Prayer be kept and used in all churches, chapels, &c. according to the statute *primo* Eliz., and that the Directory be in no sort admitted, received, or used; and whensoever it shall please God to restore us to peace, and the laws to their due course, we shall require a strict account, and prosecution against the breakers of the said law. And in the meantime, in such places where we shall come and find the Book of Common Prayer suppressed and laid aside, and the Directory introduced, we shall account all those that are aiders, actors, or contrivers therein, to be persons disaffected to the religion and laws established.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

His majesty likewise issued out warrants under his own hand, to the heads of the university, commanding them to read divine service as usual, morning and evening; and assured his peers at Oxford, that he was still determined to live and die for the privileges of his crown, his friends, and church-government.

About this time the Anabaptists [or more properly, Antipaedo-baptists] began to make a considerable figure, and spread themselves into several separate congregations. We have already distinguished the German Anabaptists from the English, who differed only from their Protestant brethren about the subject and mode of baptism; these were divided into general and particular, from their different sentiments upon the Arminian controversy; the former appeared in Holland, where Mr. Smith their leader published a confession of faith in the year 1611, which Mr. Robinson, the minister of the Independent congregation at Leyden, answered in 1614; but the severity of those times would not admit them to venture into England. The particular Baptists were strict Calvinists, and were so called from their belief of the doctrines of particular election, redemption, &c. They separated from the Independent congregation about the year 1638, and set up for themselves under the pastoral care of Mr. Jesse, as has been related; and having renounced their former baptism, they sent over one of their number [Mr. Blunt] to be immersed by one of the Dutch Anabaptists of Amsterdam, that he might be qualified to baptise his friends in England after the same manner.[[25]](#footnote-25) A strange and unaccountable conduct! for unless the Dutch Anabaptists could derive their pedigree in an uninterrupted line from the apostles, the first reviver of this usage must have been unbaptised, and, consequently, not capable of communicating the ordinance to others. Upon Mr. Blunt’s return he baptised Mr. Blacklock, a teacher, and Mr. Blacklock dipped the rest of the society, to the number of fifty-three, in this present year 1644. “Presuming upon the patience of the state (says Dr. Featly) they have rebaptised one hundred men and women together, in the twilight, in rivulets, and some arms of the Thames, and elsewhere, dipping them over head and ears. They have printed divers pamphlets in defence of their heresy (says the same author), and challenged some of our preachers to a disputation.” Nay, so wonderfully did this opinion prevail, that there were no less than forty-seven congregations in the country; and seven in London at this time, who published a confession of their faith, signed in the name of their congregations, by William Kiffin, Thomas Patience, George Tipping, John Spilsbury, Thomas Sheppard, Thomas Munden, Thomas Gun, John Mabbet, John Webb, Thomas Kilcop, Paul Hobson, Thomas Gore, John Philips, and Edward Heath. In the year 1646, it was reprinted, with the additional names of Dennis le Barbier and Christopher Dwell, minister of the French congregation in London, of the same judgment.

Their confession consisted of fifty-two articles, and is strictly Calvinistical in the doctrinal part, and according to the Independent discipline; it confines the subject of baptism to grown Christians, and the mode to immersion; it admits of gifted lay-preachers, and acknowledges a due subjection to the civil magistrate in all things lawful; and concludes thus, “We desire to live quietly and peaceably, as becomes saints, endeavouring in all things to keep a good conscience, and to do to every man, of what judgment soever, as we would they should do to us; that as our practice is, so it may prove us to be a conscionable, quiet, and harmless people (no way dangerous or troublesome to human society), and to labour to work with our hands, that we may not be chargeable to any, but to give to him that needeth, both friend and enemy, accounting it more excellent to give than to receive. Also we confess, that we know but in part: to show us from the word of God that which we see not, we shall have cause to be thankful to God and them. But if any man shall impose upon us anything that we see not to be commanded by our Lord Jesus Christ, we should, in his strength, rather embrace all reproaches and tortures of men; to be stripped of all our outward comforts, and, if it were possible, to die a thousand deaths, rather than to do anything against the truth of God, or against the light of our own consciences. And if any shall call what we have said heresy, then do we with the apostle acknowledge, that after the way they call heresy so worship we the God of our fathers; disclaiming all heresies (rightly so called) because they are against Christ; and in desiring to be steadfast and immovable, always abounding in obedience to Christ; as knowing our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord.”

When Dr. Featly had read this confession, he owned they were neither heretics nor schismatics, but tender-hearted Christians, upon whom, through false suggestions, the hand of authority had fallen heavy whilst the hierarchy stood.

The advocates of this doctrine were, for the most part, of the meanest of the people; their preachers were generally illiterate, and went about the country making proselytes of all who would submit to immersion, without a due regard to their acquaintance with the principles of religion, or their moral characters. The writers of these times represent them as tinctured with a kind of enthusiastic fury against all that opposed them. Mr. Baxter says,[[26]](#footnote-26) “There were but few of them that had not been the opposers and troublers of faithful ministers—That in this they strengthened the hands of the profane, and that, in general, reproach of ministers, faction, pride, and scandalous practices, were fomented in their way.”[[27]](#footnote-27) But still there were among them some learned, and a great many sober and devout Christians, who disallowed of the imprudence of their country friends. The two most learned divines that espoused their cause were Mr. Francis Cornwall, M. A. of Emanuel-college, and Mr. John Tombes, B. D., educated in the university of Oxford, a person of incomparable parts, well versed in the Greek and Hebrew languages, and a most excellent disputant. He wrote several letters to Mr. Selden against infant-baptism, and published a Latin exercitation upon the same subject, containing several arguments, which he represented to the committee appointed by the assembly to put a stop to the progress of this opinion. The exercitation being translated into English, brought upon him a whole army of adversaries, among whom were the reverend Dr. Hammond, Dr. Holmes, Mr. Marshal, Fuller, Geree, Baxter, and others. The people of this persuasion were more exposed to the public resentments, because they would hold communion with none but such as had been dipped. All must pass under this cloud before they could be received into their churches; and the same narrow spirit prevails too generally among them even at this day.

Besides the above-mentioned writers, the most eminent divines in the city of London, as Mr. Vines, Calamy, and others, preached vigorously against these doctrines, which they had a right to do; though it was most unjustifiable to fight them at the same time with the sword of the civil magistrate,[[28]](#footnote-28) and shut them up in prison, as was the case of several in this and the following year, among whom are reckoned the reverend Mr. Henry Denn, formerly ordained by the bishop of St. David’s, and possessed of the living of Pyeton in Hertfordshire; Mr. Coppe, minister in Warwickshire, and sometime preacher to the garrison in Compton-house; Mr. Hanserd Knollys, who was several times before the committee for preaching Antinomianism and Anti-pædobaptism; and being forbid to preach in the public churches, he opened a separate meeting in Great St. Helen’s, from whence he was quickly dislodged, and his followers dispersed. Mr. Andrew Wyke, in the county of Suffolk, was imprisoned on the same account; and Mr. Oates in Essex tried for his life in Chelmsford assizes for the murder of Anne Martin, because she died, a few days after her immersion, of a cold that seized her at that time. Lawrence Clarkson was imprisoned by the committee of Suffolk, and having lain in jail six months, signed a recantation, and was released. The recantation,[[29]](#footnote-29) as entered in the committee’s books, was in these words:

“July, 15, 1645.

“This day Lawrence Clarkson, formerly committed for an Anabaptist, and for dipping, does now, before the committee, disclaim his errors. And whereas formerly he said he durst not leave his dipping, if he might gain all the committee’s estates, now he says, that he by the Holy Scriptures is convinced, that his said opinions were erroneous, and that he will not, nor dares not practise it again, if he might gain all the committee’s estates by doing it. And that he makes this recantation not for fear, or to gain his liberty, but merely out of a sense of his error, wherein he will endeavour to reform others.”

It must be granted, that the imprudent behaviour of the Baptist lay-preachers, who declaimed against human literature and hireling priests, crying down magistracy and a regular ministry, and talking in the most exalted strains of a fifth monarchy, and king Jesus, prejudiced the minds of many sober people against them; but still the imprisoning men merely on account of religious principles, not inconsistent with the public peace, nor propagated in a riotous and tumultuous manner, is not to be justified on any pretence whatsoever; and it was the more inexcusable in this case, because Mr. Baxter admits,[[30]](#footnote-30) that the Presbyterian zeal was in a great measure the occasion of it.

Before we leave the assembly for this year, it will be proper to take notice, that it was honoured with the presence of Charles Lewis, elector-palatine of the Rhine, eldest son of Frederick, &c. king of Bohemia, who married king James’s daughter, and lost his territories by the fatal battle of Prague in 1619. The unhappy Frederick died in 1632, and left behind him six sons and five daughters, among whom were prince Rupert, prince Maurice, and the princess Sophia. The young elector and his mother often solicited the English court for assistance to recover their dominions, and were as often complimented with empty promises. All the parliaments of this reign mention with concern the calamitous condition of the queen of Bohemia and her children, and offer to venture their lives and fortunes for the recovery of the Palatinate, but king Charles I. did not approve his sister’s principles, who, being a resolved Protestant, had been heard to say, if we may believe L’Estrange, that rather than have her son bred up in idolatry at the emperor’s court, she had rather be his executioner. And Mr. Echard adds,[[31]](#footnote-31) that the birth of king Charles II. in the year 1630, gave no great joy to the Puritans, because, as one of them declared, “God had already provided for them in the family of the queen of Bohemia, who were bred up in the Protestant religion, while it was uncertain what religion king Charles’s children would follow, being to be brought up by a mother devoted to the church of Rome.” When the war broke out between the king and parliament, the elector’s younger brothers, Rupert and Maurice, served the king in his army, but the elector himself being in Holland took the covenant, and by a letter to the parliament testified his approbation of the cause in which they were engaged. This summer he made a tour to England, and was welcomed by a committee of the two houses, who promised him their best advice and assistance; to whom the prince made the following reply:

“I hold myself much obliged to the parliament for their favours, and my coming is to express in person what I have often done by letter, my sincere affections to them, and to take off such jealousies, as either the actions of some of my relations, or the ill effects of what my enemies might by my absence cast upon me. My wishes[[32]](#footnote-32) are constant for the good success of the great work you have undertaken, for a thorough reformation; and my desires are to be ruled and governed by your grave counsels.”[[33]](#footnote-33)

The parliament ordered an apartment to be fitted up for the prince at Whitehall, and voted him £8000[[34]](#footnote-34) a year for his maintenance, and £10,000. for his royal mother, till he should be restored to his electorate.[[35]](#footnote-35) While he stayed here, he frequently attended the assembly in their debates, and after some time had a pass for himself and forty horse into the Low Countries. His sister princess Sophia, afterward married the Duke of Brunswick and Hanover, whose son, upon the decease of queen Anne, succeeded to the crown of Great Britain, by the name of George I.; the numerous posterity of king Charles I. being set aside as Papists, and thus the descendants of the queen of Bohemia, electress-palatine, and daughter of king James I., came to inherit the imperial crown of these kingdoms, as a reward for their firmness to the Protestant religion:—and may the same illustrious family continue to be the guardians of our liberties, both sacred and civil, to the end of time!

Religion was the fashion of the age: the assembly was often turned into a house of prayer, and hardly a week passed without solemn fasting and humiliation, in several of the churches of London and Westminster; the laws against profaneness were carefully executed; and because the former ordinances for the observation of the Lord’s day had proved ineffectual, it was ordained, April 6, that all persons should apply themselves to the exercise of piety and religion on the Lord’s day, “that no wares, fruits, herbs, or goods of any sort, be exposed to sale, or cried about the streets, upon penalty of forfeiting the goods. That no person without cause shall travel, or carry a burden, or do any worldly labour, upon penalty of ten shillings for the traveller, and five shillings for every burden.[[36]](#footnote-36) That no person shall, on the Lord’s day, use, or be present at, any wrestling, shooting, fowling, ringing of bells for pleasure, markets, wakes, church-ales, dancing, games, or sports whatsoever, upon penalty of five shillings to every one above fourteen years of age. And if children are found offending in the premises, their parents or guardians to forfeit twelvepence for every offence. That all May-poles be pulled down, and none others erected. That if the several fines above mentioned cannot be levied, the offending party shall be set in the stocks for the space of three hours. That the king’s declaration concerning lawful sports on the Lord’s day be called in, suppressed, and burnt.

“This ordinance shall not extend to prohibit dressing meat in private families, or selling victuals in a moderate way in inns or victualling-houses, for the use of such who cannot otherwise be provided for; nor to the crying of milk before nine in the morning, or after four in the afternoon.”[[37]](#footnote-37)

The solemn league and covenant was in such high repute at this time,[[38]](#footnote-38) that by an order of the house of commons, January 29, 1634, it was appointed, “that, on every fast-day and day of public humiliation, the covenant should be publicly read in every church and congregation within the kingdom; and that every congregation be enjoined to have one of the said covenants fairly printed, in a fair letter, in a table fitted to hang up in some public place of the church to be read.” Which was done accordingly, and they continued there till the restoration.[[39]](#footnote-39)

But that which occasioned the greatest disturbance over the whole nation, was an order of both houses relating to Christmas-day. Dr. Lightfoot says, the London ministers met together last year to consult whether they should preach on that day; and one of considerable name and authority opposed it, and was near prevailing with the rest, when the doctor convinced them so far of the lawfulness and expediency of it, that the question being put it was carried in the affirmative with only four or five dissenting voices. But this year it happening to fall on the monthly fast, so that either the fast or the festival must be omitted, the parliament, after some debate, thought it most agreeable to the present circumstances of the nation to go on with fasting and prayer; and therefore published the following order:

“*Die Jovis* 19 Dec. 1644.

“Whereas some doubts have been raised, whether the next fast shall be celebrated, because it falls on the day which heretofore was usually called the feast of the nativity of our Saviour; the lords and commons in parliament assembled do order and ordain, that public notice be given, that the fast appointed to be kept the last Wednesday in every month ought to be observed, till it be otherwise ordered by both houses; and that this day in particular is to be kept with the more solemn humiliation, because it may call to remembrance our sins, and the sins of our forefathers, who have turned this feast, pretending the memory of Christ, into an extreme forgetfulness of him, by giving liberty to carnal and sensual delights, being contrary to the life which Christ led here on earth, and to the spiritual life of Christ in our souls, for the sanctifying and saving whereof, Christ was pleased both to take a human life, and to lay it down again.”[[40]](#footnote-40)

The royalists raised loud clamours on account of the supposed impiety and profaneness of this transaction, as what had never before been heard of in the Christian world, though they could not but know, that this, as well as other festivals, is of ecclesiastical appointment:[[41]](#footnote-41) that there is no mention of the observation of Christmas in the first or second age of Christianity; that the kirk of Scotland never observed it since the Reformation, except during the short reign of the bishops, and do not regard it at this day. Some of the most learned divines among the Presbyterians, as well as Independents, were in this sentiment. Mr. Edmund Calamy, in his sermon before the house of lords on this day, has these expressions: “This day is commonly called Christmas-day, a day that has heretofore been much abused to superstition and profaneness. It is not easy to say, whether the superstition has been greater, or the profaneness. I have known some that have preferred Christmas-day before the Lord’s day; some that would be sure to receive the sacrament on Christmas-day, though they did not receive all the year after. Some thought, though they did not play at cards all the year long, yet they must play at Christmas, thereby, it seems, to keep in memory the birth of Christ. This, and much more, hath been the profanation of this feast; and truly, I think the superstition and profaneness of this day are so rooted into it, that there is no way to reform it, but by dealing with it as Hezekiah did with the brazen serpent. This year, God, by his providence, has buried this feast in a fast, and I hope it will never rise again. You have set out, right honourable, a strict order for keeping of it, and you are here this day to observe your own order, and I hope you will do it strictly. The necessities of the times are great, never more need of prayer and fasting. The Lord give us grace to be humbled in this day of humiliation, for all our own and England’s sins, and especially for the old superstition and profaneness of this feast.”

About Midsummer this year died doctor Thomas Westfield bishop of Bristol, born in the isle of Ely 1573, educated in Jesus-college, Cambridge, and afterward rector of Hornsey, and of St. Bartholomew the Great, London, and archdeacon of St. Albans. In the year 1641, he was advanced to the see of Bristol, which he accepted, though he had refused it, as is said, twenty-five years before.[[42]](#footnote-42) He was a gentlemen of great modesty, a good preacher, an excellent orator. The parliament had such an esteem for him, that they named him one of the assembly of divines, and he had the goodness to appear among them for some time. Upon the bishop’s complaint, that the profits of his bishopric were detained, the committee ordered them to be restored, and gave him a pass to go to Bristol to receive them, wherein they style him a person of great learning and merit. He died in possession of his bishopric, June 25, 1644, aged seventy-one, and composed his own epitaph, one line of which was,

Senio et moerore confectus.

Worn out with age and grief.

And another;

Episcoporum infimus, peccatoruni primus.

The least of bishops, the greatest of sinners.

Dr. Calibute Downing was born of an ancient family in Gloucestershire, about 1616; he was educated in Oriel-college, Oxford, and at length became vicar of Hackney near London, by the procurement of archbishop Laud; which is very strange, if, as Mr. Wood says, he always looked awry on the church. In his sermon before the Artillery-company, September 1, 1640, he maintained, that for the defence of religion and reformation of the church, it was lawful to take up arms against the king, if it could be obtained no other way. For this he was forced to abscond till the beginning of the present parliament. He was afterward chaplain in the earl of Essex’s army, and a member of the assembly of divines; but died before he was forty years of age, having the character of a pious man, a warm preacher, and very zealous in the interest of his country.
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