

The Thirty-Nine Articles  
at the Westminster Assembly

Robert M. Norris

## THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES AT THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

Robert M. Norris

The Thesis is in three parts and is concerned with providing an introduction to, and an analysis and text of the extant manuscript minutes of Sessions 45 to 73 of the Westminster Assembly of Divines 1640. These unpublished minutes are now deposited at the Dr. Williams Library, London, and are records of the debates of the Assembly while they were engaged in revising some of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England.

The introduction to the text covers the Parliamentary activity which led to the calling of the Assembly, and deals with the relations of Parliament with Scotland, which gave so much direction to the work of the Assembly and led to the Solemn League and Covenant. The composition of the Assembly and the rules by which the Assembly was regulated, are also examined. The introduction concludes with an analysis of the discussions of the Assembly as recorded in the defined sessions.

The second part of the thesis consists of an analysis of each session dealt with. This became necessary as each of the transcribed sessions was found to be difficult to understand as the scribe had employed a highly individual form of theological shorthand, and had missed out vital parts of complicated arguments. In the analysis most of the arguments of the original text have had to be amplified to make sense.

The third part of the thesis comprises of the transcription of the text of the minutes. The original exists only in manuscript form, and the illegibility of some parts is exaggerated by the use of the unique theological shorthand of Adoniram Byfield, the scribe. In the transcription all punctuation and capitalization have been supplied though original spellings have been preserved. Though the transcription has been compared with that of Sir E.M. Thompson deposited at New College Library, Edinburgh, it has been necessary to depart from many of the interpretations of that transcription.


There are three Appendices attached to the thesis, the first compares the revised and unrevised Articles dealt with in Sessions 45 to 73. The second provides biographical information on continental authorities cited in debates. The third provided a bibliographical guide to those members who participated in the debates on the revision.



TR 8950


DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree. The research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of Professor James K. Cameron.



CERTIFICATE

I certify that Robert M. Norris has fulfilled the conditions of the resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1, and that he is qualified to submit this thesis in application of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. (Ph.D.)

  
Professor James K. Cameron,  
St. Mary's College,  
University of St. Andrews.

I graduated from the University of St. Andrews,  
St. Mary's College, with the degree of Master of  
Theology (M.Theol.) in 1974.

I have completed eleven terms of research at  
the University of St. Andrews.

I was admitted as a research student and  
candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to the staff of the Library at the University of St. Andrews, especially to Mr. R. Smart for his assistance with the difficult Palaeography, and to Mr. G. Hargreaves in locating obscure publications.

I should also like to thank the Trustees and Librarian of the Dr. Williams' Library, London, for their permission to use their facilities, and to establish the text. Also to thank Mr. M. Bond and their Lordships for the extension of the facilities of the House of Lords, for my use.

I want also to express my gratitude in particular to Professor James K. Cameron for his unfailing encouragement and his unstinted help, without which this work would most certainly not have been possible.

A special note of thanks to my typist, Miss C. Philp, whose accurate and kind labours dealing with a particularly difficult document has much expedited this work.



1841  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1842  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1843  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1844  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1845  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1846  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1847  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1848  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1849  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1850  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1851  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1852  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1853  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

1854  
The first of the year  
is very good  
and the weather is  
very good  
and the weather is  
very good

THE  
THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES  
AT  
THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

An edition with introduction  
and analysis of the text of the  
debates of the Westminster  
Assembly on the revision of the  
Thirty-Nine Articles of the  
Church of England.

by

Robert M. Norris, M. Theol.

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the  
Faculty of Divinity at the University of St. Andrews.

April, 1977.

## C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
I. <u>Introduction.</u>	
(a) Parliamentary activity leading to the calling of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.	(i)
(b) Composition of the Assembly.	(xx)
(c) Regulations governing the procedure of the Assembly.	(xxxiv)
(d) England and Scotland.	(xli)
(e) Debates on the Thirty-Nine Articles.	(li)
(f) Method of Editing.	(lxi)
(g) Footnotes on (a) to (e)	(lxiii)
II. <u>Analysis of Debates - Sessions 45-74 of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.</u>	
(a) Sessions 45 - 74.	1
(b) Text and Footnotes.	159
III. <u>Appendices.</u>	
(a) Appendix 1 - Articles.	386
(b) Appendix 2 - Continental Sources Cited.	389
(c) Appendix 3 - Participants in Debates.	398
IV. <u>Bibliography.</u>	405

Parliamentary activity leading to the calling of the Westminster  
Assembly of Divines

When Parliament was reconstituted in 1640, it began its active life by being critical of every area of the king's rule. This criticism extended into the civil, judicial and religious life of the nation. In the case of religion, Parliament, which was now composed of a majority of those sympathetic to the Puritan position, was well aware of the discontent engendered by many of the Laudian innovations and policies. Combined with this awareness of the position was a determination to do something to rectify, or perhaps reform, the church. Shaw<sup>(1)</sup> in 1908 maintained that this activity did not for the members of Parliament involve an attack upon the structure of episcopacy, nor upon the idea of church/state interdependence. In defence of this position, he notes first of all a reluctance on the part of the Commons to introduce or deal with any legislation on this subject; also he maintains that the mood of the country, accurately reflected by Parliament, was in favour of the correction of many of the abuses of the church without an attack upon the system as a whole. To defend his thesis, he cited a number of petitions presented to Parliament that called for specific reformation of certain things, as, for example, the "Petition of Remonstrance from the Clergy of Lincoln",<sup>(2)</sup> which sought an end to popery, frivolity and desecration of the Lord's day. Again, in the petition presented by Church Wardens and sidesmen from the city of London, specific reforms to do with their oaths are demanded, but not the abolition of the whole episcopal system. That other

types of more radical petitions existed Shaw would not dispute, but he believed that "it is in such petitions" [the moderate ones] "rather than in those advocating the abolition of episcopacy, that can be discerned the true measure of reformation desired by the country at large".<sup>(3)</sup>

Lamont<sup>(4)</sup>, in a more recent work, has traced the demand in some detail, and documents a number of petitions that would indicate that the clergy at least desired a greater measure of reform than the mere correction of specific abuses.

Nevertheless, Puritanism was not the religion of the majority of the population, which is a valid point made by Shaw, but it was the religion of a large number of the emerging middle class, as well as some of the other classes, further Puritanism had its origins in the classical presbyterianism taught by Cartwright. Haller<sup>(5)</sup> believed that this presbyterian hope lingered on. "The main body of the Puritan preachers," and probably their lay followers, "never surrendered the hope of taking over the establishment and running it according to the scheme of the 'Book of Discipline'." These men composed the main body of the Westminster divines, and their political influence had secured the calling of such an assembly, even though that influence was an unconscious one.

Parliament was forced to act on religious matters, and the course it took was anti-episcopal. It seemed likely that at some point there would be an expert advisory body of divines needed. From 1640 we are able to trace those Parliamentary events that were to lead to the calling of the assembly, and see

certain attitudes and trends developing. Probably the most obvious and prevalent one is that Parliament was not of a mind to surrender any of its power to an extra parliamentary body; this had been done in the episcopal system and would not be tolerated in any reforms.

The Commons met on November 3rd., 1640<sup>(6)</sup> to consider grievances and planned a debate for November 7th.<sup>(7)</sup> The records show two topics as dominating the thoughts of the members; the position, rights and powers of Parliament that had been abused, and the matter of religion. Parliamentarians of all shades of opinion spoke about the state of religion in the country. Grimston argued that episcopacy was not of divine appointment but was a human institution, a position that was seconded and echoed by Rudyard, Seymour and Pym. All attacked the royal favourites, who, it was claimed, were seeking the introduction of popery into the country; at the same time they denounced the Ecclesiastical courts as corrupt and the tool of an absolute monarch. That this feeling was the popular one may be seen in that Sir John Culpepper, who in later debates was to defend the royal position and the position of Bishops, added his voice to those who were denouncing abuses within the church and calling for the reformation of religion. On the 9th. and 10th. of November a committee of twenty-four, who were to be responsible for producing a declaration on the religious state of the nation, was appointed. At the same time the "Book of Canons", recently drawn up in response to the demands of Laud, was to be referred for examination to the "Grand Committee of Religion."

Engaged in debate, the Commons received various petitions

and complaints from both individuals and public corporations. Rushworth<sup>(8)</sup> recorded that eight such petitions were delivered to the House on the 9th. and 10th. of November alone. Individual petitions were received from Thomas Wilson, rector of Otham, Kent,<sup>(9)</sup> and from George Walker, vicar of St. John's Evangelist, London.<sup>(10)</sup> The substance of all of them is the same - they are all anti-Laudian in flavour and all called for the rejection of "papatistical" innovations in church order. They differ in their specific demands, depending to a large extent on what abuses they wanted corrected. These included the re-siting the communion table and the removal of the oath and the articles imposed on church wardens and sidesmen. The petitioners protested about the introduction of false doctrine into the church. Shaw, following D'Eves,<sup>(11)</sup> maintains that there were over 900 of them submitted to the Grand Committee for Religion, along with all cases of private injustice in the High Commission or from the bishops ordinaries. Such was the volume of work that two sub-committees were established, the Committee for Deprived Clergymen and the Committee for Scandalous Clergymen.

Following the reports made by these and other committees, the Commons, on the 15th. and 16th. of December, passed a number of resolutions condemning as illegal the Canons of 1640 and the Convocation that passed them.<sup>(12)</sup> They then went on to deny to the clergy in future any right to make canons for the church without the common consent of Parliament. This almost unnoticed act gave the legal foundation for Parliament to initiate the reform of the church that was to take place with the calling and instructing

of the Westminster Assembly.

On December 11th. a petition with 15,000 signatures was given to the House of Commons from the City of London.<sup>(13)</sup> It was avowedly anti-episcopalian, it listed twenty-eight grievances of the Laudian regime, which continued uncorrected, and then went on to demand:

"that the government of archbishops, lord bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc., and their courts and administrations in them, with all their dependencies, root and branches may be abolished, as dangerous to the church and commonwealth, and the cause of many foul pressures to the subject in liberties and estates, and the true government according to the word of God established." (14)

This was the first major demand for the total abolition of the episcopal system. It was also the first step in that series of events that led to the destruction of episcopal hierarchy in the Church of England.

The day after the presentation of the London petition, the Committee for Religion of the House of Commons appointed a sub-committee to enquire into the state of religion in the nation. Their report, presented to the Grand Committee for Religion on December 19th., was passed to the House of Commons, which ordered that the sub-committee be turned into a select committee of the House, showing the importance it attached to the work of this committee. This procedure has led Shaw to conclude that the Commons did not really want to deal with the abolition of episcopacy, and, as he saw it, therefore subjected the petition, and any attempts to discuss the contents, to this long delaying process. Alternatively, it may be argued, the lengthy procedure



was not innovatory, and was a commonplace when dealing with complex and controversial problems. If, in fact, this were just a normal procedural occurrence, then that would explain why the discussion of the petition was so long delayed - it was in fact not debated until February 8th - without there being any need to conclude that it had been deliberately held back because the Commons did not want to deal with the subject.

On January 12th. the Commons passed a resolution that the Grand Committee for Religion should remain in being and should add to its brief the consideration of the action of ecclesiastical courts, and also investigate the government of the church 'as it is now exercised'. The action of the House here seems to add difficulties to the thesis that they were not prepared to deal with the problem of episcopal jurisdiction; in fact it would seem to indicate quite the opposite, in that they appear to have initiated a process whereby they might have access to all the facts before deciding the issue.

The next day the Commons was presented with a petition with 2,500 signatures from the county of Kent,<sup>(15)</sup> similar in tone to the London one, and also strongly anti-episcopal. Petitions from Essex and Suffolk followed,<sup>(16)</sup> all of them pressing for the urgent reformation of the church and urging the immediate correction of certain abuses. The Commons then appointed January 25th. as the day for the reading and discussion of the petitions and the issues raised by them. On Saturday, 23rd. January, the Ministers' petition and remonstrance was presented.<sup>(17)</sup> It is significant in being perhaps the last of the petitions presented to advocate a moderate

reform policy. It was signed by some seven or eight hundred clergymen and, although no copy of this document is extant, it is possible from contemporary sources<sup>(18)</sup> to reconstruct if not the exact text,<sup>(19)</sup> at least to deduce a reliable guide to its proposals. It appears to have questioned the position and claims of the bishop in the contemporary situation, though not to deny the office of bishop itself; and to have aimed at the correction of abuses of the position of the bishop, which the signatories saw as having been encouraged by the acquisition of temporal power and jurisdiction.

Amongst the members of Parliament debate centred on the question whether the ministers' petition or the more extremist petitions should be used as the basis of parliamentary discussion and of reform. The matter was further complicated by the presentation on January 25th., two days after the ministers' petition, of eleven petitions from the counties of Hereford, Bedford, Surrey, Sussex, Cheshire, Warwick, Gloucester, Buckingham and Norfolk. All of these were similar in tone to the one presented by Kent, and called for the root and branch extirpation of episcopacy. Which of the two classes of petition should be read, or which should be given priority, as this would probably determine the type of reformation to be undertaken, became a question of some moment. Eventually it was decided to read the ministers' petition on February 1st. On that day, however, a committee was briefed to prepare discussion topics from each of the petitions, but confining those topics to church government. This fact is significant in that the ministers' petition almost certainly called for reformation of doctrine as well as government, as did most of the county

petitions. That Parliament chose to exclude doctrinal matters from their discussion would seem to indicate that they believed them to be outside of their competence; this would also shed light on the reason for calling the Westminster Assembly, which, in effect, was to act as a committee of experts. As no agreement was reached on which standing committee the matter should be referred to, debate was deferred until February 8th. On that day the motion before the House concerned the referring of the petitions to the relevant committee. However, before many speeches had been made the whole course of the debate changed, and the referring or otherwise of the Londoners' petition to a committee as well as - or instead of - the ministers' petition and remonstrance, was lost in the fury of a more general debate on episcopacy.

In this more general debate many speakers rose to attack the whole institution of episcopacy, some denying any biblical justification for the office as it was commonly understood. Various schemes for its reformation were introduced, but moves for the abolition of episcopacy were countered by moderate members, who obtained an order that

"the committee of twenty-four, with the addition of these six, Sir Thomas Roe, Mr. Holles, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Holborne, Mr. Fiennes, Sir Henry Vane, do take into consideration that part of the ministers' remonstrance that has been read, to prepare heads out of them for the consideration of the house, the house reserving for itself the main point of episcopacy for to take into consideration in due time." (20)

The more extreme root-and-branch members had succeeded electing three of their number to this committee of twenty-four, Vane, Holles, and Fiennes. The deliberations have been recorded in the Verney notes<sup>(21)</sup> and the D'Eves<sup>(22)</sup> diaries, and from these sources we learn that the committee concerned itself with matters

of episcopal jurisdiction and the bishops claims to power. On March 9th. they presented their reports to the House of Commons.

"Mr. Crew reports from the committee for the ministers' Remonstrance three heads for the debate and consideration of the House:-

1. Their secular employment, by which is intended their legislative and judicial power in Parliament, their judicial power in the Star Chamber and in commissions for the peace, and their employment as privy councillors and in temporal offices.
2. Sole power in ecclesiastical things, by which is intended ordination and censures.
3. The greatness of the revenues of deans and chapters, the little use of them and the great inconveniences which come by them." (23)

The debates on the report began on the following day. The discernable tone of the Commons was opposed to the place that bishops occupied in the life of the nation, though there was little talk of their abolition. The first 'head' presented by the committee was debated on three separate days under three sub-headings; the legislative powers of bishops in Parliament on March 10th., their judicial powers in Star Chamber and commissions of Peace on March 11th., and their employment as privy councillors and their filling of temporal offices on March 22nd. The result was that three resolutions were passed which were to form the basis of the ill-fated 'Bishops Bill'.

- "1. That the legislative and judicial powers of the bishops in the House of Peers in Parliament is a hindrance to the discharge of their spiritual function, prejudicial to the Commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by a bill, and that a bill be drawn for that purpose.

2. For bishops or any other clergymen whatsoever to be on the Commission of the Peace or to have any judicial power in the Star Chamber or in any civil court, is a hindrance to their spiritual function, prejudicial to the Commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by a bill, and that a bill be drawn up for that purpose.
3. For bishops or any other clergyman whatsoever to have employment as privy councillors at the Council table or in temporal offices is a hindrance to the discharge of their spiritual function, prejudicial to the Commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by a bill, and that a bill be drawn accordingly." (24)

The second 'head' recommended by the committee, concerning jurisdiction and ordination, required a specialized knowledge which the Commons realised it did not have and so they decided to consult with divines on the subject. In the meantime, however, they went on to deal with the third 'head', viz. the deans and their chapters. This debate took place on March 26th and involved a considerable number of speakers and engendered a large amount of bad feeling. No resolution was passed though the matter was referred to another meeting of Parliament for further discussion, on May 12th. On this occasion divines both defending and attacking the institution were heard. The debate was continued on May 19th., but again no real decision was made and, before further discussion could take place, that matter came up as a part of the Root and Branch Bill.

The initial resolutions concerning bishops were put together to form a bill "to restrain bishops and others in holy orders to intermeddle with secular affairs,"<sup>(25)</sup> in effect to eject bishops from both the House of Lords and the Star Chamber. The bill received its first reading on March 30th. and its second on April 1st. A report was made on it on April 16th. and 21st., when a proviso was added by the house allowing Doctors of the two

Universities to be exempted from the disability. The bill received its third reading on May 1st. and was then passed to the Lords, where it was read 'prima vice' the same day. It did not receive its second reading there until May 20th., and then only after a protest from the Commons. Following a short debate it was resolved:

- "1. That the Archbishops and bishops shall have suffrage and voice in the House of Peers in Parliament.
2. That the Archbishops and bishops shall not have suffrage and voice in the Star Chamber when they are called." (26)

A committee of both Lords and Commons met in conference on May 27th. at which both sides gave the reasons for their actions. The Lords reasons were presented subsequently to the Commons on June 4th., following which the Commons presented their objections to the Lords under nine headings. The Lords remained unconvinced and on June 8th. finally rejected the Commons' bill on its third reading. With the rejection of this moderate legislation, the Lords unintentionally opened the door for the radical party, who were gaining ground in the Commons. Nor did they intend to ignore the problem, as was shown when they set up a committee under the Bishop of Lincoln to consider religious problems. Though the deliberations of this committee have not survived, the fact that the Lords introduced legislation on July 1st.

"For the regulating of Archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, canons, prebends and the better ordering of the revenues, and for the better governing of the courts ecclesiastical and the ministers thereof, and the proceedings therein" (27)

shows their concern. They were not, however, aware of the strength of the Commons feeling. The bill disappeared after its second

reading on October 23rd., and was not mentioned again, probably owing to the fact that on May 27th., three days after the Lords had rejected the Bishops' Bill, the Root and Branch Bill was introduced into the Commons.

This new and more radical bill was introduced by Sir Edward Dering as "an act for the utter abolishing and taking away of all Archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters and canons, and all other under officers".<sup>(28)</sup> At its first reading it received more support than even its most ardent champions could have hoped for. When D'Ewes proposed its second reading on that same day, he did not believe that there would be a majority to support it. That the bill was so far carried to its second reading by 139 votes to 108, shows the exasperation of even the supporters of a primitive episcopacy in the face of the defeat of their earlier bill in the Lords. At the second reading the division of opinion on the place of the bishops made a full debate necessary. Although tabled for June 3rd., it did not take place until June 11th. when, despite strong defence from Sir John Culpepper, the House resolved "that the taking away of the several offices of archbishops, bishops, chancellors and commissaries out of the Church of England should be one clause of the bill".<sup>(29)</sup>

At this point we should note that, while the abolition of the government of the church by bishops was being advocated, nothing was being suggested as a substitute. It was precisely this piece of legislation that provided the immediate cause for calling the Westminster Assembly as a body which would be competent to advise

Parliament.

However, the debate was not yet concluded. The matter of deans and chapters remained and so further discussion was planned for June 15th. On this occasion, the House resolved:

"that all deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, canons and petty canons, and their officers, shall be utterly abolished and taken away out of the church; and, secondly, resolved that all lands taken by this bill from deans and chapters shall be employed to the advancement of learning and piety, provision being had and made that His Majesty be no loser in his rents, first fruits and other duties, and a competent maintainance shall be made to the several persons concerned if such persons appear not peccant and delinquent to this house." (30)

Discussion was resumed on June 21st. when the question of the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Courts was raised. In these debates we find a unanimity of conviction displayed that these courts had assumed too much power; and that this power should be removed. "And it be enacted by authority aforesaid that all ecclesiastical jurisdiction fit to be exercised within this Church and kingdom of England shall be committed to such a number of persons and in such a manner as by this present act shall be appointed." (31) Thereafter Dering suggested a form of primitive episcopacy; but the House, rather than debate it, recommended a sub-committee to investigate the whole question of replacing the ecclesiastical system. This committee reported back to the General Committee on July 8th. and suggested certain amendments to the bill:

"The dean and chapters lands put to feoffees to satisfy the king's dues.

Commissions to certify what lands the bishops, deans and chapters now have, and what is paid out of those lands, and also to certify what Church livings are under £100 per annum, and also about chapels of ease.



Two commissions for Canterbury and York for Archbishopal government, and nine or five commissioners in every county to exercise Episcopal government. All writs to be directed to the commissioners; all ecclesiastical courts devolved to them, and to meet monthly.

These commissioners to give warrant to five commissioners to ordain any man into holy orders. The commissioners to call three divines to punish heresy, schism, etc., according to ecclesiastical laws. For non-payment of fees he shall be as an excommunicate person, only he may come to church." (32)

These amendments were accepted in toto on July, 9th., and the following day were supplemented by two others dealing with revenues raised from church property and the extent of jurisdiction.

1. "A competent maintenance shall be allowed out of the lands and possessions of the cathedral churches for the support of a fit number of preaching ministers for the service of every such church, and a proportionable allowance for the reparation of the said churches." (33)
2. "The House resolved that such ecclesiastical power as shall be exercised for the government of the church shall be transferred by this act into the hands of commissioners to be named in this act; secondly, that the commissioners, or the major part of them, named in this act shall have authority to appoint deputies and other officers to exercise the jurisdiction given to them by this act." (34)

Shaw sums up the whole scheme when he says:

"the whole jurisdiction was to be in the hands of the nine chief commissioners. These had power to delegate their functions, and by themselves and their delegates, ecclesiastical justice was to be administered in the various counties by county commissions, and generally over the two provinces by two provincial commissions." (35)

Within each of the counties the commissioners were to be empowered to appoint five ministers to ordain others to the ministry, though all the commissioners were themselves laymen. The bill did not become

law, as the king moved to Scotland just as it was moving through its final phases in the Commons, though eventually Parliament implemented all those measures that had been voted upon. Despite an attempt to re-introduce it, the bill was eventually lost in the events of the next months.

This projected legislation is none the less important. It presents the political background out of which the Westminster Assembly was later to emerge and the attempt to abolish episcopacy must be seen as the beginning of those religious upheavals that made the calling of the Assembly so vital to the interests of Parliament. At the same time it represented the conviction of Puritans in both Houses that there were areas in which the competence of Parliament required the expert advice of divines to be effective.

A more difficult subject emerged in the attempts at religious reformation by the secular government, namely the determination of Parliament to control all religious structures in England. The schemes to replace episcopacy involved real power resting with the nominees of Parliament. It has been the substance of much criticism levelled at the Westminster Assembly - that it was a purely Erastian body controlled by their political masters.

In the discussion on the Root and Branch Bill, the suggestion had already been made that an Assembly of Divines be called to give advice. This course of action was endorsed in the Grand Remonstrance of November 8th., 1641, where the Parliament expressed its desire that:

"there may be a General Synod of the most grave, pious, learned and judicious divines of this Island; assisted with some from foreign parts professing the same religion with us, who may consider all things necessary for the peace and good government of the church, and represent the results of their consultations to Parliament, to be there allowed of and confirmed, and receive the stamp of authority, thereby to find passage and obedience throughout the kingdom." (36)

The implementation of this plan was however a matter more difficult to execute.

The first step was taken when, in February 1642, the Commons ordered that all knights and burgesses should submit names of divines whom they regarded as being worthy to sit in such an assembly. (37) It was resolved on March 26th. that on the following Thursday the Grand Committee for Religion would meet "to consider what is fit to be done for the present in the matter of religion, and what will be farther necessary to be done for the future." (38) And when the committee met on April 4th., a sub-committee was appointed to prepare "a form of declaration which may express the intentions of the House for the vindicating of the doctrine of the Church from aspersions laid upon it; and concerning Government, discipline and publick Liturgy in the church, and concerning consultation to be had with divines thereupon." (39) Three days later the Commons declared:

"that they intend a due and necessary reformation of the government and liturgy of the church; and to take away nothing in the one or the other, but what shall be evil and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome; and to the better effecting thereof, speedily to have consultation with learned and godly divines." (40)

The Lords assented to this on April 9th. and ordered its publication throughout the country. (41) Three days later the

Commons repeated its order that divines be nominated, two for every English county, one for every Welsh county, two from each university, four from London and one from each of the Channel Islands.

Upon completion of this nomination procedure, a bill was introduced for the summoning of the assembly. The history of the measure is remarkably complicated.<sup>(42)</sup> It was repeatedly frustrated by the refusal of the king to assent to it. After five successive failures, a sixth bill was prepared and read in the Commons on May 13th., passed with amendments on the 20th. and then sent to the Lords, where it was considerably amended and ten peers were included in the composition of the assembly. The amendments were accepted by the Commons on June 7th., and by the Lords on June 12th.<sup>(43)</sup> The rules governing the procedure of the assembly, and the vows binding the delegates, were then agreed on July 6th.<sup>(44)</sup>

An analysis of the ordinance that called the Westminster Assembly into being immediately reveals the determination on the part of Parliament not to lose any of its control over the religion of the nation. One of the amendments agreed to by the Commons defines clearly the limits of the Assembly's powers, when it says: "this ordinance or anything therein contained shall not give unto the persons aforesaid"<sup>(45)</sup> - the named divines - "or any of them any jurisdiction power or authority ecclesiastical, whatsoever, or any power other than that herein expressed."<sup>(46)</sup> They were to treat only of such matters "as shall be proposed to them by either or both houses of Parliament, and no other"<sup>(47)</sup> and it should also

be noted that in the first instance their calling was for the express purpose of "vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calamies and aspersions."<sup>(48)</sup> Theirs was initially a doctrinal mandate, which did not involve them in any radical reform of church government; though the ordinance did expressly mention the fact that the episcopal system had been abolished and that the divines were called to advise Parliament on certain ecclesiastical affairs. It was only with the arrival of the Scots, however, that the specific question of an alternative form of government was thrown into relief.

That the assembly was an Erastian one is now an accepted position. Parliament had called it, appointed its members, defined its rights and privileges, determined its area of debate, delimited its authority, appointed its prolocutor -- Dr. Twisse. It designated the time and place of its first meeting and proposed its expenses. In addition to the right of determining the scope of its deliberations, Parliament could also dissolve the assembly. The ordinance repeated the stipulation that the assembly possessed no jurisdiction whatever and that it was utterly dependent upon the Houses of Parliament as to the range of its discussions.

According to a strict understanding of Presbyterian ideas, the assembly was no synod of the church. Its members were not chosen to represent the church or empowered to make decisions in the name of the church. Yet it did function as a synod. It was a Parliamentary committee. Nevertheless there was a precedent for it in church history, as ancient ecclesiastical councils had met at the command of the emperor, and, more recently, the Synod of Dort

had come together at the command of the Dutch States General. Nor was the assembly out of keeping with the tradition of the Church of England, whose own Thirty Nine Articles allow councils to be called at the "command and will of princes"<sup>(49)</sup> The tradition of the English church was Erastian. Its bishops were appointed by the crown, and the king was the titular, and sometimes effective, head of the church. It was a natural progression that an assembly should be called by the effective government that had taken to itself the exercise of the royal power.

When Parliament had uprooted episcopacy, it had not substituted any alternative form of government. The church continued to exist, but without a legal structure. Without such a structure no church synod or council could have been called, and therefore had Parliament not called such a synod as the Westminster Assembly, it is doubtful if one could have been convoked at all. Under the conditions then obtaining in England, there was little choice other than the calling of an assembly and Parliament was the only body with power to make such an assembly effective. King and Parliament were at war; the latter had assumed the authority of the former not only in matters of state but also in matters of religion.

## Composition of the Assembly

In any negotiations with the king Parliament was decided that the reform of the church should be a priority. To this end the Assembly, discussed in debates,<sup>(1)</sup> was proposed and, on June 20th. 1643, an ordinance of both Houses was passed which named 121 divines and some 30 laymen (20 from the House of Commons, 10 from the House of Lords<sup>(2)</sup>) as having been appointed to the Assembly. Of this number, 29 of the divines and 11 of the laymen are never recorded as having attended. In September, 1643, some members of Parliament<sup>(3)</sup> invited the colonial churches of New England to send John Cotton, Thomas Hooker and John Davenant as delegates. While they all offered various excuses for declining, there can be little doubt that they preferred not to get involved in case they would thus become subject to any laws which were made, and they feared that these laws might interfere with their independent understanding of church government<sup>(4)</sup>.

At a doctrinal level there was little division amongst the members of the Assembly, for they were all Calvinist.<sup>(5)</sup> However when the matter of church government and order was approached, four distinguishable ideological groups emerged. There were Episcopalians, Erastians, Independents and Presbyterians. It would be anachronistic to assume that these divisions were on the basis of what we understand to be denominationalism, for the divines had, without exception, all received Episcopal ordination, and no doubt considered themselves members of the Church of England; indeed most of them had been

conformists in the Laudian Church.<sup>(6)</sup> The differences that existed were for the main part ecclesiological, and in some ways reflected the persistent demands of Elizabethan Puritanism for a reformation in the church which included the abolition of the Episcopal hierarchy. Some scholars, while accepting that divisions within the Assembly were overtly ecclesiological, have none the less attempted to show that the Independents at the Assembly were not really Calvinists at all, and have attempted to trace the intellectual origins of Independency to the Arminianism that was to be found in the Dutch Recusant Church.<sup>(7)</sup>

This whole thesis fails to explain how it was possible for the Independents to have maintained their position at the Assembly, had they been suspected of the heresy of Arminianism. It must be remembered that it was precisely for this reason that the whole Laudian party was excluded from participation in the debates. Had the Independents given any indication that they were Arminian, it is certain that they would have been expelled from the Assembly. The fact that they were not evicted even though they became an unpopular minority indicates that no charge of heterodoxy could be substantiated against them. Nor will it do to assert that they were secure because of their support in Parliament, for while it is true that they had much support from Cromwell, even he would have found it difficult to support Arminians, supposing he had so desired.

#### Episcopalians

Though there were no Laudians present at the Assembly, it would be wrong to deduce that Episcopacy was without support. Among those appointed there were some who favoured a continuance, if in



some modified form, of government by bishops. Those nominated despite holding this view included James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh and Bishop of Carlisle; Ralph Brownrigg, Bishop of Exeter; and Thomas Westfield, Bishop of Bristol; and five Doctors of Divinity, Daniel Featley, Provost of Chelsea College; Henry Hammond, Canon of Christ's Church, Oxford; Richard Holdsworth, Master of Immanuel College, Cambridge; Robert Sanderson and George Morley. Prideaux, also a bishop, whom some have included in the list,<sup>(8)</sup> does not seem to have been an official delegate, nor does his name appear on the final ordinance. John Hackett, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, is supposed to have attended briefly, though there is no record in the minutes of him ever having done so.

For the most part, these supporters of Episcopacy never attended, largely because they remained loyal to the king, who had forbidden attendance at the Assembly and it also seems probable that they would have objected to a council not properly elected by the clergy, dominated by Puritans, and interspersed with laymen.

Several other members of the Assembly, including Dr. Twisse the Prolocutor, Dr. Temple and Mr. Gataker, are said to have favoured a limited episcopacy. But there was certainly no unanimity of purpose with regard to problems of church government and the degree to which episcopacy was to be revised. Indeed, a distinction should be made between those committed to the episcopal party and those who favoured a reformation on the lines of the so-called primitive episcopacy. In the case of the latter, Flomp<sup>(9)</sup> has argued that they may be seen as a variation on the presbyterian norm rather than a branch of the episcopal party, though it is difficult to ascertain

with any certainty the ideas of the men who supported this position.

The impact of the episcopalians on the Assembly was necessarily small, as they were for the main part non-attenders, though Ussher,<sup>(10)</sup> through his writings, was extremely well respected and influential. Of those episcopalians who did attend, Bishop Westfield had little influence as he died in July, 1644, and the other royalist, Dr. Featley, was arrested. Though an undoubted Calvinist in doctrine and a regular attendee and contributor to the debates on the 39 Articles, after his opposition to the Solemn League and Covenant he was expelled, and later, in September, 1643, when he was found guilty of divulging secrets of the Assembly to Ussher, who was with the king at Oxford, he was committed to prison.

#### Erastians

The term "Erastianism"<sup>(11)</sup> was commonly used to indicate the doctrine of the supremacy of the state over the church in ecclesiastical affairs, despite the fact that in its broad sense the doctrine is not due to Erastus, nor necessarily in harmony with his views.

Erastianism was nothing new to England for, after the Reformation, the state had assumed responsibility for, and control over, church affairs, with both church and state standing under the authority of the monarch. What was taking place at the calling of the Assembly was the assumption of the headship in matters of religion by a Parliament which was convinced

"that the freedom of the laity from clerical oppression was bound up with the maintainance of the civil power, no longer represented by the sovereign alone, but by the Houses of Parliament who in a sense claimed to represent unorganised Christian laity of the kingdom."<sup>(12)</sup>

Erastianism in England in the 1640's stood for the view that

disciplinary power, and thus ultimately all ecclesiastical power, rested in the hands of the civil magistrates and also that "no church government be of divine right, but all to be a humane institution depending on the will of the magistrate."<sup>(13)</sup> The three Erastians who featured prominently in the "Minutes" of the Assembly were all formidable Hebrew scholars. Thomas Coleman was given the title 'rabbi' in recognition of his Hebrew learning, though he was bitterly attacked by Baillie as "a man reasonable learned, but stupid and inconsiderate half a peasant [sic] and of small estimation,"<sup>(14)</sup> and as one who was the champion of Erastianism. Despite these disparaging remarks, the "Minutes" of the Assembly show that Coleman often provided philological information that served both to inform the Assembly, and at the same time to slow down the adoption of a strict Presbyterianism. In his sermon "Hopes Deferred and Dashed," preached before Parliament in 1645, he expressed strong doubts about Presbyterianism, denying its claims jure divine and told the Parliament that "to rob the kingdom of Christ of the magistrate and his governing powers, I cannot excuse, no, not from a kind of sacrilege." This involved him in a bitter debate with George Gillespie, one of the Scots Commissioners, who had attacked him in Aaron's Rod Blossoming, to which Coleman replied in Male Dicis Maledecis. The English divine had attempted to show that the power of excommunication was not necessary for the church, and at the same time compiled a list of quotations from the church fathers and reformers to support him. In his second book, Brotherly Examination Re-Examined, he had claimed that there was no scriptural support for the Presbyterian form of church government, but rather he

emphasised the position of the magistrate and outlined his responsibility as one ordained under God. He also accused Presbyterianism of eroding the freedoms traditionally enjoyed by Englishmen, in seeking to usurp the power of Parliament. Throughout all the debates his strategy was "to prevent the Presbyterians from claiming too much on the basis of biblical precedent."<sup>(15)</sup>

John Lightfoot's Erastianism does not appear to have been as open as that of Coleman, and there is no mention made of him in his letters by the Scots commentator, Baillie, perhaps because he was in favour of Presbyterianism as a form of church government which could be instituted by the magistrate, as expedient, and was, at the same time, agreeable to Scripture. In his journal of the Assembly he involved himself in a number of the debates, and always he sided with the Erastian elements. This position is substantiated by Crowley,<sup>(16)</sup> who documents a number of occasions on which Lightfoot supported Coleman and Selden; and more examples could be provided from the "Minutes" themselves. Lightfoot in his sermon Elias Redivivus (1643) argued that Christian states should base themselves upon the example provided by the Old Testament, where within the Jewish state there was no suggestion of a separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In this work, the English scholar seems unsympathetic towards the Independents, whose concept of an autonomous local congregation was inimical to the idea of a national church, which Lightfoot held dearly. His position is perhaps best summed up in a quotation from one of his sermons, cited by Crowley,<sup>(17)</sup>

"It is true indeed that there is much talked of that Christ alone must reign in the conscience, but it is true also that he does so by the

power he hath put into the hands of his magistrates, as well as by his word and Spirit."

Together with these two divines we find two prominent Parliamentarians supporting the Erastian position, John Selden and Bulstrode Whitlocke. Selden, a well-known lawyer and anti-clericalist, was the most learned and probably the most effective Erastian in the Assembly. He had first angered the bishops by his book History of Tythes (1617), in which he supported the primacy of common law over canon law. There he had urged that "the practised common law ... hath never given way herein to the canons, but hath allowed customs and made them subject to all civil titles, infeodations, discharges, compositions and the like." He continued in his career to support these Erastian principles so that Baillie says of him "this man is the head of the Erastians, his glory is most in the Jewish learning; he avows everywhere that the Jewish church and the state were one, and so in England it must be that the Parliament is the church." Lightfoot showed him as speaking only occasionally but with authority, though he was aware that on some occasions he employed delaying tactics. Perhaps Baillie<sup>(18)</sup> understood his position well when he said, "Selden and others, who will have no discipline at all in any church jure divino, but settled only with the free will and pleasure of Parliament." On one occasion he opposed in the House of Commons the petition of the Assembly that in every presbytery the pastors and ruling elders should have the power of excommunication and of suspending from the sacrament.

Whitlocke, by contrast, was not a scholar. Though he was well used to debate, he is known to have spoken only on a few

occasions at the Assembly. By his own admission he was branded a disciple of Selden, but he was not opposed to the Presbyterian form of church government; rather he suggested to the Assembly that they present Presbyterianism to Parliament as agreeable to the word of God, and leave it at that. Although not active within the Assembly, Whitlocke fought for his position in Parliament itself.

As a group the Erastians were concerned primarily about the basis, and not the form of church government. Whitlocke and Lightfoot leaned towards Presbyterianism, while Coleman was probably an advocate of limited episcopacy. Selden showed no preference, which has led some to see him as the opponent of Christianity, though testimony from many of his contemporaries would cast doubt on the validity of such an interpretation.

For the two parliamentarians, on the one hand their opposition to any system jure divino of ecclesiastical control grew from their political convictions of the sovereignty of Parliament; for the motives of the two divines, on the other hand, this could not be said. Perhaps Crowley<sup>(19)</sup> is near the truth when he suggests that "they recognised in the men from Parliament fellow travellers on the road to real scriptural truth, which was that the church must be content with the decrees of the divinely instituted establishment," in which case their support of Erastianism was theologically motivated.

#### Independents

These formed the third party at the Westminster Assembly, and were "non-separating" congregationalists, their intellectual commitment to Independency probably having received its final consolidation by encounter with the Recusant church in Holland. They showed their early dissent from the Presbyterians at the

Assembly by their opposition to the third proposition on church government before the Assembly, by the sub-committee that was set up for this purpose. This proposition asserted that "the Scriptures holdeth forth that many particular congregations may be under one Presbyterian government." In opposition to this they developed a basic position which asserted that each local congregation was a church and as such held within its own officers all the powers of church discipline, including the power of excommunication. While they accepted the principle of the Presbyterian hierarchal structure, they refused to accord it the authority desired by the Scots; rather they sought to limit the power of Presbytery to the determining and declaring of that which was agreeable to God's word. Marsden<sup>(20)</sup> asserts that initially they asked to join a national church with only two reservations, that they retain the right of ordination, and that they be placed outside the competence of Presbyterian jurisdiction.

Despite the smallness of their numbers, their persuasive powers and the logic of their arguments often found support from the Erastians and even from some of the Presbyterians, who sometimes voted with them on matters of conscience. They were thus able to "filibuster" a number of the Presbyterian motions on church government. They consisted initially of five men, Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Jeremiah Burroughs, William Bridges and Sidrach Simpson. All had received episcopal ordination and had served in the pre-Laudian church, but had eventually been forced into exile in Holland. While they were serving in churches in Holland they would have encountered Recusancy, with its independent thinking, which appears to have had much influence on their own ideas. On their return they seem originally to have lacked a concrete policy, for while they saw themselves as steering

a way between the Presbyterians and the unrepresented Brownists, their position was an anomalous one. They were to contribute to the formulation of a national church by asking their supporters not to break into Independent congregations, but to support the idea of a national church. At the same time their ideas and principles gave no place to such a thing, indeed they were opposed to any church structure which limited the autonomy of the local congregation.

Because of the small number of Independent members of the Assembly, they could never hope to dominate the debates or even win many concessions, and, with the entrance of the Scottish army on the side of Parliament, the strategic position of the Independents weakened. So much so, that on Christmas day 1643 Alexander Henderson, in a sermon to Parliament, felt himself strong enough to assert that there could be no place for accommodation with the Independents within the National Establishment.

This action by the Presbyterians led to the publication by the Independents of the "Apologetical Narration" on December 30th. This defence of Independency on Scriptural grounds, was signed by the four leading Independents, and was presented to Parliament as a counter to the proposed Presbyterianism of the Scots. It called for no more than an accommodation within the Presbyterian system rather than an establishment along Independent lines. At the same time, their opposition within the Assembly continued; they remained

"adamant in their refusal to invest the presbytery with the power other than that of declaring with respect to doctrine this which is agreeable to God's word and that of calling upon elders of congregations to give account of anything scandalous in doctrine and practice within their churches." (21)



They also maintained that it was the right of the congregation alone to impose excommunication.

Eventually their filibustering techniques would have failed had not an ascendant Cromwell interceded with the House of Commons to put in the hands of a Grand Committee the problem of the accommodation or toleration of the Independents. From this time onwards, with the increase of the power of Cromwell and the decline of the Scottish influence, the Independents began to press for more than just accommodation, making a positive demand for toleration for themselves and other sects. The emergence of this demand is well documented in both Jordan<sup>(22)</sup> and Pearson.<sup>(23)</sup>

#### Presbyterians

By far the largest party within the Assembly were the Presbyterians. They had been selected from the mainstream of the Puritan movement within the established church, and were the heirs of the ideas of Travers and Cartwright but were far from maintaining the doctrinaire Presbyterianism of the Scots. The encouragement given to the Puritans by the Laudian embracing of Catholicism and Arminianism, served to quicken Puritan interest in questions of dogma, but also served to depress discussion on questions of structure and government. Not since the time of Bancroft had any Puritans provided guides on the matter of church government and, in the necessary interest of unity of doctrine, the question of church government had been side-stepped. Thus, when the behaviour of the English Presbyterians at the Assembly is compared with that of the Scots, we see a difference of emphasis between the two groups. De Witt<sup>(24)</sup> asserts that the question of

church organisation only arose again in the English Puritan movement as a result of the Scottish church's rejection of bishops at Glasgow in 1638. If this is the case, then it would certainly help to explain the confusion of thinking that is immediately observable among the English Presbyterians at the Westminster Assembly when they were confronted with the problem of church government. This view is supported by H. W. Clarke,<sup>(25)</sup> when he says:

"Presbyterianism at this, its second English birth, was not quite what it had been to the Cartwright school. These ministers who had come to Presbyterianism by the Puritan road would hardly be so mailed in prejudice as those to whom Presbyterianism seemed to come in the glory of a direct revelation from heaven. English Presbyterianism, fervent though it was, has to be taken as being nearly always one or two degrees lower than the temperature of the Scots."

Certainly from any examination of the Manuscript Minutes of the Assembly, it becomes increasingly clear that the English Presbyterians were divided over the extent to which they wanted to see the Scottish system introduced into England. Such was their confusion that Baillie at one stage wrote that there were only six members of the Assembly that were truly Presbyterians, in the sense that they were committed to the Scottish system. Rogers, following E. W. Kirkby,<sup>(26)</sup> maintains that the Puritans at the Assembly were all Anglican Calvinists, who, during the persecution of Laud, had been forced to take up theological arms against the introduction into the church of Arminianism. And as such, these scholars believe that they may be properly termed Presbyterians only in the sense that they preferred Presbyterian polity as being closer to the form of the Anglican church than Independency. At the same time, they wished to provide a stability against the rising sects and also to eliminate the abuses of the bishops.

Such an interpretation would seem to proceed upon very tenuous

grounds. In the first place it would be dangerous simply to rely upon the evidence of Robert Baillie, who can hardly be held to have provided accurate assessments of Assembly business from an unbiased position. Friends, who seemed to agree with him at one point, are out of favour in the next letter. So it will not do to cite him at one point as though that were all he had to say. That he could misread men is apparent from the list which Kirkby extracts; Reynolds became the Bishop of Norwich upon the Restoration; on the other hand, men condemned as neo-Anglicans by Baillie, such as Cornelius Burgess, refused to conform and suffered privation for their refusal.

Further, the suggestion that the English Presbyterians were not really "Presbyterians" at heart is untenable, because it represents a misunderstanding of Presbyterianism and Puritanism itself. Even such an avowed enemy as Shaw admits that left to itself England would still have come to a Presbyterian form of government even though it would have been radically different from the Scots model. Hallor<sup>(27)</sup> has shown that the Puritan clergy "never surrendered the hope of taking over the establishment and running it according to the Book of Discipline." In spite of all their troubles, the Anglican Puritans were still the heirs of the earlier Elizabethan Puritans, and there can be no doubt that they had imbued something of their thinking on matters of church polity. At the very beginning of the Assembly the members sought to effect closer links between themselves and other continental reformed churches and to bring the polity of England more properly in line "with the best reformed churches."

That there were differences between some of the English and Scottish presbyterians need not be denied, but that these differences

made the English less presbyterian than the Scots is not a necessary consequence. There are clear indications that, both before the advent of the Scots and after their departure, the English clergy were possessed of very real presbyterian principles, held not on the ground of expediency but out of theological persuasion. Those who seek to make the English Puritans less than presbyterian display in general too narrow a conception of what Presbyterianism, as a form of government, involved, and always seek to identify it with the Scottish model, while the Continental churches, who were nearly all presbyterian, differed among themselves and with the Scots in detail, but were none the less Presbyterian.

The very admission that the English voted for the Directory of Church Government is clear evidence of their views. To say, as Kirkby does, that they did not do so "wholeheartedly" is to beg the question.

Regulations governing the procedure of the Assembly

Evidence for the procedure adopted by the Westminster Assembly is derived from three major sources.

- (a) John Lightfoot: The journals of the proceedings of the Assembly of Divines convened for the work of reformation in the Church by authority of Parliament 1643. (1)
- (b) George Gillespie: Notes of the debates and proceedings of Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster. (2)
- (c) Robert Baillie: Letters and Journals. (3)

We may also compare the "Minutes" of the Assembly, though these are incomplete as the first sessions are lost. The procedure indicated in these published sources does, however, find corroboration in the "Minutes". In addition, there exist large numbers of official documents in the Journals of Parliament and in various other publications of the time. (4)

When these sources are compared the procedural rules which governed the running of the sessions of the Westminster Assembly become more obvious.

On Saturday, July 1st. 1644, after a sermon delivered by Dr. Twisse on John 14:18, (5) the Assembly convened by ordinance of both Houses of Parliament at Westminster Abbey, then adjourned to the Henry VII Chapel, where a roll-call was taken which records the presence of sixty-nine divines. As there was no immediate agenda prepared for them, the meeting was adjourned until Thursday, July 6th.

On that day, regulations to govern the procedure were sent down from Parliament, to which were added certain others decided

upon by the Assembly itself. Lightfoot<sup>(6)</sup> lists some eight Parliamentary rules:

1. That two Assessors be joined to the Prolocutor, to supply his place in case of absence or infirmity.<sup>(7)</sup>
2. Two scribes to be appointed, to set down all proceedings; and these to be divines who are not members of the Assembly: viz. Mr. Henry Robery,<sup>(8)</sup> and Mr. Adoniram Byfield.
3. Every member on his first entrance into the Assembly shall make serious and solemn protestation not to maintain anything but that which he believes to be the truth; and to embrace truth in sincerity, when he is presented with it.
4. No resolution is to be given upon any question on the same day as it is first proposed.
5. What any member wishes to establish, must be proved from the Scriptures.
6. No man is to continue to speak after the Prolocutor has told him to be quiet, unless the Assembly desires him to go on.
7. No man to be denied the right to dissent from the Assembly and to state his reasons for it, in any point after it has first been debated by the Assembly; and then, if the dissenting party desire it, to be sent to Parliament by the Assembly not by any particular man or men, in a private way when either House shall require it.
8. All things agreed on and prepared for Parliament are to be debated openly in the Assembly and then offered as the judgment of the Assembly, if the majority agree. Providing also that the opinions and reasons of any dissenters are added if the

dissenters desire it<sup>7</sup> as well as any answer made by the Assembly.

To these rules <sup>(9)</sup> were added others which appear to have been of the Assembly's own devising. <sup>(10)</sup>

"(1) That every session begin and end with prayer. <sup>(11)</sup>

(2) That after the first prayer the names of all members of the Assembly be read and those that are absent be so marked; but if any member comes in afterwards, he shall be allowed to give his name to the scribes. <sup>(12)</sup>

(3) That all Assembly meetings be at ten in the morning, the afternoon to be reserved for committee work. <sup>(13)</sup>

(4) That three of the members be appointed weekly as chaplains, one to the House of Lords, one to the House of Commons and a third to the committee of both kingdoms. <sup>(14)</sup> "

From Baillie <sup>(15)</sup> we learn that every man who wished to speak got up on his own, was not called by the Prolocutor, and could speak as long as he wished without interruption. If more than one rose to speak, then the Assembly called out the name of the man that they wished to hear and the one who received the loudest support spoke. Baillie also provides us with information on the voting procedure. This was that each proposition and text was produced separately and debated. When all debate had ended, then it was put before the Assembly by the scribe. Propositions were read and voting was by acclamation. If, however, there appeared to be a close division, then each divine was required to stand at his place voting either for or against, those voting "for" standing first. Once this procedure had been followed, then the matter was ended.

As well as standing orders on procedure, Parliament obliged every member to take an oath before admission to sit and vote in the

Assembly. The form and origin of this oath are disputed. The form quoted by Mitchell<sup>(16)</sup> is derived from the Journals of the Houses of Parliament [H.C. - 6th. July, 1643, p.157] and differs from that quoted by Neal<sup>(17)</sup> who is following the form found in Gillespie.<sup>(18)</sup>

Neal believes that the oath was itself the product of the Assembly which was held on the following Thursday [July 8th.]. Neal does not cite his source, though we know that the form of the oath found in Mitchell and corroborated by Lightfoot<sup>(19)</sup> was passed by Parliament on July 6th.

The oath reads:

"I ..... do seriously and solemnly protest in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly whereof I am a member I will maintain nothing in matters of doctrine but what I think in my conscience to be truth; or in point of discipline but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the glory of God, and the good and peace of His Church."

When this oath had been taken, the Assembly divided into three committees<sup>(20)</sup> according to the order of the names in the ordinance of the Houses of Parliament. All the committees were open to any of the authorised members of the Assembly who might be interested in their deliberations. The work prescribed for them by Parliament on July 5th. was "that the Assembly, in their beginning, in the first place shall take the ten first Articles of the Church of England into their consideration, to vindicate them from all false doctrine and heresy".

To the first committee, of which Dr. Burges was appointed chairman, was entrusted the first four Articles; to the second of which Dr. Stanton was chairman, the fifth, sixth and seventh Articles;



and to the third, which had Mr. Gibbon for chairman, the eighth, ninth and tenth. There is no list of these committees at the date of their organisation, but three lists are found in the "Minutes" at the Dr. Williams' Library, one dated November 2nd. 1643, one February 15th. 1644, the third April 12th. 1644. These lists undoubtedly constitute the real members of the Assembly at the time. The list of November 2nd. 1643, the earliest, is as follows: (21)

First Committee:

Mr. Palmer, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Wilkinson Sen.,  
Mr. Valentine, Mr. Rayner, Dr. Hoyle, Mr. Bridge,  
Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Ley, Mr. Case, Dr. Gouge,  
Mr. White, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Sedgwick, Mr. Clark,  
Mr. Bathurst, Mr. Nye, Dr. Smith, Dr. Burgis,  
Mr. Green, Mr. Gower, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Wilson,  
Mr. Tuckney, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Herle, Mr. Hericke,  
Mr. Neal and Mr. Paynter.  $\sqrt{29}$  members in all

Second Committee:

Mr. Clayton, Mr. Gipps, Mr. Burroughes, Mr. Calamy,  
Mr. Walker, Mr. Carrill, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Reynolds,  
Mr. Hill, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Carter  $\sqrt{\text{of } 17}$ ,  
Mr. Thorowgood, Mr. Arrowsmith, Mr. Gibson,  
Mr. Whitaker, Dr. Stanton, Mr. Lightfoot, Mr. Corbett,  
Mr. Langley, Mr. Lisdale, Mr. Young, Mr. Phillips,  
Mr. Conant, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Hull, Mr. Scudder,  
Mr. Bayley, Mr. Pickering, Mr. Cudrey.  
 $\sqrt{29}$  members in all.

Third Committee:

Mr. Scalloway, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Burgis, Mr. Vines,  
Mr. Greenhill, Dr. Temple, Mr. Ash, Mr. Gataker,  
Mr. Spurston, Mr. Channell, Mr. Delamarch,  
Mr. Newcommen, Mr. Carter  $\sqrt{\text{of } 17}$ , Mr. Hodges,  
Mr. Perne, Mr. Prophet, Mr. Sterry, Mr. Guibon,  
Mr. Michaelthwaite, Dr. Wincop, Mr. Price,  
Mr. Wilkinson Jun., Mr. Woodcocke, Mr. Delaplace,  
Mr. Maynard.  $\sqrt{25}$  members in all.

These lists contain two divines who were admitted after the first division, Francis Woodcocke, August 5th. 1643, in the place of Moreton, and John Maynard, admitted September 15th. 1643, in the place of Henry Mye. The others are named in the ordinance.

It was also resolved subsequently, that those members who arrived before the Assembly was quorate should form a committee to discuss any relevant business. This "Grand Committee" would then be required to report its deliberations to the whole Assembly when it arrived.

## England and Scotland

One of the tasks facing the English Parliament in 1640 was to establish a peace treaty with Scotland. The alliance was cemented by the acceptance of the Solemn League and Covenant. This was not simply a civil treaty; it was at the same time a religious covenant, which had as its object the extension of the Calvinist Protestant faith in addition to the guarantee of constitutional liberties.

The Solemn League and Covenant can only be understood against a background of Scottish history. There had been successive enactments during the reigns of both James I and Charles I to re-establish the prelatical form of church government in Scotland, thus giving ecclesiastical power to the king. Under Archbishop Laud this policy was given more definite shape as the Scottish bishops were invested with the powers of a court of High Commission and a book of Canons on the English model, and a Prayer Book was introduced. Despite the advice given by his council, Charles introduced the Scottish Prayer Book on a Sunday at the end of July 1637.

Baillie<sup>(1)</sup> and Wedgwood<sup>(2)</sup> record the riots and demonstrations that this provoked. The opposition to the Prayer Book led to the drawing up, by Archibald Johnston of Warriston and Alexander Henderson, of the "National Covenant"<sup>(3)</sup> which was subscribed to by nobles, ministers and citizens all over Scotland in 1638.

The taking of the National Covenant was followed by a meeting of the General Assembly at Glasgow<sup>(4)</sup> in November 1638 at which the Presbyterian form of church government replaced Episcopacy. This was followed by the First and Second Scots [Bishops!] wars, both of which ended in the defeat of the king's forces and the occupation of

part of the North of England by the Covenanting army. Negotiations for peace, beginning at Ripon and transferred to York, were eventually moved to London in November 1640. Nine members of the Scottish Parliament were appointed as commissioners to England: Archibald Johnston and Alexander Henderson, who were to attend to the interests of the Church, were accompanied by three ministers; Robert Blair, Robert Baillie and George Gillespie.<sup>(5)</sup>

The method adopted by the commissioners was to take one demand at a time. Only when it was accepted would the next Scots demand be made. The eighth demand of the Scots was that there be uniformity of religion within the two kingdoms and a conformity of church government. This would be a special means of preserving peace. The answer given by both Houses<sup>(6)</sup>, while showing deference to the Scots, left no doubt that the reform of the national church was a matter for them to attend to.<sup>(7)</sup> It was this answer that was included in the treaty ratified by a bill in August 1641.

The General Assembly of July 27th. 1642 received a message from the House of Commons assuring them that reform in both church and state would be taken "by the advancement of the true religion, and such a reformation of the church as shall be most agreeable to God's word."<sup>(8)</sup> Such a message was diplomatic, as Parliament realised that if civil war broke out then a Scottish army could prove decisive. The Scots' reply was far from vague. It complained "against the professions both of king and parliament" as the promised reformation in England was much too slow in coming, and referred to the demands of the treaty commissioners of the previous year, in which they outlined the conditions upon which they would give aid.<sup>(9)</sup>

"The Assembly doth renew the proposition made by the aforesaid commissioners for beginning the work of reformation at the uniformity of kirk government. For what hope can there be of unity in religion of one confession, one form of worship, and one catechism, till there be one form of ecclesiastical government. Yea, what hope can the kingdom and kirk of Scotland have of a firm and durable peace till prelacy be plucked up root and branch."

The letter goes on to outline the Presbyterian form of church government which should replace prelacy. This declaration was unanimously approved by the Secret Council on 18th. August, 1642 and dispatched to the English Parliament. (10)

The Scottish terms were debated on September 1st. 1642 (11) by the Commons, who, without committing themselves to the Scottish Presbyterian system, nevertheless determined that episcopacy was an evil which they agreed to abolish in all its parts. (12) To reconstruct the church, they declared it their intention

"to consult with godly and learned divines that we may remove not only this episcopal church government, but settle such a government as may be most agreeable to God's word, most apt to procure and conserve the peace of the church at home, and other reformed churches abroad, and to establish the same by a law, which we intend to frame for that purpose to be presented to his majesty for his royal assent." (13)

This letter, admitting that episcopacy was the cause of any division between the two nations, was sent on September 6th. 1642. And still, we note, there is a determination on the part of Parliament to retain the sole right of reforming the church. It is this determination that is one of the most striking features of Anglo-Scottish diplomatic manoeuvring in this period. At the same time, they were faced with a Scottish Church equally determined to impose their own model of Presbyterianism on the English national Church. The determination of the English Parliament is highlighted in that

they sent this letter proposing an assembly of divines, even though they must have been aware that Alexander Henderson had been commissioned by the General Assembly of 1641 to prepare confessional and catechetical documents as a basis for the English church to use, to reform itself on the lines of the Scottish church. (14)

This reply from the English was greeted with restrained enthusiasm by the Scots who at once nominated their commissioners: Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Samuel Rutherford, George Gillespie and Robert Baillie, all ministers; and the Earl of Cassilis, Lord Maitland and Archibald Johnston of Warriston, elders. (15)

However the English reply had been so vague that no direct action could be taken, and it was not until July 1643 that the Lords and Commons officially sought Scottish aid. During the interval negotiations between all parties took place.

In the summer of 1642 there was an opening of hostilities between the king and parliament. A truce with the king at Oxford failed, (16) probably because neither side really wanted this sort of peace, only time to reorganise their forces. After the truce, the Parliamentary cause declined swiftly, (17) culminating in the loss of Bristol, and this induced Parliament to seek Scottish support. On May 1st. the Commons had asked the Lords to join with them in selecting commissioners to send to Edinburgh, and on May 27th. the Lords listed their nominees, (18) who received instructions, accepted by the Commons on July 12th and by the Lords three days later. (19) The Commissioners landed at Leith on August 4th. (20), and began their negotiations with the Scots on the 7th.

Baillie (21) records the division within the Scottish leaders,

Henderson and the majority wishing to be mediators between king and Parliament, Johnston of Warriston advocating the parliamentary cause. Eventually Warriston convinced the others that the role of mediator was untenable, as experience had shown<sup>(22)</sup>, and persuaded them that Scottish interests would be best safeguarded by an alliance against the king. The English Commissioners wanted a civil league: the Scots were determined that the price of their aid was uniformity in church government. Some would see these two points of view united in the Solemn League and Covenant,<sup>(23)</sup> though I believe it to be more in the nature of a capitulation by the English Parliament. For, though we may see in their previous abolition of episcopacy an unbiased resolve to attempt the reformation of church government, which may have led to the establishing of a Presbyterian system in the signing of the Covenant, we see them surrendering their independence of action in reforming the church. It is also a triumph for Scottish diplomacy, which had always sought to impose the Scottish system on England. Baillie<sup>(24)</sup> highlights this when he says the English were "for keeping a doore open in England to independencie", which was not acceptable to the Scots, who would not tolerate a diversity of sects. So, by the 18th. a draft<sup>(25)</sup> of the Covenant had been completed and forwarded to the English Parliament. It reached London on the 26th, where it appears as under discussion by the Assembly of Divines. From there it was sent to the Commons, adopted in principle on September 5th. and passed to the Lords, where it was adopted on September 18th. It was then sworn to by the Commons, together with the divines, at St. Margaret's on September 22nd. 1643<sup>(26)</sup>. On the 13th. October, the

Covenant was also taken by the commissioners of the Estates and of the General Assembly, at the East Kirk of St. Giles at Edinburgh. (27)

The version of the Covenant which was taken by Parliament differed in two ways from that first drawn up by the Scots. In the First Article the words "according to the word of God" were inserted to qualify any reformation of religion that might be undertaken in England. This addition is attributed to the diplomacy of Sir Henry Vane, who, by securing its inclusion, enabled the English Parliament to argue that they never committed themselves to establishing Scottish Presbyterianism, only to reform "according to the word of God. C. V. Wedgwood says:

"The Scots were later to accuse the English of deceiving them, but at the time both parties were open-eyed. The "word of God" might be interpreted by Sir Henry Vane to mean something very different from Presbyterian government. The Scots perfectly understood the purpose of the interpolation, but they believed they could render it harmless, partly by offering theological proof that the Presbyterian discipline, and no other, was according to the word of God and partly by the overwhelming influence they would wield in English affairs, when invincible Scottish soldiers had won the war." (28)

There is little doubt that Parliament had, by signing the Covenant, forfeited its independence of action. As much is admitted by Shaw, who was no friend to the Presbyterian cause. (29) Debate must, however, be continued as to what exactly was forfeited. The Scots believed that England was now committed to total reform on the Presbyterian model; however it would appear that the English understanding of what they had agreed to was otherwise. Certainly reform "according to the word of God" was in no way new. The phrase had appeared in the "Root and Branch" petition of 1640, where it signified that "officers and courts should not be brought into the church by the



Laws of men or on grounds of prudence, but only by the law of God".

This traditional understanding would certainly not allow the English reformers to disregard the Scots model, but neither would it commit them to the wholesale adoption of it. It is this position which is found to be reflected in the "Minutes" of the Westminster Assembly, and it is this position alone which satisfactorily explains why the English Presbyterians were divided on many issues of Church government which the Scots believed necessary to the Presbyterian system.<sup>(30)</sup> This understanding of the situation is further upheld when we examine the sermons or addresses delivered at the time of the signing of the Covenant. Philip Nye, one of the leading independents, was chosen to preach at the formal signing. He had already displeased the Scots when he preached at Edinburgh [this may have been more for his delivery than for his independency]. His views on church government were well known, and yet he was still chosen. Many historians have seen in his selection an indication of the English Parliament's determination to show to the Scots that they still wished to retain their sole right to reform the church. Others have argued that, in the absence of Stephen Marshall, it was Nye's right to preach, as he had been in Scotland at the time of the drawing up of the document. There is no doubt that he had offended the Scots, nor that it would have been more tactful for another to have been chosen to preach, yet Nye was appointed, and he was known to believe that the Covenant did not bind England to any "servile imitation of the Scots".

In this sermon<sup>(31)</sup> he certainly does not attack the Scottish system, but rather praises the Scots for their achievements in the field of church order - so much so that Mitchell speaks of Nye's

"kindly sentiments".<sup>(32)</sup> At the same time he outlines the achievements of the English reformers, and sees the two coming together to produce a further reformation "according to God's word, the best rule, and according to the best reformed churches, the best interpreters of this rule." Other examples drawn from the sermons of Coleman and Case<sup>(33)</sup> show that there was much admiration for the Scots and their church, but there is no evidence to lead one to believe that they regarded themselves as being bound to a full and slavish implementation of what they regarded as a purely Scottish system. Rather, the evidence indicates that the Scottish example would be reviewed, along with other Reformed churches, and the English church would be reformed in the same way as would accord with the best of these systems.

The second alteration was the addition of an explanation of the meaning of the terms "exterpation of ... prelacie".<sup>(34)</sup> The alteration, or elaboration, originated in the debates of the Westminster Assembly itself on the Covenant. The opposition to the phrase as it stood was led by Dr. Burgess and joined by Dr. Featley, Twisse, Gouge and Gataker.<sup>(35)</sup> These men affirmed that, while they were opposed to the form of government which had been established in the Church of England, namely prelacy, they did not oppose, nor would they attack, all forms of episcopacy or church presidency. To satisfy this scruple, explanatory words were added parenthetically: "that is, church government by Archbishops, Bishops, their chancellors and commissioners, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons and all other ecclesiasticall officers depending on that hierarchy."<sup>(36)</sup> So strong was the opposition of Burgess that he was suspended from the Assembly.<sup>(37)</sup> When the three Scots commissioners, Henderson,

Gillespie and Lord Maitland, arrived at the Assembly on the 15th. of September, they were angry that changes had been introduced into the Covenant without mutual consultation. (38) Here the "Minutes" are vital in determining what took place.

On September 11th. Lord Saye and Sele came into the Assembly to report of a meeting on the preceding Saturday with the Scottish commissioners "to receive what they should offer to Parliament". These commissioners said that they also had something to give into the Assembly. It seemed there was some difference of opinion between the General Assembly and the Westminster Assembly in respect of the Covenant; hence the former body desired that a committee be appointed to receive the communications they had to convey. To this request Parliament acceded. The Assembly appointed White, Nye, Hill, Calamy, Seaman, Goodwin, Temple, Smith and Hoyle as a committee for this purpose. (39) On the same day White reported back to the divines, "you sent us in the name of the Assembly to the commissioners come out of Scotland". A letter was read to the effect that they would prepare a copy of their commission and also that they desired a copy of the order of the Assembly and a signification of the assent to the Covenant. After some discussion the letter was ordered to be read again the next day; and the same committee was also to meet with the Scots to ask if there were more papers to be communicated to them.

On the following day, the letter was read anew and the position of the commissioners discussed. De la March thought they should be admitted to the Assembly itself. Calamy retorted "they are not sent as members but desire liberty to come amongst us and heare our debates". It was finally decided that the solicitor "be desired to present this

letter to the House of Commons".<sup>(40)</sup> On the same day notice was given to the Assembly that the Scots had something to say about the Covenant, and a committee of divines was designated to join with the Commons to treat with them about it.<sup>(41)</sup>

On the 15th. they were finally welcomed into the Assembly with appropriate speeches, to which Henderson replied on behalf of himself and his colleagues.<sup>(42)</sup> It would appear that he made reference to the alterations in the Covenant, and especially to the phrase "according to the word of God". The remarks, in reply, of the English divines are not entirely intelligible in the "Minutes", but they would seem to indicate that there had been no attempt to change the meaning and the intent of the Covenant itself.<sup>(43)</sup> The Scots were therefore persuaded that the alterations which had been introduced did not damage the sense of the Covenant,<sup>(44)</sup> and agreed to the draft which incorporated the changes, as the one binding on both nations.

Debates on the Thirty-Nine Articles.

On Wednesday, 5th. July, 1643, the Commons and Lords agreed that the Assembly of Divines should consider the first ten of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England - "To free and vindicate the doctrine of these from all aspersions and false interpretations."<sup>(1)</sup> This was followed on 22nd. August by an order that another nine Articles be included within the brief of the Assembly and that they too should be cleared and vindicated "the same from all aspersions and false interpretations".<sup>(2)</sup> The Assembly divided the Articles between three committees, and recommendations of alteration to be made, or of scriptures to be appended, came from these committees to the floor of the Assembly.

The "Minutes" of the Assembly only contain the debates from Session 45 onwards, though some knowledge of the contents of the first forty-four sessions can be derived from the diaries of some of those present.<sup>(3)</sup> Also Carruthers<sup>(4)</sup> considers some of the controversy on the third and eighth Articles.

The debates on the Articles continued until 12th. October, breaking only for the discussion of the terms and implications of the taking of the Solemn League and Covenant. In this time they had revised fifteen of the Articles and were so far engaged upon the sixteenth that they had resolved to change the phrase "may depart from grace given" into "may fail of the grace of God attained".<sup>(5)</sup> After this date, Parliament ordered that the full attention of the Assembly be directed towards the question of the government and liturgy of the Church. The completed Articles were sent to Parliament as they were, even though the Assembly recorded its unhappiness that the revision

should be halted because, as Mitchell says, "they regarded the work as in several ways imperfect, and as having relation only to the Church of England, and therefore as superseded by the more recent order sent to them to prepare a Confession of Faith for the Churches of the three kingdoms".<sup>(6)</sup> Mitchell lists in the same place the various reprintings of the corrected Articles and indicates which forms are the earliest.

The main part of the debates in the "Minutes" deals with the revision of comparatively few of the Articles - Article 11 "Of the justification of Man before God"; Article 12 "Of Good Works"; Article 13 "Of Works before justification"; Article 14 "Of Works of Supererogation"; Article 16 "Of Christ alone without Sin". Though the number of Articles dealt with is small they cover the most distinctive and central doctrines of seventeenth century protestantism. In all the debates there is evidenced the dual purpose of providing an accurate and exhaustive definition of the dogma being maintained, and a determined articulation and refutation of all possible alternatives, departures and opposites. Throughout the debates constant references are made to "Papist"<sup>(7)</sup> or "Antinomian"<sup>(8)</sup> or some other deviation from defined orthodoxy. This aim of affirmation and refutation corresponds to the double design of scholasticism to establish the truth and at the same time to define and anathematise heresy. In this endeavour the science of dialectic became the most useful of the theological tools. Fatio<sup>(9)</sup> has defined it as "the common instrument of arts and sciences by which one may affirm that which is proper to the material and reject other things." The methodology of dialectic made it the obvious handmaid to "scholasticism."

It became characterized by its method of choosing the shortest path in replying to heretics, by attacking fundamental and architectonic principles. It was the Aristotelian methodology of searching out weaknesses in the argument of your opponents, and then exploiting these weaknesses to the fullest measure. In doing this the use of syllogism became indispensable. This method involved expressing the argument in the force of two propositions or premises, one of which contained a common term, the third proposition being the conclusion resulting from the other two. It constrained debaters carefully to define and divide their material, relinking true arguments and separating and refuting paralogisms. The use of this mode of reasoning demanded of necessity a considerable initial application from those debating, but the method itself had the utilitarian virtue of combining brevity with clarity. Fatio sees this as being the "Aristotelian Ciceronian"<sup>(10)</sup> method, and its value had been recognised by Melancthon. Through his and his followers application of it to dogmatic problems, it became the tool of most seventeenth century theologians. The method was not without its critics, especially the French logician Ramus<sup>(11)</sup> whose bitter attack on Aristotle provoked a sharp rejoinder from the anti-scholastic theologians at Zurich where Bullinger is to be found adding his influential weight to the attack on Aristotle and Beza. It is to the linking of Protestant theology with the pagan philosophical methodology that he refers when he says "philosophers are the patriarchs of heretics."<sup>(12)</sup>

The two opposing ideas are reflected in the debates at Westminster. A number of the delegates present had spent part of

In the numbering of the pages

(iii)

was inadvertently omitted.

(iii)



their time in exile at Zurich, and had imbibed these Ramist methods. The great majority, however, were more influenced by the scholastic way of thinking, and the prevalent idea seems to have been that while dialectic was not capable of giving a definition of faith, the defence and articulation of faith lay within its compass. It became impossible to escape the division of form and content, and we find a tacit assumption behind all the debates of two corner-stones of the Protestant Scholastic Method. First, was the idea of the absolute authority of scripture, resting upon its divine and infallible authorship. Then the construction out of this authoritative corpus, of the systematized truth based upon the assumption that the Holy Spirit uses the rules of dialectic. Nor did they believe this method to be an innovation. There is little doubt that the Westminster Divines would have sought to trace this approach through Melancthon, Aquinas and Augustine back to St. Paul. The first principle - the authority of scripture - can be shown to underlie the whole of the debates. Most of the debates concern texts of Scripture, and what they mean and imply. Corroboration for every assertion was sought from scriptural texts and when the same Assembly drafted its "Confession of Faith" it formally invested its material principle with that authority which it had accorded to Scripture in its prior debates.<sup>(13)</sup> The very act of producing a Confession of Faith implied a trust in this method. The divines attempted to provide a definitive exposition of the fundamental system of truth contained in Scripture, and in so doing they had to rely upon the given material and the proper use of reason and logic to arrive at a satisfactory result. And so it may be asserted that the Westminster Assembly stood by method and

result within the Protestant Scholastic tradition.

Another strand of evidence comes from the text of the debates and this deals with the influence exerted upon the Assembly by ideas stemming from the Continent. Carruthers<sup>(14)</sup> has shown that the Assembly had generated interest among the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and letters exist from the Assembly to some of these churches.<sup>(15)</sup> However there were no delegates from other churches or nations present, as the concern of the Assembly was with national interests. What has never been established is the theological impact of continental thinkers, controversies and synodical decisions. Mitchell<sup>(16)</sup> has shown that the structure of the Confession of Faith drawn up by the Assembly depends in a large measure on the Irish Articles of Archbishop Ussher. He has also argued that the substance of the Confession was the culmination of a British tradition of theological speculation, Augustinian in character, traceable through Cranmer and Tyndall back to Bradwardine. A corrective to this insular view is provided by a consideration of the points of dispute in the doctrine of justification, as recorded in the "Minutes", and also the sources cited as authorities for one position or another. The main question in dispute, and one which is found in most of the debates on justification, was whether the merit of the obedience of Christ, as well as the merit of His sufferings, was imputed to the believer for his justification. Twisse,<sup>(17)</sup> Gataker,<sup>(18)</sup> and Vine<sup>(19)</sup> are the leading supporters of the argument which sees the passive work of Christ as also being imputed for righteousness. This view held that only the suffering and death of Christ had a satisfactory significance, and the argument revolved

around the point that forgiveness of sins and justification are synonymous terms.

Certain main theses are submitted throughout the debates. The law, it is argued, obliges obedience on pain of punishment. Christ has freed us from the punishment which our sins deserve; thus there was no need for Christ to be obedient to the law.<sup>(20)</sup> Again, if Christ fulfilled the law in our place, then we are not required to fulfil it; the consequent being absurd, the antecedent must also be.<sup>(21)</sup> From the argument that Christ made satisfaction in respect of our sanctification, it is concluded that the death of Christ would have been superfluous had He given satisfaction by His holy life.<sup>(22)</sup> Also as that on account of which sins are forgiven is what is concerned in the satisfaction, but sins are forgiven by reason of the death of Christ; it follows that this alone is satisfactory to God.<sup>(23)</sup> And in response to the argument of the imperfect obedience of Christ, the point is made that the imperfection of believers is not imputed to them but forgiven on the ground of the death of Christ, which completely cleanses men of their sins, including the sin of that imperfection.<sup>(24)</sup> Finally it was maintained that Christ could not have given satisfaction simply by His active obedience, because as man, although He be perfect man, He was under the law. This was interpreted to mean "the curse of the law" and was seen to have been fulfilled in His passion.<sup>(25)</sup> Undoubtedly the active obedience of Christ to the law also had an effect on the satisfaction He made, but it was an indirect one. Unless He had led a sinless life, His death would not have constituted a perfect satisfaction.<sup>(26)</sup> Throughout the debates constant references are

are made to continental sources and to the names of Daniel Lilermus of Sedan and John Piscator of Herborn to support the position. Dr. Featley<sup>(27)</sup> was the main protagonist on the side of those supporting the thesis that Christ's active obedience or fulfilling of the law, as well as His passive obedience, was imputed to the believer, and was necessary to constitute him righteous in the sight of God and entitle him to eternal life. He was supported by Arrowsmith<sup>(28)</sup> and Case<sup>(29)</sup> and again drew upon the continental sources of Peter Martyr, Calvin and Luther as well as upon Augustine and Chrysostom.

The general position maintained throughout the debates begins by maintaining that sinners are not released from their obligation to fulfil the law because there has been an endurance of the punishment for breaking it. Therefore the substitute must both undertake the fulfilling of the law and suffer the punishment of having broken it.<sup>(30)</sup> And while they held that Christ's vicarious fulfilment of the law had the effect of abolishing it in the case of believers, this was restricted to the original condition of salvation, not going so far as to be the universally binding standard of the Christian life.<sup>(31)</sup> Another significant point made was that justification consists not merely of the forgiveness of sins, but also of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and the latter is founded upon Christ's active obedience to the law. In so far as God, in His justification of sinners, could not ignore the demands of His own eternal law, it was necessary that justification involve the perfect fulfilment of the law; and this fulfilment, not being possible for the sinner, had to be accomplished by Christ in the sinner's stead and imputed to the sinner.<sup>(32)</sup>

It was impossible to reconcile these two systems within a single Confession or Article, as is shown by the careful way in which both the Article on justification in the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the definition of justification given in the Confession of Faith avoid maintaining either of the positions. The fact that the issue was raised at all indicates the direct influence of continental theological debate and adds a further strand of evidence to the general theses that whatever happened on the Continent was mirrored in Britain. This was an area of genuine and legitimate difference of opinion. Neither side surrendered their Calvinism for the respect of other delegates. It was a point on which difference was tolerated. It shows that the Calvinism of the Assembly, so long regarded as inflexibly rigid, and pilloried for being so, was capable of divergent opinions within it, and of tolerating and discussing these opinions without much of the acrimony that accompanied continental theological debate.

Lightfoot<sup>(33)</sup> records for 12th. October, 1643:

"We being at that instant very busy upon the 16th. Article of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and upon that clause of it which mentioneth departing from grace, as we have already seen there came an order from both Houses of Parliament enjoining our speedy taking in hand the Discipline and Liturgy of the Church."

This is substantiated in the "Minutes" of Session 73, where the order from Parliament was read to the Assembly. Though the work was thus broken into the Articles were not forgotten. Shaw<sup>(34)</sup> following Mitchell<sup>(35)</sup> records that the revised Articles, with their scriptural proof texts, were submitted, on demand to Parliament. These Articles were then printed as:

"The Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines upon the  
Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England." (36)

Mitchell<sup>(37)</sup> records the few differences between the final form recorded in this place and the form given in other places.<sup>(38)</sup> This form of the Articles, with the omission of the eighth, was submitted to King Charles at Orlamonde Castle in December 1647, as part of the proposed settlement between king and Parliament.<sup>(39)</sup> They were to be regarded with the Apostles Creed as a sufficient and sure definition of the Protestant Faith, and were to be used as a test of orthodoxy. The negotiations broke down, however, and afterwards no use was found for the Articles.

Masson, when he said "these first weeks of the Assembly's pains over the Articles of the Church were labour wasted"<sup>(40)</sup> has articulated what most scholars have generally accepted. Some have argued that these first debates were not properly a part of the work of the Westminster Assembly at all.<sup>(41)</sup> Others have seen them as work set by a Parliament which did not really want it finished, as they had known as far back as the beginning of the summer of 1643 that the real work of an Assembly of Divines must be the composition of a new Confession of Faith, and therefore had seen the work only as "stop-gap" employment.<sup>(42)</sup> These points of view are answered by the use the Commons sought to make of the revised Articles in their negotiations with the King; his continued interest in making them the test of orthodoxy renders objections such as these obsolete. What is more telling is the charge of wasted labour, for indeed such would seem to be the case, as the value of the revised Articles in negotiation declined and died with the king. Certainly there was no direct or permanent result, but the labours were far from wasted. The debates involved cardinal points of a doctrine that stood at the

heart of the Protestant Faith. As they continued, it is possible to discern a growing concern to be explicit in the articulation of the faith. Also a great deal of time was spent thrashing out differences in emphasis, and in determining what was and what was not important. Also there can be no doubt that, when the Confession of Faith came to be drafted, the clear and defined thinking that resulted from these first debates on the revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles reduced the time needed for discussion, and conduced to the clarity and conciseness that are the hallmarks of the Westminster Standards.

### Method of Editing.

The extant text of the Minutes of the Westminster Assembly is to be found at the Dr. Williams' Library, London. It is from a microfilm copy of this text that this transcription of the edition has been made. The transcription has also been compared with the extensive but incomplete transcription made by Sir E. Maude Thompson at the request of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and now deposited at New College Library, Edinburgh.

Because the text itself, which contains only scattered phrases, instead of sentences, with little or no punctuation and no standardisation of spelling or of capitalisation, certain devices have been employed. All capitalisation and punctuation have been provided. The spellings given in the text, however, have been retained and therefore marked differences in the spelling of names may be noted. Contractions have, normally, all been expanded.

Throughout the text gaps are observable. Where the text contained illegible or missing words these have either been supplied in square brackets, or are indicated by empty square brackets in the text. Often in the debates reference is made to scriptural verses and sometimes those cited are evidently not the ones intended. Where this has happened the correction has normally been made in the notes. However, where the verses are used as the basis for debate or exposition, the correction has been made in the text itself, within square brackets. Scriptural references where necessary have also been included within square brackets, and all references are taken from the King James Version of Holy Scripture, 1611.

Where pages are missing from the text this has been indicated in the text itself.



The text, even when reconstructed, is difficult to read. To assist with this an analysis of the arguments employed within each session has been made and is included before the text. This analysis is normally an expansion on the text, though sometimes it has been possible to contract it. This has been determined by the difficulty encountered in the reading of the particular texts.

The footnotes contain all references cited in the text, though full bibliographical references are given in the bibliography. Where books are referred to which it has not been able to check, this is made clear in the footnotes, where full bibliographical details are given, but such works do not appear in the bibliography.

Throughout the notes the references to scripture have been standardised in accordance with the rules for compositors provided by the Oxford University Press.

As all the debates concern the revision of certain of the Articles of the Church of England, all the debated and cited Articles are provided in Appendix I.

FOOTNOTES - Parliamentary activity leading to the calling of the  
Westminster Assembly of Divines.

- (1) W. A. Shaw, History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660.
- (2) Shaw, 1., 8.
- (3) Shaw, 1., 8.
- (4) W. M. Lamont, Episcopacy and a "Godly Discipline", 1641-1646,  
Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. X  
(April, 1959) pp. 74-89.
- (5) W. Haller, The Rise of Puritanism, p.16.
- (6) J. Rushworth, Historical Collections (London 1722) 4.,34.
- (7) Shaw, 1.,10.
- (8) Rushworth, 4.,39.
- (9) Collection of State Papers Domestic, 471.,49.
- (10) State papers domestic, cccclxxii., 37.
- (11) Ms., D'Ewes' Diary, 1.,8. British Museum Ms.162, 3., p.1021.
- (12) Journals of the House of Commons, 2.,51-52.
- (13) Rushworth, 4.,93-97.
- (14) Rushworth, 4.,93-97.
- (15) Rushworth, 4.,135.
- (16) D'Ewes, 1.,142.
- (17) Shaw, 1.,23.
- (18) British Museum Ms., E.197, A Collection of Speeches.
- (19) Shaw, 1.,24-25. He has attempted a reconstruction in part  
which is useful but incomplete.
- (20) C. J., 2.,81.
- (21) Verney Notes of Long Parliament, Ed. Bruce for the Camden  
Society, 31., p 83.
- (22) D'Ewes, 2.,657.

- (23) G. J., 2.,200.
- (24) G. J., 2.,102.
- (25) D'Ewes, 137.
- (26) Journal of the House of Lords, 4.,256
- (27) L. J., 4.,296-8
- (28) G. J., 3.,57.
- (29) Shaw, 1.,87
- (30) G. J., 2.,176.
- (31) G. J., 2.,179.
- (32) Verney Notes, 105.
- (33) G. J., 2.,204.
- (34) G. J., 2.,205.
- (35) Shaw, 1.,96.
- (36) Rushworth, 3.,1., p 450.
- (37) G. J., 2.,427.
- (38) G. J., 2.,489.
- (39) G. J., 2.,510.
- (40) G. J., 2.,515.
- (41) L. J., 4.,707.
- (42) Shaw, 1.,124-127. He traces the passage of the Bill in all its complexities.
- (43) G. J., 3.,126. L. J., 4.,89.
- (44) G. J., 3.,157
- (45) L. J., 4., 84.
- (46)
- (47) G. Gillespie, Notes of the Assembly of Divines in The Presbyterians Armoury, Works of George Gillespie. 2, pp vii-ix.
- (48) Ordinance .. as found in Gillespie.
- (49) P. Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, 3., p.500

FOOTNOTES - Composition of the Assembly.

- (1) The nominations to the Assembly were made by the Knights, Burgesses and lay members of the House of Lords, and the Commons was either to approve or reject the nominees. There were to be two from each county in England, one from each Welsh county, two from the Channel Islands, two from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and four from the city of London. C. J., 2, pp 539,541.
- (2) Briggs, "The Documentary History of the Westminster Assembly," in Presbyterian Review, 1. (Jan. 1880) p 133 f.
- (3) Among the 30 signatories of this letter are: Lord Saye and Sele, Lord Brooke, Nathaniel Fiennes, Oliver Cromwell and Arthur Haselrigg. These were all Independents, as were the colonial ministers, and this letter provides an indication of the determined and concerted efforts of the Independents to obtain toleration at least.
- (4) They were not appointed officially as was stated by Rogers, but only invited informally. Hutchinson, History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1628-91, 1, pp 115-7.
- (5) Given that they were all committed to a Reformed theological position, the divisions within Calvinist orthodoxy and the Continental controversies are often found reflected in the discussions. See Transcription, Sessions 57/8 "On Justification", where the influence of Piscator is seen in the discussion of the Active and/or Passive work of Christ. Or again, where election is discussed, Amyraud and the Saumurian School had obvious representatives amongst the Divines. See Mitchell, p 151.
- (6) Sykes, "Ecumenical Movements in Great Britain in the 17th. and 18th. Centuries," in A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948. eds. R. Rouse and S.C. Neill. p.132.
- (7) Bronkema, The Essence of Puritanism; Van Schelven, Calvinisme Gedurende Zyn Bloeyd, Schotland, Engelande, Noord Amerika, pp 215-17.
- (8) Rogers, Scripture in the Westminster Confession, pp 120 f.
- (9) Flomp, Presbyteriaal - Episcopaal? (Kampen 1967)
- (10) Ussher, in all his writings, was well received and his "Irish Articles" are obviously the structural form adopted by the committee when they drew up the Confession of Faith.

- (11) Erastianism took its name from Thomas Erastus, a Swiss Physician and Zwinglian theologian. He raised the question of the power of the state versus that of the church, by opposing the church discipline of the Calvinist party in Heidelberg. In his book Explicatio gravissimae questionis utram excommunicatio, he contended that the punishment of Christians for their sins is not the function of the church, but rather of the state.
- (12) Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly, its History and Standards, pp 27 f.
- (13) De Witt, Jus Divinum, p 27.
- (14) Baillie, Letters and Journals, 2, pp 110 f.
- (15) Crowley, "Erastianism in the Westminster Assembly," in Church and State, p 57.
- (16) Crowley, pp 51 f.
- (17) Crowley, p 56.
- (18) Baillie, 2, 266.
- (19) Crowley, p 64.
- (20) Marsden, History of the later Puritans, pp 73 f.
- (21) Pearson, "Reluctant Radicals" in Church and State, p 477.
- (22) Jordan, History of Religious Toleration.
- (23) Pearson.
- (24) De Witt, Jus Divinum, p 28.
- (25) Clarke, History of English Non-Conformity, 1, pp 324 f.
- (26) Kirkby, E.W. "English Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly," Church History, 23 pp 418, 419, 426.
- (27) Haller, Rise of Puritanism, pp 11, 16.

FOOTNOTES -- Regulations governing the procedure of the Assembly.

- (1) The Journals are published in volume 13 of the Whole Works of John Lightfoot. They extend from the day of opening, July 1st, 1643, until December 31st, 1644. Lightfoot was present every day until January 22nd, 1644, when he was absent at his charge at Manden. (Journals, p 116)
- (2) These notes extend from February 2nd, 1644 to January 3rd, 1645, with a gap from May 14th. to September 4th., and are published in the Presbyterian Armoury, volume 2, Edinburgh, 1846, edited by David Meek from the Woodrow Mss. in the National Library of Scotland.
- (3) The Letters describe the proceedings, giving reliable information regarding the setting of the Assembly as well as familiar gossip concerning the day-to-day happenings in the Assembly. The best edition is that edited from the Author's Mss. by David Laing, Edinburgh, 1841.
- (4) See: Mercurius Aulicus - the court paper of the day.
- (5) "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you."  
The sermon has either not been published, or has been lost.
- (6) Lightfoot, pp 2 f.
- (7) On Saturday, July 8th., Dr. White and Dr. Burgess were appointed to these positions, which were made the more important in that Dr. Twisse was both old and infirm and died on July 20th, 1646, after an illness that had confined him to his bed for twelve months. Charles Herle was then appointed in his place and remained Prolocutor until the close of the Assembly.
- (8) The usual spelling of the name is doubtless Henry Roborough: so Baillie, 2, p 108 and Minutes p 211.
- (9) These rules, whilst nowhere specifically enumerated, are to be found by a study of the sources. Neal, History of the Puritans, 3., p 51, lists six points which he states were agreed on by the Assembly prior to the meeting on July 6th. There is no confirmation of this, as Neal does not cite his source, and this information is not available in any extant source. Heatherington, History of Westminster Assembly, p 10, follows Neal.
- (10) The Lords had originally proposed yet another rule: "No long speeches to be permitted, that may not be carried by impertinent flourishes, but all debates to be by way of argument soberly and gravely managed". The Commons objected to this, and the Lords agreed to its omission. L. J. 4. p 114.

- (11) The fact that this occurred is substantiated by other sources, which report that the Prolocutor always performed this function.
- (12) Baillie, 2., p 109, notes that this actually took place.
- (13) On this point Baillie, 2., p 107, does not agree with Neal and Heatherington. Baillie records "we meet every day of the week but Saturday. We sit commonly from nine to one or two afternoon". Neal does not cite a source.
- (14) It was a body composed of members of both Houses of Parliament as well as the Scots commissioners, exercising general executive powers under responsibility to Parliament. It had been set up by ordinance of both Houses (C. J. 3., 392; L. J. 4., 418-30) "to advise, consult, order and direct concerning the carrying on and managing of the war". It was also entrusted with diplomatic negotiations.
- (15) Baillie, 2., pp 107 f.
- (16) Mitchell, p 141.
- (17) Neal, History of the Puritans, 3., p 51.
- (18) "Works of George Gillespie", Presbyterian Armoury, 2.
- (19) Lightfoot, 13., p 4.
- (20) It is interesting to note that this division into three Committees is the same one that is employed at the Synod of Dort, 1619, which some of the Westminster Divines attended.
- (21) C. Briggs - "Documentary history of the Westminster Assembly", Presbyterian Review 1, 1880, pp 136 f. "Including the Prolocutor, 84 of the 121 named were present on November 2nd., 1643, the remaining 37 having declined to attend or withdrawn. The list of February 15th., 1643 adds to the first committee Mr. Ruthband and takes away Mr. Paynter, to the second committee, Mr. Strickland and Mr. Bond, and to the third committee Mr. Paynter and Mr. Good. The list of April 12th. 1644 adds to the first committee Mr. Hickes, to the second Mr. Hams, and to the third committee Mr. Hardwicke, making 91 in all.

FOOTNOTES - England and Scotland.

- (1) Baillie, 1., p 18.
- (2) Wedgwood, The King's Peace, p. 164.
- (3) The document itself consisted of three parts: the confession of 1581, an enumeration of the acts of Parliament condemning popery and confirming the privileges of the church, and a protest against the corruptions and innovations that had led to the present troubles.
- (4) Wedgwood, pp 225,297. Also Baillie, 1., pp 118-175.
- (5) Orr. Alexander Henderson, p 143.  
"The Scottish Commissioners and the ministers were given the use of Worcester House previously occupied by the Lord Mayor - and were given the use of St. Antholine Church for their services."
- (6) "This house doth approve of the affection of their brethren in Scotland in their desire of a conformity of church government between the two nations, and doth give them thanks for it. And as they already have taken into consideration the reformation of church government, so shall they proceed therein in due time as shall best conduce to the glory of God and peace of the Church." L. J. 4, p 216.
- (7) The question of uniformity - the substantive part of the Scots proposals, was not debated, nor do any contemporary sources allude to them. Compare Clarendon 3, D'Ewes diaries.
- (8) C. J., 2., p 683; L. J., 5., p 227.
- (9) Records of the Kirk of Scotland 1638-1842, pp 309 f.
- (10) Shaw, 1., p 137.
- (11) C. J., 2., p 748; compare D'Ewes 2.
- (12) C. J., 2., p 748.
- (13) Rushworth, p 329; full text C. J., 2., p 754.
- (14) Baillie, 1., p 34.
- (15) Baillie, 2., p 55.
- (16) The Treaty of Oxford lasted from March 4th. to April 15th; terms were offered which neither side found acceptable. Parliament asked for the abolition of episcopacy, enforcement of the laws against the Catholics, and punishment of certain men: Prince Rupert and Lord Digby. The king demanded that fortifications in the kingdom be surrendered to him, that the Parliamentary army be disbanded, and that Parliament itself be transferred from Westminster to some neutral ground, where there would be no fear of violence. See Wedgwood, King's War, pp 100-101.



- (17) June-July 1643 contained a number of blows for Pym and his party; Edmund Waller's plot, the treachery of the Hothams, the defeat of the Fairfaxes in the North and of Sir William Waller in Devonshire, and the surrender of Bristol.
- (18) The English Commissioners were: From the Lords, the Earl of Rutland and Lord Gray or Warke; from the Commons, Sir William Amyn, Sir Henry Vane (younger), Mr. Hatcher and Mr. Darnley; from the Assembly, Stephen Marshall and Philip Nye.
- (19) That instructions were given is recorded; what these instructions were is not. C. J., 3., pp 164-5; L. J., 6., p 132.
- (20) Baillie, 2., p 89, records their arrival at Edinburgh on 7th. August, when they presented their letters asking for military aid; "Likewise a letter from their Assembly subscribed by their Prolocutor, Dr. Twisse, and his two assessors, Mr. Whyte and Dr. Burges, shewing their permission from the Parliament to write to us, and their invitation to some of us to come for their assistance, further a letter subscribed by above seventy of their Divines, supplicating, in a most deplorable style, help from us in their present most desparate condition."
- (21) Baillie, 2., p 90.
- (22) Scottish Commissioners sent to mediate between King and Parliament, during the treaty of Oxford had been detained by the King, despite the Parliament's request. Their determination for uniformity of church government had probably proved the greatest barrier in separate negotiations with the King.
- (23) De Witt, Jus Divinum p 47.
- (24) Baillie, 2., p 90.
- (25) Baillie says that Henderson was the chief author (2, p 90) and most later historians have agreed with him. Johnston of Warriston, however, records in his diary for 1650-54, that the first draft was from his hand. p 72.
- (26) Manuscript Minutes (Ms. 1), Session 53; Rushworth, 5., p 475; Lightfoot Works, 13., p 19. "After a psalm by Mr. Wilson; picking several verses to suit the present occasion out of several psalms, Mr. White prayed near upon an hour. Then he went down out of the pulpit, and Mr. Nye went up and made an exhortation of another hour long. After he had done, Mr. Henderson, out of the seat where he sat, did the like - all tending to forward the Covenant. Then Mr. Nye being in the pulpit still, read the Covenant, and, at every clause of it, the House of Commons and we the Assembly raised our hands. Afterwards we had a prayer by Dr. Gouge, and another Psalm by Mr. Wilson, and departed to the Assembly again, and after prayer adjourned till Thursday morning because of the fast."

- (27) Orr, Alexander Henderson, p 311.
- (28) Wedgwood, King's War, pp 239-400.
- (29) Shaw, 1., pp 24-25.
- (30) Kirkby, E.W. English Presbyterianism in the Westminster Assembly. Church History XXXIII, pp 418-428.
- (31) The Covenant with a Narrative . . . also Two Speeches, (Published by special order of the House, 1643) p 14.
- (32) Mitchell.
- (33) Kirkby.
- (34) Solemn League and Covenant. Article 2.
- (35) Minutes.
- (36) Mitchell, p 162; Lightfoot, 13 pp10-11.

(37) Cornelius Burgess raised objections to the Covenant within the Assembly itself, and, when the Assembly presented its judgment to Parliament, petitioned the House of Commons for liberty to present his exceptions to it. He was subsequently suspended from the Assembly until he gave satisfaction for his conduct and a humble apology; his suspension continued from 2nd. to 15th. September, when he was reinstated. The case of Burgess is an interesting one, and the Manuscript Minutes yield some information about it.

On September 8th. Dr. Smith told the Assembly that Burgess "was willing to give any satisfaction that he should be commanded to give to the Assembly by the House of Commons, though it were upon his knees." Burgess himself then appeared and told the Divines that "the suspension did not move me so much as the judgment of the House of Commons that I have aspersed the Assembly. I must yet be confident of my innocency." It was far from his intention and, if he had been admitted to be heard before, he said "the aspersions would have been more easily removed". He said that he was sorry that these had fallen upon the Assembly. "I shall say as Judah, what shall we speake, the Lord hath found out the iniquity of your servant. This Assembly will never account it too exasperate a disease, that they may after cure it with a great deal of glory". It was then resolved, "that the Assembly is well satisfied with Dr. Burgess, his acknowledgement in the Assembly" and Mr. Seaman added "as we have put no bar to his coming, so we shall be very glad to see him in his place again."

A committee was then set up to report to the Commons the satisfaction of the Assembly with Dr. Burgess's repentance and to advocate his restoration. On September 13th. Dr. Temple and Mr. Palmer moved that the Assembly look for some way to restore him as "his crime is not dissenting, that every man is free in, but in his petitioning."

Parliament accepted the recommendation and Dr. Burgess was reinstated on the 15th. "Sir," he said on being readmitted, "you know the occasion of that unhappy interruption that hath been. It hath pleased the House of Commons to give me see much liberty as to come in and speake for myself. The summe of what I said is this; howsoever it was my great unhappinesse to stumble at some expressions contained in the Covenant as first propounded, yet I find by report of divers members that ther hath been a review. And those things that principally stumbled me were removed ... in that I rest fully satisfied; in that they were pleased to accept of as satisfaction from me and have restored me."

- (38) Orr, pp 309-310.
- (39) Ms. Minutes 1 p 78
- (40) Ms. Minutes 1 p 80, p 81.
- (41) Ms. Minutes 1 p 82.
- (42) Ms. Minutes 1 pp 115 f.
- (43) Ms. Minutes 1 p 117
- (44) Orr, p 310.

FOOTNOTES - Debates on the Thirty-Nine Articles.

- (1) G. J., 3., pp 155-156; L. J., 6., p 121.
- (2) G. J., 3., p 214; L. J., 6., p 194.
- (3) Lightfoot, 13.
- (4) Carruthers, Everyday work of the Westminster Assembly, pp 105 f.
- (5) Ms. Minutes - Session 71.
- (6) Mitchell, p 157.
- (7) Ms. Minutes - Session 45.
- (8) Ms. Minutes - Session 62.
- (9) Fatio, Methode et Theologie, p 35.
- (10) Fatio, p 36.
- (11) See Ong, Ramus: Method and the decay of Dialogue.
- (12) Cited in Fatio, p 39.
- (13) The Westminster Confession in Articles 2, 3 and 4 define the authority of the Books of Scripture that they regard as inspired, resting their case for this authority upon its divine authorship and inspiration. That it was their material principle of theology may be seen from the fact that they placed it first in the Confession of Faith.
- (14) Carruthers, pp 36f.
- (15) A Letter from the Assembly of Divines in England and the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland, to the Belgic, French Helvetic and other Reformed Churches.  
This letter was ordered on 22nd. November, 1643 and sent on 13th. March, 1644.
- (16) Mitchell and Struthers, Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, pp xlvii f.
- (17) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (18) Ms. Minutes, Session 47.
- (19) Ms. Minutes, Sessions
- (20) Ms. Minutes, Sessions

- (21) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (22) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (23) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (24) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (25) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (26) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (27) Dr. Featley's main speech is recorded in Session 50 of the Ms. Minutes of the Assembly, but Mitchell includes a part of one of them in his History of the Westminster Assembly, pp 150 f. Also some of Featley's speeches are included in his work Dippers Dip't.
- (28) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (29) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (30) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (31) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (32) Ms. Minutes, Sessions.
- (33) Lightfoot, 13., pp 8, 10.
- (34) Shaw, 1., p 148.
- (35) Mitchell, p 318.
- (36) British Museum, King's Pamphlets, E 516.
- (37) Mitchell, p 157.
- (38) Neal, 5., Appendix 53.
- (39) C. J., 5., p 332; I. J., 9., p 481.
- (40) Masson, The Life of Milton, 3., p 6.
- (41) Heatherington, History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.
- (42) Warfield, The Westminster Assembly and its work.

Mr. Palmer began by suggesting that texts in support of the 16th. Article be found in Matthew 5:48.

Mr. Gataker, after laying emphasis on the importance of this text, went on to relate it to election. The necessity of election he saw as a result of the Fall.

Mr. Valentine cited Colossians 1:24 and stated that the Roman Catholic theologians Cajetan and Catarino had interpreted this text to prove the existence of works of supererogation. De Lyra disagreed with them. Mr. Valentine, however, was not satisfied with De Lyra's refutation.

Dr. Hoyle argued that there was nothing in St. Paul's works which would contradict the position held by the Assembly - that Christ's suffering is sufficient on its own. He accepted this, but did not allow that Christ's suffering was all the satisfaction that was required. Dr. Hoyle continued by pointing out that we must also suffer; but not as Christ suffered; he suffered to merit our redemption and to satisfy the justice of God, whereas we make satisfaction - that is perform good works. Mr. Walker went on to state that the Scriptures already cited disproved any idea of works of supererogation.

Mr. Sampson, commenting on Matthew 5:48, pointed out that this text was not cited by any Protestant divines against the Papist doctrine of supererogation, because it was thought to be unclear. Cameron was, however, an exception. Mr. Sampson showed that the Papists brought this verse forward as a proof for works of supererogation.

Mr. Walker corrected this by saying that Chamier had used

this text against the Papists. He went on to show that the commandment was to be like God in all things, as nearly as we are able. If perfection is commanded, then there can be no works of supererogation. Thus, he concluded, we beat the Papists with their own weapons. Mr. Woodcocke agreed that this was a plausible interpretation, though he insisted that it be confined to matters of mercy and forgiveness. Dr. Hoyle insisted that there cannot be perfection in one duty only. And Mr. Gataker reminded the Assembly that love, and not merely mercy, is the fulfilling of the sense and substance of the Law.

Dr. Gouge argued that the usual practice of Scripture was to prove particular points by general propositions, so that the conclusion would prove the particular case and the proof would stand as a general principle. Mr. Fare agreed that it was a frequent device of the Scriptures to specify one duty where all are required.

Mr. Herle did not believe that this topic was relevant to topics under discussion. He went on to comment that Matthew 5:48 is the conclusion of what Christ has given by way of interpretation of the Law, and showed that the outward act may cloak a heart in which lurks murder. As Christ wants us to be totally sincere, by commanding us to be perfect, He wants us to add the inward man to the outward man in Christian living.

Mr. Walker explained that Christ had shown that the Law reaches further than ever the Pharisees had allowed. Mr. Gataker, setting the text Matthew 5:48 in its context, showed it to portray that our heavenly Father exercises not only sincerity, but also love, even to His most malicious enemies. This example not

only proves the necessity of sincerity in us, but also a very high degree of affection and love, approaching perfection, in our behaviour to others.

Dr. Featley alleged that these words are a general rule and refer to the whole chapter.

Mr. Vines argued that there was no example of God acting in respect to particular aspects of the moral law, but only in general, for instance in doing good to those who do evil. The question then arises: how are we to be perfect? The answer lies, not in being perfect in the Law, but rather in being perfect as God is perfect, i.e. in His ways and dealings with evil men. He went on and argued that if that is the case, then there is no good reason why there should not be evangelical councils. Dr. Gouge reasoned that in all things in which we follow God we must be perfect. Mr. Walker pointed out that Christ gave us an example of good which appears to go beyond what is required by the Law.

Dr. Hoyle reminded the Assembly that love is the fulfilment of the Law.

Mr. Carter said that texts which speak against voluntary works should be added, together with any human injunctions. In this context he cited Job 9:<sup>21</sup>, and Gregory the Great in his commentary on this verse.

Mr. Gataker questioned the relevance of this text, as he believed that Job was speaking of his own justification. Mr. Walker disagreed with him, believing that the text confirmed the attack on voluntary works.

Dr. Gouge pointed out that Job justified himself to his



friends, but before God he was unable to do this and so became cast down. Mr. Coleman agreed that the text established this point, insofar as any particular example could do so. Dr. Featley cited Calvin's Institutes as an excellent exposition of this text.

Mr. Palmer argued that the evangelical precepts were not to be found in the Old Testament. It is not until the New Testament that they become clear.

Mr. Walker added that even the Papists did not confuse Old Testament examples with New Testament ones. Mr. Whitaker disagreed, and argued that many Papists did cite examples from the Old Testament to support their view of supererogation.

Mr. Hearle pointed out that, set in its context, the texts from Job must speak of a metaphorical and not a literal perfection, as God is portrayed as One Who destroys. Mr. Coleman commented that all men die.

Mr. Whitaker argued that the first text [Matthew 5: <sup>48</sup>] proves that there are no counsels of perfection, as all are commanded.

Mr. Nimes agreed that the texts cited were already sufficient to attack any idea of works of supererogation being meritorious. He did not believe that it therefore follows that we cannot do anything that is not expressly commanded.

Dr. Hoyle pointed out that the Papists supposed it possible to keep the Law in all its points.

Mr. Whitaker argued, however, that if our duty is to love God to the best of our ability, then there is nothing we can do which does not come under this command. Mr. Nimes pointed out that, as in the command about marriage, there is a difference between those

who do well and those who do better. He also said that all individual acts come of necessity and are therefore commanded.

Mr. Calamy pointed out that while the Assembly was entering a very large area of discussion, yet it was not outside that demanded by the 14th. Article. The article expressly forbade the teaching of the doctrine of supererogation, and, while he believed this must certainly be true in the case of the Popish doctrine, he would not be so sure that there is not a way to teach the need to do works that are not especially enjoined. For he believed that we may choose to do certain things that are not wrong. There are various means to perfection, and though they are all aiming at one goal, they are varied means. An example of this is that we may show love to our neighbour by building a hospital rather than a church. He went on to cite Dr. Davenant as one who supported this position.

Dr. Gouge regarded this as being off the point, as the article specifically concerns works of supererogation. Mr. Walker believed that there are two ways of doing charitable acts: either we do specifically what we are commanded, or we do all that we are able for everyone, and the latter is also commanded of us.

Mr. Wilkinson Sen. adduced two texts to help clarify the discussion -- in Romans 3:<sup>23</sup>, as all men are declared to have come short of God's demands, no-one can do works of supererogation, for even one defect makes the act evil. In Psalm 49:<sup>7</sup> we find that no man can redeem himself by his own action, let alone anybody else. Thus all individuals and groups are excluded from obtaining merit.

Mr. Calamy pointed out that the passage previously cited from

Corinthians referred not to things commanded, but to things advised.

Dr. Featley believed there was a double controversy on this point, first of all between Protestants and Papists and then between individual Protestants. As examples of the latter, he cited Richard Montague and Richard Hooker. He then went on to explain that Peter, confronting Ananias and Sapphira, exemplified the principle of the general being commanded but having effect on the specific. For they were not commanded to do particular actions, only generally to love God with every faculty at their command.

Mr. Nimes pointed out the difficulty that Paul faced while proclaiming the liberty that he had as a preacher of the Gospel, and stated that it would be hard to make this liberty a matter of precept. Dr. Hoyle agreed that, this being the case, Paul had no option but to enunciate both principles. If he had not done so, he would have been abusing his position.

Mr. Nimes asked where the command was that bound him, for he believed himself to have freedom of choice. Mr. Hill commented that the same command that made Paul aware of the danger of scandal also obliged him to preach the Gospel freely.

Mr. Seaman posed three questions to the Assembly: Whether there are works of supererogation or not? Whether there are works which, while not commanded, are counselled? And whether there are works which are morally and practically neutral? He advised that they keep to the first of these in their discussions. The second question he believed to consist only of a confused definition, for there was only, to his way of thinking, an appearance of specific

command within a general, all-embracing command. Moreover, the answer to this second question depended on the answer which is given to the third. In the case of this last question, both Savonarola and Scotus had written extensively, but he concluded that whatever one does, it is from choice and from counsel. It is done for some compelling reason. When speaking of moral action, we argue that on the basis that there is nothing one does that does not contain both vice and virtue within it. As to the case of marriage, which had previously been cited, whether one married or not was always a decision made with reference to God's glory, and as such must contain God's active will within it.

Mr. Hoyle, while asserting that the last question posed by Mr. Seaman was not within the compass of the article, thought that it would not be inadmissible to debate it. Mr. Walker adduced two passages of Scripture that show man's ability to perform works of supererogation or otherwise. In Romans 8:<sup>3</sup>, man is portrayed as finding it impossible to fulfil the Law and being therefore unable to do more than that which is commanded of him. This was further substantiated by reference to Romans 11:<sup>35</sup>.

Dr. Gouge agreed that because of the Devil's power and the fact that we are of flesh and, therefore, by nature corrupt, we are unable to do the works of the Law. Our disabilities are not, however, our only reasons for such failure, for, he asserted, even had we the greatest ability we would none the less be unable to do them. In support of his claims he also cited Romans 11:<sup>35</sup>.

Mr. Goodwin believed that this verse concerned the doctrine of election, in which matter no man was either God's counsellor, nor

yet had God foreseen in any of his creatures anything that would move Him to elect them. He then reiterated this point.

Reports were received from the committees considering the 15th. and the 11th. Articles. The reasons for proposed alterations to the 11th. Article were then outlined.

(1) .. "in the sight of God"

It was proposed that this be added to the article to avoid any confusion in people's minds as to the sense in which the word 'justification' was being used.

(2) .. "remission of sins"

It was proposed that this be added to the article for a number of reasons; first of all because the concept was an integral part of justification and was absent from the article.

Secondly, remission of sins is the first factor in justification, as in nature the negative precedes the positive, so also in God's acts.

Thirdly, God Himself has said so.

Fourthly, because any Papist that would read these articles would see his doctrine condemned. For faith, upon which justification is built, does not come until there is remission of sin. If this phrase had not been added then it would have been more difficult to see faith, which is the instrumental cause of our justification, properly set out. Nor would 'work' have been opposed to Christ so effectively.

(3) .. "freely by his grace"

It was proposed that this be added, as, although the concept embodied in it was the efficient cause of the whole article, it was not mentioned.

(4) .. "merit"

It was proposed that this word be deleted, not because Christ

was not the meritorious cause of our justification - he was - but because as it stood the article was ambiguous and sounded as if merit was imputed. Had this been the case then our actions could be the cause of merit, which was not acceptable.

(5) .. that a formal cause of our justification should be added, in which both the active and passive obedience of Christ should be maintained.

(6) .. that the word 'apprehended' should be added so that readers should see by what means salvation had been won.

(7) .. that the last clause should be made to assert the nature of the doctrine, whereas before it merely illustrated it.

(8) .. that the reference to 'homily' should be deleted because:

(a) Homilies were no longer printed or available.

(b) No homily with such a title was extant.

(c) The authority of any homily grows less with the passing of time.

(d) The substance of the homily had already been extracted and added to the article.

(e) Scriptural proof texts had been added to the article which carried more authority than any homily could ever have done.

Debate on the 11th. Article: Its Title

Mr. Gataker said that the title should be changed, as it appeared to indicate that there was no difference between a sinner being justified by God and by his own inherent righteousness. Mr. Wilkinson, Sen., then offered a definition of justification in which God is seen as accepting a man as guiltless when his sins are remitted and righteousness imputed through Christ. Mr. Coleman objected that all this had already been included in the article itself and he saw no need to include it in the title of the article. Mr. Wilkinson continued to press for the inclusion of a definition within the title. Dr. Hoyle, after pointing out that the title was not to be separated from the article proper, explained that the addition "in the sight of God" was prompted by the greater definition demanded by Romans 3:<sup>20</sup> and Galatians 3:<sup>11</sup>. Dr. Gouge approved the addition of "a sinner" to the title. Mr. Herricke argued that it was best to retain the title as it stood, as he did not accept a division between "man" and "sinner". Mr. Coleman argued that "sinful man" should be the form adopted. Mr. Gaiver pointed out that Paul used the word "man" not "sinner".

Mr. Gataker, while not opposing the addition, failed to see how it helped to interpret the teaching of Paul and James. He explained that in James justification is spoken of in relation both to God and man, and paraphrased some scriptures to show that works are a product of the divine justification. He saw the question of whether a man needs to be justified by faith as a different one, not to be confused with any apparent differences between Paul and James. There remained the question of whether Abraham was a Christian or a



heathen; in this case he believed that the works exhibited were to be taken as evidence of faith.

Dr. Hoyle agreed with Mr. Gataker on this question. He wanted to raise the further question of why God accepts us. He answered that, while men look on our works, God accepts us without any consideration of these things.

Mr. Hodges expressed fear that some would misunderstand what was meant when they said that God saw "no sin in His children."

Mr. Coleman said that the article did not sustain any such error. Mr. Seaman agreed with him, and asked that something be added to the article to rectify this omission. He further pointed out that the phrases used in the article did not specifically explain whether the justification was actual or just intentional.

Dr. Gouge objected that the title was only a general explanation and if people wanted a more explicit definition they would turn to the body of the article.

Mr. Hodges objected that some would say that God, by use of his omniscience, justified men, and would say this was an over-emphasis on His justice.

Mr. Taylor voted for the retention of "a sinner before God."

Mr. Nimes supported the inclusion of the amendments as scriptural into the title, pointing out that any error could be confuted in the article.

Mr. Hodges suggested the phrase "before God's tribunal."

Mr. Power argued that the article was not the proper place to deal with the objections so far raised and that they would be better dealt with in the discussion of another article, suggesting either the 15th. or 16th.

Mr. Seaman repeated his desire that the title of the article explain whether justification spoken of was actual or intentional.

Mr. Sey suggested that, in the fashion of the ancient councils, the Assembly should deal with modern errors such as the Antinomians.

Mr. Woodcoke supported the demand for a definition.

Mr. Nimes supported the motion as it stood.

Dr. Smith thought that it was evident that justification had to be actual and that the article, as it stood, expressed this, and could see no reason to change the title.

Dr. Hoyle provided a definition for justification.

Dr. Temple suggested that there was no need to make any addition to the title, but that they could point out the errors of the Antinomians in the article and also define the difference between the seeing and the imputing of the sin.

Mr. Seaman maintained that the article implied an act of justification and was capable of sustaining no other meaning.

Mr. Walker agreed that the article clearly sustained justification as an act of God.

Mr. Young believed that the article clearly defined the title.

Mr. Walker argued that something ought to be inserted to explain at what point a man is justified.

Mr. Seaman thought the article savoured of the doctrine of the Antinomians where faith is used only to show to man what has already been accomplished even before he repents and believes.

Dr. Temple agreed.

Mr. Nimes also agreed that if, in the article, faith is

understood as justification already having been made, then he accepted it, but rejected the interpretation that would make faith a means of satisfaction.

Mr. Hill pointed out that there must be a double understanding of justification, recognizing it, and accepting it. The Antinomians see what God has done, but do not see what man has to do.

Mr. Palmer moved that the title be sent back to the committee, on the grounds that the double concept of God making satisfaction and imputing justification to man, ought to be balanced by man being obedient and apprehending God's work. Mr. Herle pointed out that this had already been discussed, and he was convinced that there could be no doubt that the article supported an actual justification, and that, as this opposed the Antinomians, there would be no confusion. He also explained that what was apprehended was the satisfaction made by God, and asked that there be no rejection of the article by the Assembly unless they had something better to put in its place.

Mr. Case believed that the discussion highlighted the danger that lay in the ambiguous word "apprehended", which he suggested should be replaced by "laid hold on by faith". Mr. Gibson wanted to insert "as soon as we repent and believe, we have remission of sins." Mr. Seaman suggested that "his whole obedience" should be added in parenthesis. Mr. Bathurst commented that this would be an exegesis of what went before. Mr. Nimes believed that the problem would be resolved if the word "justification" was changed to "righteousness".

Mr. Hill suggested that the wording should be "who imputes to all that apprehend".

Mr. Gataker, speaking on the clause "remission of sins", understood that many divines and Continental theologians believed it to be part of justification, yet he held it to be something distinct. While agreeing that sins are always remitted only by the merit of Christ, and also that remission of sins always accompanies justification, he argued that they remain distinct. He maintained this on a number of grounds. First of all, on purely linguistic grounds, in no language, modern or ancient, is "to justify" found to mean "to pardon" or "to forgive." Rather, in the ancient authors, it is used to pronounce a thing to be equal and right - <sup>here</sup> he introduced a number of sources<sup>7</sup>. He maintained that if the word is never used to mean "pardon", either in classical or sacred writing, then remission of sins has no part in its definition, and he referred to Romans 2:<sup>15</sup>.

He went on to say that to justify is an act of justice, not of favour. If a man asks for pardon, that man may not be declared "not guilty". Justification, he concluded, is opposite to "crimination, as the act of an advocate, or condemnation, as the act of a judge."

Secondly, Mr. Gataker pointed out that, on the basis of certain scriptures, it was possible to have justification without remission, and vice-versa. Using Phineas as his example, he showed that where God has justified a man it was always necessary because of his sin. He concluded by drawing a parallel showing that, though reconciliation is an effect of justification, it remains a thing distinct.

Mr. Walker complimented Mr. Gataker on his erudition and

agreed that "remission of sins" is a consequence of justification. He stressed that this is an active justification, in which God makes us righteous, and also expressed approval of the way that the article defined it. At the same time he drew the distinction between the two types of passive justification. The first, which he supported, declared to the consciences of men the act of God. The second, which was not acceptable, spoke of justification as something that had already been accomplished. The active justification, he explained, involved the individual believer in enjoying, as it were, the benefits of marriage with Christ, which included all "the riches of Christ." All this was defined as "the fruit of justification," the practical exhibition of which was enjoined upon all men. It was an escape from the hold of Satan. All these things, he explained, were to be found in Romans Chapter 5.

Dr. Hoyle, in expounding Revelation 22:<sup>11</sup> and Acts 13, drew a distinction between the judgement of God and of men. He argued that Paul drew from the idea of justification the conclusion that men are therein pardoned. He further denied any distinction between non peccator and justus. He argued that pardon need not involve the taking away of all guilt, even in the case of sin; because God gave pardon it did not mean that we had not sinned. Pardon involved the deferring of guilt. Nor would he accept the idea of justification without remission, or vice-versa. Citing Romans 8, he maintained that justification involved both grace and justice on the part of God.

Mr. Gataker elaborated on this by showing that justification was grace towards men, but was just in regard to the work of Christ. Also, he said that being justified involved acquittal, not pardon.

He argued that remission of sin followed justification as a necessary effect, as justification freed men from both the condemnation and the guilt of their sin.

Mr. Wilkinson, after he had expressed a desire not to appear contentious, defined justification from his own experience. He denied any inherent righteousness in man, and saw God as accounting sinners as righteous after forgiving their sins and imputing Christ's righteousness to them. This then evidenced itself in their conduct.

The Prolocutor showed that the Assembly needed to oppose Antinomianism, otherwise justification and sanctification became confused, and faith relegated to a grace of sanctification.

It was then ordered that the debating and voting of the article should not be hindered by its recommitment.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 47

A report on the previous article was given.

Mr. Greene began by stressing the importance of a doctrine of Assurance as opposed to any doctrine of falling from grace, and asked if this article was not the best one in which to assert it.

Mr. Coleman argued that "falling from grace" is dealt with in the 16th. Article and "Assurance" in the 17th.

Dr. Gouge pointed out that the article was concerned with justification, which he defined as "being accounted righteous".

Dr. Featley believed that help in seeking a definition for "justification" may be found in the word thabis. He recognised the difficulties that face anyone who attempts to define the highest things of the faith, but believed that they should stimulate us to greater effort. He distinguished between three parts in "righteousness". First, perfection, which is not inherent within us established on the basis of 2 Corinthians 5:21, but which is dealt with in Justification. Secondly, that which is inherent in man, but is not perfect, established on the basis of Luke 1:15. This is dealt with in Sanctification. Thirdly, a combination of perfection and inherent life established on the basis of Hebrews 12:21 which is found ultimately in Glorification. He then defined justification as "an act of God whereby He acquits and pronounces just every believing and repentant sinner." This definition, he believed, refutes the differing errors and heresies of the Libertines because of the need of repentance, of the Arminians and Socinians because of Christ's perfect satisfaction, and of the Papists because of the imputation of Christ's perfect obedience. Further, he denied that faith is a work.

As the Papists challenge the antiquity of this doctrine, he cited against them Justin Martyr, St. Jerome, St. Augustine and St. Bernard, who all upheld a doctrine of justification by another man's righteousness. He questioned that part of the article which talks of "works" when Scripture clearly talks about "faith".

Dr. Hoyle explained that "faith alone" excluded all merit or works that we could do.

Mr. Gataker, after pointing out that many of the items under discussion will be debated at a later date, explained that he believed there is ambiguity in the article on justification where a Scriptural phrase is used to define the formal nature of the doctrine. As an example, he cited Luke 1:<sup>6</sup> where Zacharias and Elizabeth are described as just persons. He explained it means they were sincere, not justified, as Ambrose had argued. The words following it, he shows, support his interpretation for their conduct shows them to be sincere and upright people keeping God's commands. In this sense of the word even the most wicked of men may be just before God, if, for example, they are wrongly accused.

Dr. Hoyle pointed out that the definition does not express the formal principle, only the general one. The formal one must follow, for this is not the whole definition. Mr. Coleman, taking up the example of Zacharias and Elizabeth, argued that whilst justification by works is an ingredient of the passage, it is not repeated in the article, and the article is satisfactory as it is. There is not the same thing in sanctification, for we are not accounted holy. The phrase "by works" is explained by saying that though faith is a work, it is not deserving or meritorious work.



Mr. Seaman thought that it would be better to omit the latter words of the Article as he did not believe that being accounted righteous and being justified are all one thing, though he did not doubt that we are accounted righteous.

Mr. Palmer believed that the Article should remain as it is. He argued that one of the first controversies with the Papists was on the point as to whether "to justify" indicated an act of justification or of judicature, and upheld the latter position and sought to express it in the Article.

Mr. Walker [text not clear.]

Dr. Gouge pointed out that the phrase "we are justified" is an addition to the Article, and that the remainder of the Article defined the whole thing and not just one section.

Mr. Seaman added that the word "justify" could be used in two senses, either forensically or by infusion, and both these uses are to be distinguished from being "accounted" righteous. He warned that the use of "accounted" is an explanation of justification, and a short one at that.

Mr. Bathurst did not believe that the Assembly had vindicated the justice of God in justification, for he believed that in the Article, sin is merely done away with. Mr. Gataker pointed out that "being accounted righteous" was mentioned before "remission of sin."

Dr. Smith explained that in describing these things we are forced to put into order things that happen all at one time. Mr. Nimes pointed out that we are safe when we use biblical phrases such as "many shall be made righteous". He reminded the Assembly that

the imputing of righteousness is the means whereby we become righteous in the sight of God, and is not to be confused with being accounted righteous, which has another meaning.

Dr. Hoyle placed the Article within its historical context and reminded the Assembly that it was designed to counteract the Papist doctrines being formulated at the Council of Trent. Mr. Gataker wished the phrase "accounted righteous" omitted, because he believed "justification" and "remission of sins" to be distinct.

Mr. Wilkinson (Sen.) pointed out the difference between justification and sanctification. In the former he believed we are accounted righteous by imputation; in the latter by infusion of grace.

Mr. Taylor agreed that the order of debate was correct because forgiveness of sin is a result of Christ's satisfaction.

Mr. Seaman believed the Article contradicts itself by suggesting that we may be accounted righteous without any righteousness being imputed. Mr. Walker suggested that the apostle used the words "imputing" and "reputing" synonymously.

Mr. Coleman advised that the Article first stated that "we are accounted righteous" and then went on to show how this came to be - by obedience. Of Christ or us? Mr. Nimes argued that our standing as Christians depends on Christ's obedience, which may not be divided, for he believed even when Christ was passively obedient, still, active obedience was involved. Though any involvement which we have in our justification is purely passive, he questioned that this sort of passive obedience which all men, because they are men, must have, is of the same sort as Christ had to perform. He also believed it to be trifling with Scripture to define justification purely in terms of

remission of sins and to attribute it solely to the passive obedience of Christ. He argued that the various phrases used by Scripture to outline the work of Christ are the product of total obedience, active and passive. He drew attention to the fact that justification results not from Christ's obedience as pure man alone. As an illustration, he showed that while a sacrificial lamb had to be pure, without the shedding of blood there could be no sacrifice. He concluded by showing from Romans 5:<sup>19</sup> that as sin entered by the disobedience of one man, so restoration is portrayed as arising from the undivided obedience of Christ.

Dr. Hoyle raised the question as to whether Christ was required to keep the Law. He added that he was not as sure as others that Christ's purity was not imputed. However, he did not believe that it was possible to make out a division of the purity of Christ. He said that Scripture, by use of synecdoche in Romans 5, meant "blood" by use of the word "obedience". Proof of this, he believed, is found in that, as Adam's disobedience was active, so Christ's obedience must also be active.

Mr. Walker showed the far-reaching consequence to man of Adam's act of offence, in that we are made sinners. To remedy this, he believed that it would only be necessary for Christ to bring righteousness, which is more than just a taking away of sin. The absence of sin is not the same thing as being righteous. For him it was impossible to separate the passive and active obedience within the activity of Christ.

Mr. Nimes argued that the suffering of Christ could not be compared with any other suffering. In his suffering, Christ was both

active and obedient, or else there is no pardon for our sins. He believed that we must be intimately involved in the discussion, as it concerns our salvation, which is not the case with animals. He acknowledged that he was unsure whether the Article should refer to Christ's active obedience imputing righteousness to us or whether a "title" to cover this work should be used. He admitted also that there was some debate as to whether the New Testament supported this as much as the Old Testament.

Mr. Bathurst agreed that making righteous involves more than making innocent, citing 1 Corinthians 1:<sup>31</sup> and 2 Corinthians 5:<sup>21</sup> as scriptures which establish this. He went on to argue that our righteousness is in fact the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, thus confirming that we have no inherent righteousness independent of Christ.

Mr. Ley agreed that the cited scriptures establish that Christ's active obedience is imputed to us. He went on to argue that those who believed that justification consists of remission of sins must believe in the active obedience of Christ, because remission of sins includes those sins of omission as well as those we commit.

Mr. Woodcocke remained unsatisfied with the inclusion of the phrase "whole obedience" in the Article, because, he argued, if the whole obedience of Christ is imputed as the individual obedience, then there will be no need for the pardon of sin.

Mr. Gataker argued that because Christ was man as well as God, as man he owed to his Creator his creaturely service, though, he stressed, Christ was perfectly holy without any earthly service. Where He assumed "the form of a servant", there we see Him hallowing

our human nature. None the less, Christ was bound to love God with all His soul and might, etc., and this was His obedience. Although, he asserted, even those things which Christ had to perform, as under the Law, especially His sufferings, were included in His satisfaction. But there are some actions and feelings which belonged to His nature as man, and these cannot be included as pertaining to satisfaction. He went on to say that while it is true that by faith there exists between Christ and us a union and communion, this does not extend to every aspect and particular action. We know that whatever God sends is good and that He made full satisfaction for man's sin. The question remains whether full satisfaction could be made through Christ's passive obedience alone. If it is sufficient, then there is no need for the sanctity and holiness of Christ's nature. To the dignity of Christ's person is added the merit of His blood being shed. As was previously said, however, he argued, we must not only be made guiltless, but also made just. He admitted that he was not able to find any difference in meaning between justonum and justum for, he asserted on the basis of Deuteronomy 25:<sup>1</sup>, anyone who cannot be charged with any breach of the Law may be said to be perfectly righteous. He believed that this involved the active obedience of Christ. He went on to state that he accepted the argument which holds that if we are freed from sin then we are put automatically into a state of righteousness and we know that "the blood of Christ cleanses us from all our sins". This argument, he believed, was used by Luther.

Mr. Hearle, following the argument so far, presented that Christ was a creature, showed that, if this were the case, then Christ is doubly bound to give duty as a son of Adam and of Abraham. Ho

also argued that the human nature taken by Christ was not deified, because God had covenanted with a person, not with nature as a whole. He then stressed that the person in whom the human nature lies is not a creature. This belief Hearle regarded as a heresy, which, in common with most error, was to be found among the Papists. For he believed that this doctrine would mean that Christ by His obedience obtained merit for Himself, whereas he believed that the active obedience of Christ was part of His work as mediator. This he saw as substantiated by Galatians 4:<sup>5</sup> where Christ is said to have been made under the Law to redeem those under the Law - this, Hearle, believed cannot be restricted to passive obedience. Again, he cited Hebrews 10:<sup>7</sup>, where Christ is said to do the will of the Father, this being interpreted as being God's will in redemption; however, he thought it Socinian to believe that Christ suffered merely in obedience to the will of the Father, for such would not on its own bring us remission if He suffered without willing as God so to do. While it is true that satisfaction was made by someone other than ourselves, it was made by His free choice. Satisfaction was freely provided, as it must be freely accepted.

Dr. Smith argued that, while much of what is said in Romans 5:<sup>18</sup> had already been covered, he still believed it to be more pertinent and more fruitful than any previous verses. He said that there were two major themes: first, that, when the passage speaks of "righteousness of one", it refers to the active obedience of Christ. He believed this because he held that in the Old Testament the word "righteousness" is used to apply to the moral law - which gives rise to its use in Luke 1:<sup>6</sup>. Secondly, the passage tells us of the way in which the

active and passive work of Christ is made known to us.

Mr. Walker expressed two doubts: first, that though Christ was God, He was none the less a creature and bound to fulfil the Law, as was shown by the fact that He took to Himself human nature and suffered Himself to be laid in a manger. To question His divinity because He was laid in a manger and because He fled to Egypt was, he believed, to come close to Socinianism. He went on to raise the question why Christ became man and answered it by saying that it was for us.

Mr. Wilkinson, commenting on Christ's baptism, used it as an example to exhort the delegates to righteousness.

Mr. Seaman pointed out that the debate involved the question not whether we need the obedience of Christ, but whether His whole righteousness was imputed to men. He added that everything Christ did was for men and that His obedience began as soon as He joined His divine nature with human nature. He argued further that nothing that Christ did could be of any use unless it was an act of obedience. And even though it was true that Christ was under the Law and bound to obey it, He had in the first instance voluntarily placed Himself under it.

Dr. Hoyle, following an unrecorded speech of Mr. Herricke, added that he believed it a dangerous opinion to assert that Christ as creature could be compared to angels, or even be obliged to die.

Mr. Walker believed it to be mistaken to assert that innocence is the same thing as righteousness.

Mr. Carter, stating that the argument so far developed made no difference between pardon of sin and righteousness, asked how, if this pardon from sin makes a man righteous [with an Adamic righteousness]

it makes of him a heavenly creature. Commenting on 1 Corinthians 15:<sup>47</sup>, he argued that Adam, with his original righteousness in Paradise, would not have been fit for heaven; the only way this fitness comes was by keeping the Law, and the way this is done is by the power of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Gataker reminded the delegates that the charge of heresy was a serious one to level at those who disagree on a disputed point. He pointed out that other divines, including Tilemus and Cameron said that Christ as man is inferior to God and as such owes Him duty and he saw nothing wrong in this. Using Galatians 4:<sup>4/5</sup>, he argued that Christ was truly human and had come into the world under the dominion of the Law, His purpose being to redeem those under the Law. This, he explained, meant to redeem not from the curse of the Law, but rather from the pedagogy of the Law, in which was involved our adoption as sons - so that we might be in a freer state than those portrayed in Hebrews 10, who were "under the Law".

As there exists a covenant between God and man, so there exists a special covenant between God and Christ, which enabled Him to do all that which the Law was unable to do, as is shown in John 14:<sup>31</sup>.

Mr. Gataker went on to show what the work of Christ was. With reference to selected texts, he showed that men are sanctified, discharged from guilt of their sins, by Christ paying the price of their redemption. This involved justification and sanctification.

Commenting on 2 Corinthians 5:<sup>21</sup>, which spoke of Christ being the sacrifice for sin on man's behalf, Gataker pointed out that there was a difference between pardon and justice to be kept in mind. And justification was not just pardon, but involved being discharged from



the guilt of sin, at the same time, not violating justice - neither pardon nor justice is attacked. Anyone who has not broken the Law, he argued, is justified, because man was commanded before the Fall to keep the Law. God had covenanted with Adam that if he kept the Law he would continue in the state in which he was created. There is, however, no mention of him having a right to heaven as a reward for keeping the Law. If we asked how this right to heaven comes, we must answer "by adoption". By justification we are raised to no higher a state than that occupied by Adam before the Fall. Adoption is merited for us by Christ by His death and sufferings. Some argue that Christ brought merit to Himself as man, and these should not be classed as Papists, though Gataker did not affirm this position.

Mr. Wilson believed, on the basis of Ephesians 1, that there is another right to heaven apart from adoption, and this is the right of redemption. As Adam's sin and disobedience were by imputation to men and this banned them from heaven, so by the imputation of Christ's righteousness men have been redeemed.

Mr. Palmer called for a motion to appoint a committee to discuss this question.

Mr. Hearle wished to retract what he had said, acknowledging that the charge of heresy was too harsh to level, unless it be at Nestorianism, and he did not wish to bring this charge against his brother delegate. He apologised for his use of the word and wished to record his esteem for his fellow.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 48

Dr. Hoyle objected to saying that Christ was a creature, though his human nature was created. He also maintained that Christ died for others and not for himself. He argued that as Christ's life and death are mentioned together, then this indicated His obedience was both active and passive. He further argued that as men had been bound to keep the Law under pain of forfeiture, Christ, as man, was also bound by this. He went on to show that Christ was righteous and thus is contrasted to men's sin. Sinless, He was eligible to be the sacrifice. Thus the suffering of Jesus on the cross was a catastrophe. He, the only righteous One, died on the cross.

Mr. Gataker apologised for maintaining that Christ had no duty to God as man, and cited sources which contradicted him. He brought to the attention of the Assembly the advice from the French Synod which urged that a man's intentions should be considered when his speech is reviewed.

Mr. Nimes pointed out that he had never been fully persuaded of the doctrine whereby we are justified by the active obedience of Christ, and had, therefore, never preached it. He went on to explain that Christ was fit to be a sacrifice because of His nature and actions, just as His resurrection, ascension and continued intercession proved that He had justified men.

While asserting that the obedience of Christ was both active and passive, he maintained that only His passive or formal sufferings, which led to His death, were counted in the matter of righteousness. This he asserted because he believed that the scriptures laid down that blood was the only means of expiating sin, and if blood was the means

of our redemption and justification, then it was by the passive obedience of Christ that we are saved.

He went on to attack the two exceptions sometimes made to this, viz. - 1 that sins of omission were taken away by the imputation of the active obedience, 2 that our title to heaven was secured in the active obedience of Christ. He pointed out that the sin of omission remained a sin which required atonement as it made man guilty, and, therefore, blood was required, thus there was a passive obedience. He went on to show that if heaven was lost to man by his sin, then when man is freed from his sin, his entrance to heaven is assured. Also, everlasting life was promised as the outcome of the passive work of Christ. He also points out that the passive obedience of Christ results in our entitlement to sonship and adoption, as they are merited for us by Christ. If this is the case, he argued, then it would be impossible to see any part of our entitlement to heaven being the result of the active work of Christ. This, he maintains, is the position of the scriptures. It is our task, he argued, to live up to what has been accomplished for us, a position defended by citing a number of texts of scriptures, all of which, he claimed, expounded the fact of the passive obedience of Christ.

Mr. Walker defended the need of the active as well as the passive obedience by, first of all, reminding the Assembly that a number of points raised had previously been answered. Then he argued that Mr. Nimes was incorrect about the sin of omission as it was first an absence of righteousness, then a sin. The sin he said required the passive obedience, the absence of righteousness required the active obedience of Christ. He based his argument on the fact that as sons

of God by adoption, we needed to be as God wanted His sons, and this required the active work of Christ. And after adducing texts to support his case, he warned the Assembly that to take away the active obedience of Christ would leave a gap in explaining how the works and duties of a regenerate man could be explained.

Mr. Wilkinson, while approving of the exaltation of the passive work of Christ, would not exclude the active. He argued that there were elements of active obedience, however, running through the three offices of Christ's role as mediator, namely, prophet, priest and king. As prophet He was to instruct the church in the truth of justification, to tell of God's will, and to foretell His second coming. In this preaching He was actively obedient. As priest, He made satisfaction, which involved the passive obedience, but as priest he also made intercession as our mediator; here he cited John 17. As king of the church He governs and enlightens the church, which, he said, involved Christ's active obedience. For these reasons, he claims, there must be some active obedience. Citing the parable of the prodigal, this, he claimed, showed how God in justification both removes sin and then imputes righteousness, first involving the passive and then the active obedience of Christ. He concluded that, as Messiah, Christ came to teach righteousness, as well as to take away sins.

Mr. Gibson supported Mr. Walker. He pointed out that attackers of the active work of Christ had concentrated upon the remission of sin, neglecting the growth in righteousness and sanctification. He then urged a study of these truths as useful. He argued that active obedience was involved in Christ's work of justification in that it qualified Christ, by confirming His dignity, to continue with

His passive work, which, he argued, was then unfettered. He admitted that, where justification is involved, the scriptures always support Christ's passive work. At the same time, he claimed, there is always a reference to His active intercessory work.

He examined in detail Romans 7, asserting that while the Law demanded a remission of sin, made possible only by the passive work of Christ, righteousness was also required. This righteousness, he argued, was possible only through the active work of Christ, because, he argued, that Adam by his disobedience brought sin, opposed to this, Christ's obedience brought abundance of grace. From this he argued if Christ's obedience had simply been passive, this abundance would not have been possible, because it simply brought remission of sin and not the establishment of righteousness. He further argued that in Romans an inherent corruption after remission of sins is taught. This is removed, not by the blood of Christ, which is not mentioned, but by the Law of Christ and the virtues of Christ, which in the process of sanctification establish the whole righteousness of the Law. It remains true, he agreed, that without the passive work of Christ there would be no remission and thus no justification, but without the active work of Christ the work of justification would be an incomplete one.

He pointed out to those who argued that he was making the Law the thing which justified us, that rather it was from the whole Law, with its demand for righteousness, that we had been saved, not just the part of the Law which demanded sacrifice. To those who objected that active obedience had no part of the Law, he reminded them that gifts, as well as sacrifices were required, so Christ offered Himself in both His active and passive obedience. He reaffirmed his position that

Christ as man owed His obedience to God, and it, on its own, was not sufficient for man's salvation. At the same time as seeing Christ's obedience to the Father as something which all men owed to their creator, he urged them to consider first, that He became man by His own free choice, with the sole intention of saving man. Then, that He was not obliged, as God incarnate to submit Himself to the 1st. and 2nd. commandments, nor indeed was He under the Law by nature, but rather by fact. His submission to the Law was thus an act of His own choice. His obedience was thus not that of a creature but rather it was freely entered into. At the same time Mr. Gibson reminded the Assembly that the second person of the Trinity had a unique claim to humanity in that He claimed the nature to be His own, therefore, the blood He shed, He gave freely, and not because He was under any obligation to.

Mr. Hearle also supported the inclusion of both active and passive work of Christ. He again argued against the objection that maintained that the old Law knew nothing of active obedience, knowing only remission by blood. He pointed out that the fault of this objection was that it is not remission of sins that is under discussion, rather the imputation of righteousness. And there can be no doubt that the active obedience of Christ can be of no effect until Christ has died. He rejected the exposition of Matthew 3:<sup>15</sup> which would suggest that righteousness was imputed prior to the death of Christ. In Romans 5 he rejected the interpretation that would make only passive obedience necessary for justification on the grounds that Adam's disobedience was not passive. He cited Piscator as supporting his assertion that, as we are still under law, an active obedience is required to offset Adam's disobedience. He further cited relevant texts to prove that Christ

came to accomplish the will of God, which was that the Law should be fulfilled. This required His active obedience, accomplishing what man had failed to do, and imputing this work to us. Only the Antinomians would deny this. That Piscator called Christ a creature, he regarded as dangerously close to error, for which he should be censured.

Mr. Gataker, while accepting that justification is a judicial act, pointed out that there were three main divisions. First that holiness was required, next that it needed to be activated, and finally the problem of transgression. Holiness, he argued, was the requirement of God, but if a man is accused, if he be a believer and be guilty, then he may still plead not guilty, and because the blood of Christ is sufficient for all sin, then he must be acquitted. The blood shed is that of the man Christ, but to forget that He is also God will, he argued, lead again to the heresy of suggesting two wills, human and divine, in Christ.

He confessed an inability to understand the dilemma concerning sins of omission as he asserted that those who omitted nothing were demonstrating their adoption, and, since this concerned sanctification and not justification, he considered it irrelevant to the point under discussion.

He went on to cite numerous texts to support his refutation of the views of Osiander, who thought of man as having an essential righteousness apart from God. All these texts show righteousness as being the exclusive gift of God.

Mr. Palmer, while asserting that he did not want to repeat what had already been said, pointed out that it had not yet been

scripturally proved that as we were enjoined to be righteous, this righteousness must therefore be active. He then asserted that the chief argument employed by those who opposed the inclusion of the active work was that the scriptures always spoke of the passive work of Christ, which was the main drift of its teaching. Yet, he pointed out, there was also agreement on the fact that the sufferings of Christ in his "soul" was also part of the satisfaction made for sin. This he urged was not part of the general trend of Scripture, though he agreed that it was none the less true. On the same grounds, he said, he was given to see the need of the active work of Christ as necessary for our redemption. Even though it was nowhere explicitly mentioned in scripture, it was there implicitly, in the same way as the emotional sufferings were to be found. This he went on to prove by reference to Romans 5:10, which, he said, spoke of Christ's active righteousness, though without saying so explicitly. For the only other explanation of the verse was that Christ was made righteous by His sufferings, and this, he said, was an unacceptable alternative.

[Page missing from Manuscript at this point.]



ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 49

After setting up two committees to distribute money to members of the Assembly, and to the needy, the Assembly returned to the discussion of the imputation of the obedience of Christ.

Mr. Wilson argued that it was wrong to divide the work of Christ, as he believed them to be inextricably linked, as in the case of sacrifice, where, he asserted, though it was the passive work of Christ, there was an implicit requirement of innocency which was the active work. He went on to claim that while the division of doctrine was useful, to show the extent of a particular dogma [and he illustrated this with reference to justification] it was dangerous to forget that each part did not fully explain the whole, as the parts of justification never fully defined the whole doctrine. He went on to confess his ignorance as to the extent of the mediatorial work of Christ, but he confidently asserted that Christ had died for mankind. In support of this he urged several texts. Romans 5:19, which he claimed showed that Adam's sin was active and without limitation, therefore Christ's obedience paralleled this by being active and without restriction: Daniel 9:24, where he showed that Christ had come to bring righteousness as well as the remission of sins. He pointed out that remission of sins preceded the establishment of eternal righteousness, as it was necessary first to fulfil the law and its demands: Romans 10:4, where he showed that Christ was the fulfilment of the law, and imputed this to us, rather than abrogating it: Philippians 2:6-8, showed that Christ became a servant for the sins of men, from which he explained that while Christ's death was passive His willingness to become man showed the active nature of His obedience: Galatians 4:4-5, he claimed showed Christ as being under

the law, if this meant under the law of circumcision, then, He was also a debtor to the law.

Mr. Price <sup>✓</sup>much of this argument is missing from the Manuscript<sup>✓</sup> pointed out some of the dangers he saw in rejecting the active obedience. He believed that to deny the active obedience necessarily involved the denial of the imputation of Adam's sin. Also he believed that most of the previous arguments against active obedience could be levelled against passive obedience.

Mr. Nimes, on the basis of his exegesis of Philippians 2:<sup>4ff</sup>, maintained that Christ had been born as man, under the law, for man's sake, but remained always perfect, maintaining inward and outward obedience. He also affirmed that Christ had been actively obedient to the Father even prior to the Fall, but always for the good of men. He raised doubts to certain things previously maintained. First of all whether the active obedience was a proper foundation for the title to heaven, and whether it could be proved from scripture. Also whether the imputation of Christ's active obedience should properly be considered under the name of justification. He elaborated by asserting that justification was not opposed to guilt and condemnation, and he asserted that there was no need of the active work of Christ to be involved in such an act of justification. He explained that he did not deny the merit of Christ's active obedience in relation to adoption, nor did he deny that Christ's life and acts were meritorious, though he pointed out that Christ's personal dignity was always sufficient for the work of justification alone. He further maintained that there was another reason for Christ's obedience, that he should be a fit sacrifice.

He went on to show that the law had been fulfilled by the

passive obedience of Christ, and this had brought with it pardon, as the righteousness of Christ had been imputed to us. This, he asserted, was the teaching of Romans 5, where all of Adam's sin was covered in the death of Christ. He went on to provide an exegesis of Romans 5: 11-18, in which he explained that the phrase "abundance of grace" was a Hebrew expression used to describe the reaction to the great extent of sin. In dealing with justification in verses 18 and 19, he explained that "obedience" referred to justifying "to life". The change in verse 19 from obedience to righteousness did not mean a change from active obedience to passive. The question at issue was "justification unto life" and that demands active obedience. This was because justification had been used as opposition to "condemnation and death". He cited Romans 8 which he claimed was a summing up of what had gone before, where justification had overcome sin and death thus securing "no condemnation", therefore those who are not condemned "walk in the Spirit".

He concluded that satisfaction for sin was derived from the justification that is in Christ, and he did not see that the holiness of Christ's life was imputed to man.

Dr. Gouge brought forward an apology from Dr. Burgess for his actions in the Assembly.

Mr. Goodwin sought then to establish the meaning of the passage in Romans. He began by asserting that the first three chapters established the place of the law and explained that our justification, while not secured by the law, was none the less the "righteousness of the law". Citing Romans 8:<sup>3</sup>, and 10:<sup>4</sup>, he showed that, where the law failed, there Christ fulfilled it.

He went on to divide the law into two parts, the preceptive

and the appendix, though he acknowledged that this argument was built on the premise that all men were bound to obey the law. He then went on to assert that if only the passive obedience of Christ was imputed, then men would only be turned to a state of passive creational innocence. Without the imputation of the active righteousness then man would still lack the "eternal active righteousness demanded by the law." This position was supported by Daniel 9:<sup>24</sup>, where, he believed, first pardon was provided and then duty required, as the law demanded. While he refused to divide righteousness, he asserted that part of the definition of justification was that it took away guilt, though justification also involved reckoning with sin in all its parts. When he considered Romans 4:<sup>12, 22</sup>, he showed himself to be aware of the interpretation that made the imputation of righteousness responsible for the pardon of sin, but he explained that this was only part of the truth, and suggested that the whole active and passive work of Christ was involved in justification.

Just as in sanctification, the work was described in its composite parts, yet remained the whole work of Christ, so in justification the whole work of Christ led to the remission of sins, though in Romans 5:<sup>19</sup> the active work of Christ is given the greater emphasis. He showed how "abundance of grace" applied to the active work of Christ which encompassed the mercy of pardoning.

He went on to assert that the believers title to eternal life lay in the active work of Christ, because this was in line with the law which set its aim upon "doing" rather "suffering". By Christ's "doing" the law was fulfilled. To support this he cited Romans 8:<sup>1</sup> which, he said, referred to justification as it was spoken of as in the present

"there is .. now .. no condemnation", whereas we are perfectly justified we are not sanctified. The reason for this fact lay in the holiness of God, which frees men from the law of sin and death. This should bring comfort to believers as they should be able to see that by justification, a perfect obedience was made, and this is imputed to us, thus is the law fulfilled in us. The confidence this should engender is lost if the obedience imputed is lacking or imperfect. He then explained that the law is fulfilled in us, and not by us, by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, in Whom the law is perfectly fulfilled. Christ as the perfection of the law, did what the law failed to do. He justified men by keeping the law.

Dr. Hoyle pointed out that Christ gave His life freely, not under obligation. He also maintained that Christ's innocence and perfection were qualifications for His role as sacrificial lamb.

Mr. Seaman then explained why he believed both active and passive obedience had to be imputed. He gave eight reasons:

- 1) Because both active and passive obedience of Christ were undertaken for men, and are inseparable in their use.
- 2) Because if Christ's obedience to the law was total, then a total imputation needed to be asserted.
- 3) Because if Christ's inherent righteousness needed to be imputed, so also did His active obedience which displayed His inherent.
- 4) Because if whole Christ was imputed to men, then necessarily His whole obedience must also be imputed.
- 5) If all God's justice could not be satisfied in all its parts without the active and passive obedience of Christ, then there is no justice in God commanding or threatening.

- 6) Because Christ's active obedience, which was not necessary in heaven, was shown on earth, even though He was God.
- 7) Because anything that was done for us should be imputed, as it was done by a free mediator, and not accomplished merely by a creature.
- 8) Because Christ died as a lamb and His sufferings were a part of His office.

He went on to point out the difficulty in understanding the meaning of 2 Corinthians 5:<sup>21</sup>, where Christ is referred to as being made "sin for us". He explained that while Christ was undoubtedly a sin sacrifice, which supported the imputation of the passive obedience, this was not the exclusive meaning, nor did it exhaust the interpretations.

Mr. Hearle exposed the difficulty that the law required of man, repentance. This Christ did not do. He then explained that the law could not require repentance, or else God would have commanded a contradiction. Rather the law shows us our duty, without measuring our ability. Our own sin has involved us in attempting an impossibility.

He then returned to problems raised by others. He cited Romans 8:<sup>3</sup> as supporting the claim that it was the active obedience of Christ which is the basis of our title to heaven. He went on to show how it could be imputed by expounding 2 Corinthians 5, in which he argued that if the righteousness is said to be in us, then it is only possible by imputation. He then explained that justification before men involved only the absence of guilt, whereas God also required

positive righteousness.

Dr. Smith then presented to the Assembly an apology from Dr. Burgess, in which Dr. Burgess expressed his willingness to give any satisfaction for his past behaviour, which he claimed had inadvertently brought shame to him.

On receipt of the apology the Assembly expressed itself satisfied with Dr. Burgess' contrition.

Mr. Seaman then looked forward to seeing Dr. Burgess reinstated.

A deputation was then delegated to seek permission from the House of Commons to reinstate Dr. Burgess.

Mr. Gataker began by seeking admission for those who had not previously spoken in debates.

Mr. Woodcocke accepted that the "whole obedience" of Christ was imputed in justification, but was not prepared to say that it was "formally imputed and transmitted" because this asserted that the justified sinner could be looked upon as never having sinned, and implied that there was some intrinsic merit in man; whereas it was only true that God saw no sin in justified men, for they were clothed in the righteousness of Christ.

Mr. Walker retorted that such doubts had already been answered, and pointed out that satisfaction had been made by Christ's death. This obviated the need of the imputation of either the passive or active obedience. He claimed that there were many scriptures which maintained that man required righteousness, and that it was not enough simply to have sins removed.

Mr. Bathurst answered the objection raised by Mr. Woodcocke by showing that by the logic he applied, imputed righteousness implied imputed sin. To the suggestion that men lacked merit, he responded that it was plain that God saw sin in men, but He sought to cover it with Christ's righteousness, not simply to judge men for their lack of merit.

Mr. Woodcocke posed the question of how God could see a man as a sinner if he had fulfilled the whole law. Dr. Gouge replied that God saw Christ as having fulfilled the law for us and thus it was "accounted" as if we had fulfilled it. Mr. Walker reminded the Assembly that the totality of Christ's merit was not applied to every member, but to every member as he had need of it.



Mr. Case answered the objection that the imputation of active obedience involved God as looking upon justified sinners as if they had never sinned, by saying that God did look upon sinners, but first of all in regard of the act of sin, then in regard of the consequence of sin. Neither of these involved God in looking for merit in man, therefore he did not see that there was any need to maintain that Christ's divinity had been imputed for merit. To the objection that scripture asserted that God saw no sin, he explained that God did not see sin in the act of justifying sinners.

Mr. Owen asserted that the word "formally" could be used of sanctification but not of justification. Mr. Vines saw that the phrase "God's imputing" implied both the active and passive moods of action, but that he understood the term to refer rather to the use and product of imputation rather than to its composition. Mr. Hill objected that if both were taken together and imputed, man would not stand as a sinner at all.

Mr. Hearle distinguished between "formally" and "virtually". "Virtually," he maintained, suggested that the obedience and suffering are not our own, whereas "formally" implied inherent virtues, and involved God looking upon justified men as if they had never sinned. He then divided sin into constituent elements, as he saw them; first there was culpa which was the sinful act itself. This was transient and God looked upon it. There was also the guilt attached to the act. It was this that made a man liable to God's justice and punishment, though he confessed that there could be no binding God. When the guilt is removed, then in God's sight we are no more sinners. He further maintained that there was an efficacy in the death of Christ. Finally,

there was the final punishment for sin. This last point came near to the Antinomians doctrine; for he maintained that it was true that God never punished sin that had been taken away by Christ; and there was correction, which was not punishment but an instruction, and in some sense a revenge. He went on to establish that because of Christ's obedience, merit was available for sinners, though he warned against asserting that such merit was imputed to men, because what the Law required of men was obedience, not merit. The merit always would belong to Christ.

After Mr. Walker had spoken Mr. Rayner stated those things upon which there was general agreement among the delegates. He said that if he were asked by what a sinner is justified, he would answer that it was by the righteousness of Christ. If he were further asked how this was applied to an individual, he would answer that it was by divine imputation, and if asked what the basis of this imputation was, then he would answer that it lay in Christ's obedience even to death.

He said that there were certain things however with which he was not satisfied. He outlined the position held by some whereby justification was of two parts, remission of sins obtained by the passive works of Christ, and acceptance by Christ. This he disagreed with as he did not think that scripture gave warrant to divide up Christ's work, when it described sin as being original and a unity, and if original sin were removed, then God would have to account man as righteous. He maintained from a scriptural text that whatever removed man's sin constituted him righteous. He did not believe that the righteousness of Christ before His death was imputed, even after His death, but that there was ample scriptural evidence to establish that He was righteous

when He died. He then suggested an alternative reading of the Article, supported, as he maintained, by the scriptures.

He claimed that some texts submitted as proof of the active obedience of Christ did not have any reference to righteousness. He then went on to state some of the propositions of those who supported the active as well as the passive obedience of Christ. One argument was that if there were none of the active obedience of Christ imputed, then Christ could have been slain at birth with the same effect. To which he answered that while this could have been the case it would have resulted in the loss of His ministry of proclaiming the gospel, and the confirmation of His claims to be the Messiah by His performing miracles. Christ wished to give voluntary obedience to the Father and gradually exercise all His faculties.

Another objection raised by some was that there was a double debt owed to God by man, that of man as both creature and sinner. To which he retorted that while he accepted that sin could be called a debt, it was obedience that was owed to God, though it was the debt of sin that was covered in justification. He suggested that even if man had all his sins forgiven him, there remained the debt of obedience that man owed God. This remained even after the remission of sins. It was only by Christ sanctifying a man and enabling him to be obedient, combined with the remission of sins, could the whole debt be paid.

Another objection was that if the active obedience of Christ was not the basis of sanctification then there could be no entitlement to heaven. To which Mr. Rayner answered that he had not heard any proof offered to support the assertion. He believed that entitlement to heaven came as a part of the total purchase of Christ, as adoption closely

accompanied justification, and justification alone, involving as it does the remission of sins, entitles a man to heaven. Justification, he said, was to life, which at the very least involves the removal of all that hinders life.

Another argument he countered maintained that those things which a sinner should have done, and yet had not done, those Christ had done for him, and so they needs be imputed to him. While Rayner accepted the main proposition, he denied that it was a distinct part of justification. Again he stated that Romans 8:<sup>2</sup> was used to assert that there was an habitual righteousness and holiness in the passion and nature of Christ, a position to which it was claimed Beza had added his support. He answered this by agreeing that the gospel had freed men from the law of sin and death, but it was not clear that this applied to justification or sanctification, as Paul opposed the law of the Spirit and life, to the Law and sin, and made it clear that the unregenerate served the Law. To the objection that one scripture could endanger his position, he claimed that there could be no condemnation because freedom came by the gospel. He went on to argue that the ministry of God's Spirit is a spiritual one, nowhere is the Law said to be "in Christ", rather the "Spirit of life" is in Christ, which confirmed that Christ had to do with "Spirit" and not "Law". He agreed that if the verse referred to sanctification then the argument failed. He concluded by moving that the phrase should be accepted as it stood.

Mr. Arrowsmith said that he intended to defend the position attacked by Mr. Rayner, though he said that he would leave answering of specific questions to those who had first propounded the ideas. He noted some deficiencies in Mr. Rayner's argument; especially that there

was no righteousness available for imputation until the death of Christ. Obedience was required of men yet they could only give it in sanctification, and as this left an uncanceled residue from the original debt, men remained in their sin. There were, he maintained, three conclusions to be made. First of all, that justification included removal of guilt and entitlement to heaven, to which were opposed the two natural laws of guilt and deprivation of glory. Justification had answered both these laws by being a single state in two parts. Secondly, on the basis of Acts 26:<sup>10</sup> he asserted that justification included remission and inheritance. Thirdly, the active obedience of Christ procured both these things. This he asserted on the basis of the understanding of adoption which he found in Galatians 4:<sup>5</sup> and Romans 8:<sup>5</sup>. The argument he summarized as being that "whatsoever is a part of the price of our redemption is a part of the substance of our justification".

Mr. Coleman submitted Isaiah 53:<sup>11</sup> as a scripture relating to Christ in which redemption had the dual effect of justifying many and bearing away the sins of many. These two effects, he claimed, confirmed the active obedience of Christ. Though he was aware of the difficulty in the use of the word "knowledge", the initial question was whether "knowledge" was a quality in Christ or in man. If the "knowledge" was in Christ, then he believed that his point was established, if in man, then it posed a more difficult problem of interpretation. Because knowledge was so infrequently attributed to man he believed that it was meant as a quality in Christ. A second question was whether this "knowledge" was a quality that contributed to the making of man righteous. He suggested that Christ, because He knew of the value of His death, was able to make many righteous. He also maintained that scripture applied

to God such attributes as were required in the specific circumstance to accomplish the immediate task. In the same way Christ was called "righteous", as later on He was called "servant", to indicate His work of obedience.

To the argument that phrases such as "justify many" or "to carry righteousness to many" did not specify the active or the passive obedience of Christ, he replied that righteousness was conveyed to man, and that righteousness was referred to as the beauty of Christ, and the beauty of Christ was shown to be His active obedience.

Mr. Gataker noted that Isaiah 53:<sup>11</sup> was the only text adduced to maintain the idea of the imputation of Christ's active obedience. He also affirmed that the burden of proof lay with those affirming any position, whereas those contraverting anything had only to register their objection.

By comparing the way in which translators had translated "in thy fear" using tui rather than suus, he approved the translation of "by the knowledge of him" as it was rendered cognitione sui rather than cognitione sua. He also claimed general agreement for the position that equated "knowledge" with faith, claiming that that which preceded to stand in the place of the consequence. This device he saw as presenting the text more forcefully, otherwise the impact of "righteous servant" is lost. It was well known, he said, that Christ was just, as it was prophesied that He should be. The reason for His being so was that He should bear the iniquities of men. He then established the casual use made of conjunctions by referring to another verse, and asserted that the casual principle explained the reason for saying "my righteous servant" as He was to bear the sins of men and thus to provide their justification, yet

in the earlier part of the chapter it had been said of Him that He was judged as a sinner.

He then dealt with the argument that the active obedience of Christ was His beauty. He regarded the scriptural evidence as eisegetic and far-fetched, and spoke of the context of the verse, and the subject of the verse, which was the nation of Israel and her beauty was not an inherent one, but one that had been conferred on her by God.

Continuing, he turned his attention to the objection that the question had not been properly framed. He explained that justification had been discussed in two parts over two days, with the aim of producing a single aphorism. He discussed the question in what he regarded as the basic terms, justification, righteousness, imputation and obedience.

Justification, he argued, was a judicial term meaning acquittal, or absolving of guilt, and he sought to distinguish it from pardon. He noted that the Lord's Prayer contained no petition for justification as it was a prayer for men who were already justified, though he saw justification as being more than simply a remedy to sin. He maintained that daily pardon was still required from God for having offended Him, even though this offence was different to the guilt of sin, which had been dealt with.

Righteousness, he continued, was another legal term which consisted of two parts. There was the performance of the duty; and recompense for non-performance of the duty. The word righteousness could be applied to either of these concepts. Paul, he said, had argued in Romans 5:<sup>10</sup> that a man could be pronounced guiltless, and therefore righteous. Righteousness, he argued, came as the result of a single action. To the objection that no example of such an exposition existed in scripture, it was shown that there was a diversity of usage of the

word "righteous" in scripture, and so there could be no conclusive argument. He then catalogued some of these differences, giving scriptural references. It had been used to stand for moral precepts, for ceremonial rites, for judgement, for inherent righteousness and for justification. The last use - for justification - was found only in Romans 5:<sup>16</sup> and this place had been well expounded in terms of a full recompense having been made for the breach, and the lack of justice. Such, he claimed, was the use made of the word by Greek authors. He elaborated by saying that because full satisfaction had been made, then at the bar of any court of law, any man who was charged, and could plead that full satisfaction had been made, would be termed righteous.

Imputation, he claimed, could be applied when a man was believed to have done something which he had actually done. In a case where full recompense for the breach of the law was made by somebody standing as a surety, then by the imputation of the actions of the surety, the guilty could be deemed to be guiltless. Thus guiltlessness and righteousness were seen to be the same thing.

Obedience, he thought, provided no difficulty as long as it was taken on its own. If, however, the Article revision contained the word "whole", then he believed that he had to object. The question as he saw it was whether the active obedience of Christ was to be included in the price paid to discharge the guilt of sinners. He said that a professor from Basel had made the point to him that nowhere in scripture was the active obedience of Christ called the price or ransom by which sinners are redeemed. He said he did not deny that there was an activity in Christ's active and servile suffering and this was a sign of Christ's willingness to pay the ransom, but he noted that it was not the willingness



to pay but the actual payment that provided the ransom. This, he implied, was provided by Christ's passive obedience, of which the willingness was a part.

He answered the objection that Christ was Lord of the Law, and therefore not its subject, by saying that the title was used in the same way as the title "Son of Man". And that title had been accorded to Christ while He was still in heaven.

He clarified his position by dealing with a number of objections to his position. To the thesis that there was a united obedience, he replied that there was undeniable distinction between Christ's obedience to the law in general, and His fulfilling it in His office of mediator. This distinction he saw as necessary, as it would be difficult to argue that love of God, and self sacrifice for the sake of another, were the same thing.

To the argument that justification, redemption and remission are all one thing, he replied this was as difficult to substantiate as the first position, and that the untenable nature of the thesis was shown by attempting to ascribe Christ's active sufferings to various texts where justification, remission, redemption and reconciliation are specifically expounded.

In answering the proposition that what Christ did for our good, He also did in our stead, Gataker said that he doubted the basic proposition, as Christ taught and performed miracles for our good but not in our stead. The difference he likened to the difference between watching out for a man's good and watching over a man who was sick and had lost blood or was lethargic. It was true that Christ kept the law for our good, but if He kept it in our stead then we are released from

the obligation of keeping it ourselves. He cited Gomarus as one who taught that our obedience to the Law sprang from a thankfulness to Christ and not from any obligation. He replied to this by asserting that this understanding could not be true, because if Christ had fulfilled the law in our stead then the obligations that are ours as creatures are taken away.

To the objection that there was no need to keep the law, as we did not derive life from it, he replied that the question was irrelevant as the man who served God only from a desire for eternal life was doing less than was demanded, as God desired man's service freely. He did not exclude the possibility of reward, but that in seeking the reward they neglected the full command, and so ended up in a contradictory position.

Gataker listed objections to what he had said and then went on to deal with them. To the objection that there was a contradiction, as everybody was bound to obedience to God, he retorted that there was a problem. If all were bound to obey how could any escape the condemnation of the law, for nobody had been fully obedient. Though it may have been answered by saying that where man failed, then Christ completed man's obedience for him, he claimed this did not take due notice of the doctrine of the wholeness of Christ. Again it could be objected that Christ's wholeness was not at question, only the honesty of His bride, the church. To this the answer must be that the typology of the Old Testament confirmed the New Testament affirmation that the bride of Christ had been cleansed "by water and by blood". This was stressed by Beza who believed that "by water" implied sanctification and "by blood" justification. Thus the only imputation is that of righteousness.

Sanctification was not accomplished by a single act of imputation. Redemption then was seen as the final confirmation of all the graces at the last day.

To the argument that the active and passive obedience of Christ were inseparable, he replied that though they were inseparable in regard to their general benefits to man, their specific ends and benefits could be separated. He used the analogy of the heat and light of the sun.

In reply to the thesis that Christ had been obedient to all three laws, Gataker asserted that all of Christ's actions were motivated by love, which he saw as included in the price paid for the redemption of sinners, but he did not accept that it followed that Christ had to be a surety for man, though it could be retorted that the actions of the surety released the sinner from his obligations. Christ, he affirmed, had suffered as a righteous person. Though Gataker did not dispute this, he made the point that when the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies to make atonement for the sins of the nation, the atonement was not made with the robes in which he was arrayed, but the blood which he carried.

In conclusion he proposed a motion considering whether it was possible to allow dissension on the topic, as there was legitimate disagreement among the delegates. He did not want to prevent some men from exercising their ministry because of disagreement over this point. He made the point that only in The Second Helvetic Confession was the exact nature of the obedience of Christ specified, and though mentioned in the Irish Articles, there had been no compulsion for people to subscribe to them.

Dr. Gouge said that he would rather listen to more debate before

expressing his opinion though he maintained that the Article made no distinction between active or passive obedience, but spoke rather of the whole obedience and therefore did not provide the ground for such controversy. He made a comparison with temples built in various styles. So in that which Christ had done for men there cohered many elements suitable for all things. He then supported this position by reference to the scripture where it was asserted that all man's needs had been met in Christ. He adduced another scripture to establish that not only did Christ remove man's filthiness but provide for his sanctification on earth and his presentation as perfect before God in heaven.

In the face of the suggestion that there was a possibility that Christ might have sinned, and His death made of no avail, whilst He attempted to restore the church to its proper inheritance, Gouge answered that it was impossible for Christ to sin. He insisted that Christ had come as a surety in our place and for our good, and that man stood in need of Him, and added that imputation was the only method of acquiring these benefits. He admitted that there was no type of this obedience given in the Old Testament, but added that some truths were beyond types. He asserted that Christ's death was gift as well as sacrifice, and adduced the biblical example of Melchisedec, who was king of Salem and a type of Christ, in that he was termed "Prince of peace" and King of righteousness".

He noted, in conclusion, the antiquity and general approval by English and Continental Synods of his doctrine, and believed that it was established in scripture, especially where Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience are said to be imputed as in Romans 5:<sup>19</sup>, and where sins are contrasted with the imputed righteousness of Christ as in 1 Corinthians 15:<sup>22</sup>. On the principle that all remedies offered for an ailment would have some

effect, he suggested that each of the specific parts of Christ's work would have some special use in men. He went on to establish that Christ came as a surety for man on the basis of Hebrews 7:<sup>26</sup>, where Christ is described as "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners", and said to have "become us". He then suggested a motion to establish this and stated that those who sought to change the motion were opposed to the active obedience of Christ, and asked if it should be excluded because of their objections.

Mr. Ley asked for a vote to be taken, and adduced a number of scriptures which he believed established his position, which was that Christ achieved on man's behalf all those things that man should have done. He argued that there could be no comfort derived from the doctrine if this element was absent. He also believed the position was one maintained by various Confessions and by Calvin himself.

Mr. Hearle continued to debate the points raised because he thought they tended towards Antinomianism. He took issue with the idea that obedience consisted of two things and either of them could be used. He said that his opponents had argued for a change in the wording of the Article because of the imputation of obedience, yet he believed it was still an open question as to whether the habitual righteousness of Christ was imputed to man.

Concerning the mediatorial obedience of Christ, he maintained that any moral obedience would have been done for men's good, but not in their stead. He did not accept that it necessarily followed that this led to Antinomianism though it was true that men were freed from the rigours of the law. He wanted to consider the difference between the Covenants. The Covenant of Works, dependant as it was upon man's

own efforts was unable to provide reconciliation, a man was weak, through the flesh. The offence was against God and required His method of salvation. In Christ this reconciliation was effected, because of His intrinsic value and virtue which comprised the price and power for satisfaction. To say that man's works could entitle him to heaven was a difficult position to maintain. He then dealt with the text in Colossians 2:<sup>10</sup>. He said that the passage described the duties and obligations incumbent on men, and which they were unable to perform. It was true that these things made it necessary for Christ to perform on man's behalf that which man had been unable to perform, otherwise man could not be described as "complete in Him"; though some would object that man could be declared to be "complete in Him" - because Christ had joined Himself to man for mankind's sake - which he answered by saying that while it was true that man is bound, it cannot be forgotten that all men are born sinners.

He turned his attention to the arguments of the Antinomians, Papists and Arminians. To the Antinomians, who maintained that man was not bound to fulfil the law if Christ had done it already, he retorted that the obedience of Christ was imputed only to penitent sinners, and therefore they are not bound to obey it for the same purpose as He did, but for other ends or purposes. To the Papist argument that if Christ's righteousness was imputed, it could be done so either totally or in part. If the whole, then one man may receive total righteousness, just like Christ, whereas another man would receive none. To which he retorted that all justified sinners were pronounced "just", but not all "equally just". The Arminians argument maintained that sinners were justified by their act of faith and not by any imputed righteousness, either active

or passive, as it would be unjust to lay the punishment of one upon another. To this he answered that it would be unjust unless he had voluntarily accepted that he came to provide a surety. He emphasised that Christ had purchased salvation for sinners, and stressed the union of the justified man with Christ.

Mr. Goodwin dealt with various points made by Gataker. First he answered the point made that justification as a judicial act referred only to the acquittal of sin by asserting that the justification of Adam and the fallen angels required more than mere acquittal of sin. He also made the point that all God's attributes were enemies to sin. And the outrage to God's holiness had to be made up, and the ability to do so was not in man. He also made the point that although Christ had remedied this for man this did not absolve man of his responsibility to strive to his uttermost. He concluded, on the basis of 2 Corinthians 5:<sup>21</sup> that Christ being righteous, and man standing in need of righteousness, there must be a necessary imputation.

Dr. Featley adduced a number of texts to establish the active obedience of Christ. He corrected the interpretation of the "Son of man" by arguing that if Christ did not need to fulfil the Law, and as Lord of the Law He was not bound by it, then it was possible to impute His fulfilling of it. He stressed the Lordship of Christ, saying that if He were not Lord then all His works would be lost to man, and whatever we owed God would not in that case have been paid by Christ.

Dealing with the argument that the righteous obedience of Christ, spoken of in Romans 5:<sup>16-19</sup> was His passive obedience, he challenged anybody to produce one place where dicciomai was taken to mean passive obedience. He cited Bernard as a source. Dealing with

1 Corinthians 1:<sup>30</sup> he observed that Christ's righteousness was imputed to man to make him righteous, not to perfect his unrighteousness, and he cited Clement as one who supported this position. He then cited Chrysostome and Augustine as his authorities when he asserted that 2 Corinthians 5:<sup>21</sup> taught that as Christ was accounted righteous, so man is accounted righteous, or guiltless. The Adamic example, he claimed, showed that while Adam was innocent at creation, he was not righteous until he had fulfilled the law.

To the argument that it was not necessary for Christ, the Mediator, to perform the act of sacrifice for man, Featley replied that it was a rule of law that satisfaction could be denied if something other than what was needed was presented. In the same way Christ had to be the surety and ransom, or else the law would not have been fulfilled or completed, as something other than a satisfactory sin offering by man for mankind would have been made. It may have been possible to satisfy the law in some other way, but in no other way could it have been fulfilled, except in the same way it had been broken. He agreed that the last act of Christ was of infinite worth, and one drop of His blood was sufficient to effect satisfaction, but God's law demanded that a soul be given in exchange for a soul even in specie. The passive obedience of Christ he saw as an adding to the Law and fulfilling of it, moreover what God demanded of men He required of Christ.

Featley rebutted the Antinomian position which saw Christ's fulfilment of the Law as releasing man from his obligation to keep it, by saying that Christ had fulfilled the Law in order to justify men, and that we are bound to keep it, but not for the same end. God, he maintained, did not see obedience to the law as always being for the same end.



To the assertion that the law only bound man because he was a creature, he replied that Christ's fulfilling of the law freed justified men from merely creaturely obligation. He distinguished two strands; obedience to the Law, and obedience in daily living. The first he saw as an eternal command binding on all creatures, but the second, embodying as it did the promise of eternal life, cut out the creaturely obligation.

He went on to discuss Romans 8:<sup>2</sup> saying that answers had already been given to points raised from it, and he mentioned the problem of whether the holiness of Christ's nature or whether justification was being referred to. He asserted that there was a general agreement that the subject of the verse was justification, especially as the fourth verse set the first within the context of justification, and that the reason that there was no condemnation was because there had been justification, and though there were verses in between they were there for another reason. A second point he raised was whether "from the word hath freed" referred to justification or sanctification. He said it could not be sanctification as there were various places in the former chapter where Paul indicates that he was not free from the embrace of sin. The fact that he spoke of "the law of sin and death" indicated that justification was spoken of, for it fitted the idea of "no condemnation". When sanctification is spoken of, then the condemnation and destruction of sin, with all its claims, were necessarily seen as having been already dealt with. Having established that the burden of the verse was justification, he added that habitual holiness was also maintained. He saw the Law of Christ as being opposed to the Law. He said that in the writings of Paul, the "law of Spirit" was always opposed to "law in the flesh". He asked the rhetorical question as to how

Christ condemned sin, and answered it by saying that "He took upon Himself the likeness of sinful flesh". Dicaionai, he concluded, came by obeying the precepts of the law, if that was the way intended, then for man to be righteous it must have been the course taken by Christ.

Mr. Vines hoped for a conclusion of the problem and made the point that the Article had not intended to specify the type of obedience, nor to engender such debate. He said that to deny the imputation of Christ was to deny the whole Christ, which is what the Socinians did. He stressed his acceptance of the doctrine of the whole Christ, but said that if the Article spoke of "whole obedience" then men would want to know what was meant by it.

He could not accept the imputation of the habitual righteousness but added that he was not opposed to the whole idea of the active righteousness of Christ. He raised the question of to what extent the imputation of righteousness covered all the sins committed by men, maintaining that eternal life could be found only in the doctrines of justification and adoption. He expanded on this by saying that if when a man had been justified by faith the active obedience of Christ was imputed to him, then all his acts would be made perfectly righteous, and there would be no room left for sin.

Lord Say said that while he did not want to disrupt the discussions of the Assembly, he had a message from Parliament. He reported that at a conference with the Scottish Commissioners certain differences between the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland were noted, and Parliament wanted a committee to be appointed to deal with the matter.

A committee was appointed to meet with the Scottish Commissioners.

Mr. Seaman made the point that as it was not an ordinary matter, the nominations should not be put to the vote in the normal manner.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 51

Mr. Hodges suggested a motion concerning the absence of the Assessor.

Mr. Gataker directed himself to the suggestion that justification covered all sins. He raised the difficulty of the differing requirements of the laws of God and of man, and answered this by asserting first of all, that the only difference between the law of God and that of men was that God's law had a positive as well as a prohibitive side. Secondly, that while the decalogue provided a summary of God's law, it did not encompass the totality of God's law. He went on to show that the prophetic literature with its emphasis on the covenant relationship asserted a positive as well as negative requirement, which was paralleled in human law. He cited the case of treason, where, the law applied not only to those doing violence to the person of the king, but also included those who knew, and yet concealed the knowledge, of such treason. However, if a man charged with treason can prove himself not guilty then he is necessarily declared righteous. Some people, he argued, denied that the example of Adam could be used to uphold the definition of justification, which involved a freeing of a man from the guilt of his sin, as Adam had been created innocent but not originally just. This position he rejected on the grounds that it was opposed to scripture, which asserted that Adam had been created "in righteousness and true holiness", and, further, justification is only applied where a crime has been committed. He then concluded that righteousness lies in the performance of acts of contrition.

Mr. White reported on behalf of the committee sent to the Scottish Commissioners. He read a letter and reported that the Scots

were preparing a copy of their commission for the Assembly. He also reported that the Scots wanted the terms of reference of the Assembly sent to them, and they wanted the full assurance of the Assembly that they would support the Covenant.

Mr. Seaman asked that the Assembly send to the Scots a copy of the order of Parliament, and express the thanks of the Assembly. Also, he asked that the Assembly intimate its desire to meet with the Scots again.

Mr. Nye suggested that the committee be sent to the Scots again to find out if they had any more papers to deliver, also to find out more about their proposals for the covenant and to fix another time to meet with them.

Dr. Temple objected that the Assembly had had nothing to do with the drafting of the Covenant, to which Mr. Nye retorted that as the Scots were sent as a delegation from the General Assembly of the Scottish Church, then it was fitting that they deal with the Assembly.

Dr. Gouge endorsed the earlier suggestion of Mr. Nye, while Mr. Seaman stressed the importance of sending a written token of thanks.

Dr. Smith objected that written replies from the Assembly were outside of the remit laid down for them by Parliament.

The letters were ordered to be read again the following day.

Mr. Nye's earlier proposals were accepted.

After a second reading of the letter from the Scots, Dr. Stanton proposed that the committee membership should be strengthened as it was likely to be of some importance. He, Dr. Gouge, Mr. Vines and Mr. Palmer should join it. Dr. Gouge preferred to let the committee stand as it was.

Mr. White then proposed that the Scots letter be sent to the Commons. This was seconded by Mr. Nye, because it contained reference to things that were beyond the remit of the Assembly. Mr. Seaman urged that it be dispatched quickly.

Mr. De la Mare considered that the responsibility for dealing with the letter lay with Parliament and Assembly, as Parliament had called both the Assembly and sought the aid of the Scots. He said that he saw the political situation as a spiritual warfare in which all the allies should be united.

Mr. Calamy pointed out that though the Scots were not sent to be members they still wanted to listen to the Assembly in session. Mr. Seaman added that there was a difference between the commissioners now present and those that were to come. Mr. Nye warned the Assembly that to deny the wishes of the Scots was impolitic.

It was then ordered that the Scots letter should be sent to the Commons.

The Solicitor then brought the request that a delegation from the Assembly should meet with the Scots to confer about the Covenant.

Mr. Nye, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Seaman and Mr. Hill were then appointed to join a delegation from the Lords and Commons to investigate the proposals regarding the Covenant.

The Prolocutor found that there were two points in the discussion which he did not think had been satisfactorily explained; he claimed that man was returned to his pre-Fall condition, and was concerned about the hypostatical union. He acknowledged that Christ was called "Son of man" but did not see that it placed Him under the normal human obligations. He then argued that the entitlement to heaven was won by Christ, which none could deny, and it should not be the cause of dissent, whether it was the "blood" of Christ or the "obedience" that was responsible.

He then adduced a number of texts to show that the blood of Christ is responsible for the growth in grace in the Christian life, and provides the motivation for good works. He then argued that if all grace was the product of the cross, then so was all glory, as in scripture they were always inextricably linked.

He then declared that Christ was mediator because He was the "propitiation for our sins." He also drew attention to the fact that all prayers were made through Christ, as He had fulfilled the law. Because of this His active obedience should also be accorded honour with His suffering, though it is often neglected. Unlike men, he reminded the Assembly, Christ found obedience natural and no burden, not only obedience to the ceremonial law, but also the moral law, and not even the temptations of Satan could make Him swerve from the law.

Dr. Hoyle complained that he found some of the earlier debates disturbing. He could not accept that part of the double debt owed by man could be paid by sanctification, because this was to confuse justification and sanctification, and to make sanctification half a saviour. If this were the case full satisfaction could not be made while we were still in the world.

He also found it strange that justification should remove the punishment but not the guilt of sin. As punishment is still present in the world, he argued, must we then say that we are not justified in this life? This is not to say that man's actions are disregarded, or that sin is overlooked in the believer. Rather he urged the Assembly to accept the full biblical teaching of Christ, not just in His passive obedience. The active, too, is imputed. This does not mean that we must keep the law or forfeit our justification. Rather it provides a remedy for men's continual sin.

Similarly he dealt with the problem of the title to heaven. He affirmed that our acceptance is made conditional on the death of Christ, but he doubted if it were just for His death, for he adduced scriptures to show that it was the life of Christ that was required. He then concluded that scripture would allow of no division in Christ's obedience, allowing that while sacrifice was made through His perfect sufferings, His whole life went to produce that perfect sacrifice. He ended by advocating that the division between active and passive obedience was unreal and should not be made.

Mr. Hearle brought the attention of the Assembly to certain passages of scripture. He pointed out from Hebrews 10:<sup>19</sup>, that the priest may not enter into the Holy of Holies without a blood sacrifice, even though he was legally clean. From Galatians 1:<sup>3-4</sup> he argued that grace was a product of the passive obedience of Christ and, therefore, also glory was the product of the same passive obedience. He further argued that as by the death of Christ all sin is removed, and all wants are removed, so the lack of original justice is remedied.

He further argued that although the sacrifice of Christ takes



away all our wants, it does not remove the formal principle. As an example he supposed a man ignorant; for his ignorance to be removed he must be instructed, and before this there must be the positive quality in him capable of being instructed. Consequence thus brings with it necessity. The two elements always go together. But the being taught does not make him a person, nor does the learning qualify him, for heaven. In giving an example he explained the general proposition that all grace is given for Christ's sake, because grace existed, of necessity there must be glory. The referring to "vain conversations" has reference to grace, so glory has reference to sanctification.

He showed that the sufferings and death on the cross of Christ as mediator, is both the stimulation to holiness and the basis of prayer for the believer.

He then argued that any merit that Christ gained by becoming man must be lost in our case. The argument, he said, was ended if the birth and the death were united, and if this were the case then the active would share in the entitlement to heaven. The dying, however, he likened to the last sand in the glass, for it is that that formally empties it. While he asserted that it was Christ's death which gave access to heaven, other things needed to concur to make it effective.

He rejected the idea that Christ gave obedience to God, which was required of Him, even though it was natural for Him to do so, on the grounds that it did not befit His dignity as God. He then drew a distinction between the creaturelyness of Christ as man, and human personality, which he denied Him. Obligation, he maintained, belonged to the human personality, which Christ lacked. He agreed that if there was any undischarged obligation, then it was a debt, though this was

clearly impossible. He then expounded Isaiah 53, where he claimed the knowledge referred to was Christ as object and not subject. This was because we should exercise faith in Him. He then concluded that Christ's death, had it not been voluntary, would have been mere slaughter.

Mr. Price did not accept that the scriptures previously forwarded excluded the active obedience of Christ. There were many texts, he argued, that asserted the active obedience, including Philippians 2:<sup>8</sup> which showed the total duration of the obedience of Christ.

Mr. Seaman then defined two types of breaking of the law; by neglecting the law, and by breaking it. Both, he argued, were covered by justification, and went on to define two types of condemnation and to show that justification involved both condemning to death and initiating to life.

He pointed out that the scriptures taught that we are made righteous, though still liable to death, but possess a title to eternal life.

He then went on to make four points about the doctrine of justification:

- 1) that because justification must be at least as all-encompassing as "by works" all the above elements were necessary, as they were included in any works of justification;
- 2) though all those who are justified by Christ are blessed spiritually, for full spiritual blessing the individual must contribute;
- 3) those who are justified by Christ shall reign in life;
- 4) those who are justified may rejoice in the fact while they are on earth, as they have a hope of glory.

On the basis of a number of texts he suggested that righteousness was a work of God and a gift of God, and involved us in

not only "being" but "being made" righteous. If these propositions are accepted, he argued, then an imputation of the active obedience was necessary because:

- 1) if Christ's active obedience had any merit, then this should be imputed as it might be pleaded as the ground of His own, or our, glory;
- 2) if Christ's sufferings really exclude His active obedience, then they must also exclude His sufferings in life. That this is untrue is shown in that as Christ was born to die, He was also born to suffer. That He became poor for us relates to His life and not specifically to His death;
- 3) if Christ had redeemed by both active as well as passive obedience, then four things would be evident:
  - .. (a) by His serving in the place of others;
  - .. (b) by His paying the price of our redemption;
  - .. (c) by conquering the power of evil;
  - .. (d) His life of intercession for us.

He then argued that it was weak to separate any of the four elements, or to exclude any of them. Rather he asserted they were all interlinked. If they were all to cohere then he believed that the active work of Christ would be conclusively established. He went on to say that of the four only the first point, our redemption by His serving in our place, was likely to be challenged, as the rest commanded general acceptance.

He argued that the proof of the first point was established in Galatians 4:<sup>5</sup>, where Christ was spoken of as being made under the law, and many other places where He is spoken of as giving His life as a

ransom. And also where His ministry is spoken of as one of serving. These two aspects are inseparable.

He concluded by saying that the obedience of Christ extended from the time that He took upon Himself "the form of a servant", and extended to the time when He was the substitute and ransom for men.

Mr. Gibson would not consent merely to the passive obedience of Christ being imputed. He maintained that more was meant by "remission of sins" than merely baptismal regeneration, rather we are exhorted to "put on Christ".

The question was then put to the Assembly and carried.

Mr. Sedgwick failed to prevent the election of Mr. White to one of the Committees.

The Assembly then debated the phrase "by faith alone laid hold on".

Mr. Wilkinson wanted the addition of "and applied". He argued that this was the privilege of faith, and differentiated between the "knowledge of" and "application of" faith. Faith understood as knowledge was exercised by the devils, but it was faith as understood and applied by the individual conscience that distinguished the Christian.

Justification, he continued, was effectual in that it applied Christ's crucifixion to the conscience, which was necessary if "by faith alone" was to have any effect on the individual believer. This application was also necessary if the blood of Christ was to be effective "by faith" to the conscience. He then argued that as it is the heart of man laying hold on Christ by faith that brings home the work of Christ and makes it effective, then it was necessary to mention the application of the work of Christ. This for him was the main point, that faith's activity, rather than its simple intellectual action, should be included. To the objection that this made faith a function of both understanding and will, he retorted that faith was rather the function of the soul of man, of which will and understanding are only faculties.

Mr. Bayly contributed a number of points on the nature of justifying faith, to clarify the issue, then defined four areas for classification; types of faith, differences between the types, areas of agreement and the resolving of two questions.

There were, he said, three types of faith; general assenting

faith, special resting faith and particular applying faith. He said of the third type that some called it saving faith and justifying faith, but this he regarded as the source of the error. He went on to define these three types. General assenting faith, he said, was an acceptance of truth of scripture, because of God's authorship. Special resting faith he defined as that whereby we put our faith and trust in Christ to enjoy the benefits of His mediation. This, he believed, consisted of "believing in" as an act of confidence, which distinguished it from general assenting faith, which was simply to believe as an act of credence. As we lost all in Adam, so we gain all in Christ by exercising this special resting faith, thus making us the bride of Christ. Particular applying faith, he defined as that whereby the promises of Christ are appropriated by the believer. This he urged on the basis of Galatians 1:20, though he believed that this also encompassed the other types of faith. The differences between the types of faith could, he argued, be more easily seen when the object and subject of the faith was investigated.

In the first, the object was the word of God. In the second, Christ and His benefits. In the third, the promises of Christ were made into personal propositions, on the basis of the special resting faith, which saw Christ as the mediator between man and the ultimate God.

As to agreement between the three types, he believed the first to be the cause of the second, the second to be the ground of the third, and the third to presuppose both the first and the second. He went on to elaborate and suggested that in the elect, where the general assenting faith is made clear, it impresses itself upon the "practical understanding". The will, which he argued was the seat of the special resting faith, always

listened to the reason and dictate of the "practical understanding". He went on to argue that the special resting faith is the ground, not the cause of the particular applying faith, because those who rest on Christ have warrant to apply to themselves the promises of the gospel, whether they do it or not.

Having thus defined the objects of the three types of faith, he went on to deal with the subjects. The subject of general assenting faith was, he said, the understanding, of the special resting faith, the will, and of the particular applying faith, the conscience. It was the office of the understanding to accept the word of God; the will was linked to the understanding by a rational connection. The conscience he defined as the soul of man reflecting on itself, and it was to the conscience that all the promises were appropriated.

He then went on to deal with two questions.

The first one that he dealt with was, by which of the types of faith was a man saved? To this he answered that it was the special resting faith, though he admitted that the general assenting faith was also necessary. If it was alone responsible for our salvation then devils could also be saved, as they could exercise this type of faith. The particular applying faith, he pointed out, was designed to assure us of salvation, not to procure it.

He then went on to the second question: by which of the types of faith is a man justified? Again he answered that it was the special resting faith, which, he said, included justifying faith within itself as a part of it. He argued that we first believed in Christ that we might be justified, and that those who believed that the object of justification is God's pardoning sin are wrong, because justifying faith

goes before justification. Justifying faith, he added, involved "believing in" and not simply "believing".

He concluded by proposing a motion that there be a definition of the nature of justifying faith made, to prevent sincere Christians losing their assurance, and so falling into sin.

Mr. Gataker explained that both the word "applied" and the word "apprehended" had been rejected because of their ambiguity. He then went on to explain the steps that led to justifying faith.

First he insisted that there was nothing that we do that is necessary for our own justification. He then distinguished between faith and justifying faith. Faith as a "resting" while being connected to justifying faith was not the same as it. An atheist, he believed, might have some faith, but it was not a justifying faith.

Secondly, he said, belief or "assent" was necessary to justifying faith. This belief he thought possible for devils, but not atheists.

Thirdly he pointed out that there was the conditional application, whereby some men believed that if they fulfilled the same things that Christians did, then they too would be saved. This, he maintained, was done by reprobates. For salvation, however, it was necessary that they "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ".

Fourthly he explained fiducia which he defined as a "special resting" upon Christ. He argued that it was taught in Romans 10:<sup>9</sup>, where it occurred after a man's profession and is built upon it; again John 3:<sup>8</sup> and Romans 3:<sup>25</sup>.

He then dealt with the objection that "believing in" and "believing about" are really the same thing, by asserting with the Greek



that "believing in" could only be properly used in reference to God. He supported this by reference to Jonah 3:<sup>5</sup> where, he said, the men of Nineveh are said to have believed in God, which, he said, came after their repentance. He denied that it was a belief inspired merely by threats, but was the justifying faith which involved the will casting itself upon Christ.

Fifthly, he went on to advocate that there was a faith which acted as an assurance to the believer, that he had believed and was justified.

Sixthly, he concluded that assurance of faith came two steps after justifying faith and could not be said to be justifying faith.

He closed his remarks by saying that, having established the ambiguity of the word "application", it would be dangerous to include it in their revised Article.

Mr. Carter argued that the phrase under discussion made difference between "the act of faith" and "the habit of faith", and also pointed out that while the "act" implied "the habit", in children "the habit" often dominated. He went on to say that there was only a gradual difference between the act and the habit. The habit manifested itself in the believer by acting as a restraint on his behaviour. Though in the act of faith the believer is first of all passive, yet at the same time he is active in responding, though the response does not precede justification, it appears at that instant of time that they are both one.

He went on to assert that at the time of a man's justification, then he began to acquire the habit of faith. He also maintained that the habit of faith produced a union with God, as much as did the act of faith. He agreed that the habit of faith may be the condition of the new covenant,

though faith could in no way be seen as a condition of God's activity.

He went on to use Peter as an example to show that even in times of sin, when the act of faith was gone, then the habit of faith remained. Therefore he suggested the insertion of the phrase "received" as it was both the scriptural term used, and could be used of both the act and habit of faith.

Mr. Vines stressed that the habit of faith could never justify man. To make it so, he continued, implied that justification was given on the basis of some inherent quality in man. Rather he wanted habit to be understood only for what it was. Imputation of sin, he maintained, required an act on the part of men, and he advocated that this be shown in the Article by the inclusion of a scriptural term such as "received" or "apprehended".

Citing Acts 10:43, he claimed that this necessitated an active reception on the part of the individual, not a passive reception, but one which he likened to that reception extended in marriage on the part of a woman to a man.

Citing John 3:<sup>16,75</sup>, he sought to establish that there was in man a power to receive God's gifts. There was, he said, a potentia in the habit, but that is the power of faith, not of receiving Christ. Infants have this potentia, but he questioned their power of habitual faith. There existed, he maintained, the possibility of a union between Christ and us, because of the covenant. And this union is of the same nature as that which exists between the Son and the Father.

He concluded by saying that though we receive pardon, and are thus at that time pardoned, it does not mean that we are always pardoned of sins that follow afterwards. And as with marriage we are married

once and though we are not always marrying, but we are always married. So with justification, and thus we could not simply be justified by a habit.

Mr. Walker explained that his ideas of saving faith did not differ in their subject or object from what had already been said. He explained that for him assent of the will, as well as of the understanding, was required. The exercise of the will led to resting on the word of God and then to personal application.

Justification for him involved the remission of sins and being accounted righteous before God, and he maintained that the term could only properly be applied to things that concerned our justification. He distinguished this from the faith of the reprobate who, while he may have a faith, could never have a saving faith as this was the product of the Spirit of God; and then concluded by asserting the prior activity of God in any saving faith.

Mr. Palmer, seconded by Dr. Temple, urged that something be done to restore Dr. Burgess to the Assembly. Mr. Clayton added his support. Mr. Vines pointed out that it was outside the power of the Assembly to restore him. Dr. Temple explained that Dr. Burgess was guilty of petitioning Parliament, not dissenting from the Assembly decision. Dr. Smith proposed that if Dr. Burgess gave satisfaction, that every effort be made to restore him to the Assembly. Mr. Palmer, Dr. Temple and Mr. Vines were appointed to be a committee to draw up a presentation to the House of Commons on Dr. Burgess' behalf.

"And by faith alone laid hold upon."

Dr. Hoyle began by discussing the word "hold" in relation to faith. He cited a number of texts to elucidate its meaning, and then discussed its etymology. He suggested that faith as a hand was a useful metaphor, and then went on to discuss faith in its three parts: notitia, which he defined as "knowledge with the assent of the understanding; "act of will", which involved man in taking or accepting Christ; and fiducia, though he acknowledged that he was not clear whether it should be part of the definition, or be included as intellectually necessary. He argued from Augustine that knowledge is a constituent of faith, not just a consequence. He then informed the Assembly that "by works" had been added against Stapleton, who had said that works led to justification. He also said that there was no contradiction involved in saying that we are saved "by grace alone" and "by faith alone". He then attacked the idea that sins can be pardoned before they are committed.

The petition concerning Dr. Burgess was ordered to be presented the following morning.

Mr. Palmer summed up what had already been said:

1. it had been argued that the word "applied" should be added, but this had been shown to be ambiguous;
2. it had been argued that the object of special resting faith was the person of Christ;
3. there had been a desire to express something about the habit of faith in the Article;
4. there had been debate on how to distinguish justifying faith from the sort of faith that drunkards and others have, and whether the possession of the Spirit of God was the answer to this problem;
5. it had been debated whether or not justification came before or after believing;
6. and whether it came whilst there was still impenitence.

He then proposed that instead of just "by faith alone", "laid hold on" should be added. Then he repeated the revised phrase for inclusion within the Article; "when by his spirit workes true repentance and faith in us, by which faith alone we lay hold on Christ as our only saviour."

Dr. Gouge pointed out that it was dangerous to place repentance before faith.

Mr. Vines referred to dogmatic faith, the object of which is God, though he insisted that this was not justifying faith. The subject and seat of this is the intellect.

√The missing text obscures the meaning at this point.√

He went on to argue that this intellectual conviction should not be confused with faith as Christ did not always trust those who, scripture said, had "believed in His name", though he cited Calvin to prove that their faith was not simulated. He then spoke about the part played by fides temporari which he said came under the general heading of historical faith. It was, he said, given to apparently strong ground and was received with joy, nevertheless there followed a falling away. He did not see that such temporary faith should be made a distinct type of faith, for the faith was intentionally given only for a specific time. He also argued that there was no way of knowing that it was temporary until it had been lost, and then it would be obvious that as Christ had said "it had no root in Him". This type of faith has as its object the gospel, but involves believing in the historical facts about Christ, rather than in Christ Himself. He used the illustration of marriage to show that when a woman married a man it was not his status of wealth which she married, but rather the man himself. A woman may enjoy the status and wealth etc., and then deny the man, so in temporary faith.

He went on to assert that justifying faith was to be the basis for the habit of faith, which showed itself in various acts. He defined faith as an apprehending or "laying hold of" the object of which being, generally, the gospel and, specifically, Christ, who is the specific object, i.e. the basis of our righteousness, or of our being accounted righteous. The belief, he continued, was not, correctly speaking, intellectual assent, but also a union with Christ. He maintained that faith went before fiducia as "Faith is unto righteousness".

but he understood there would then be a problem in defining faith as a "resting". He resolved the difficulty by defining faith in terms of "a going out" to Christ, or "a laying hold on Christ", the seat of this being, as the scripture said, in the heart, which he took to mean the whole soul, citing Devenant as his authority.

He went on to speak about faith as a trust, especially in the Old Testament, where it did not always imply evidence, but always involved an assurance of the power and wisdom of God. He then distinguished between general and temporary faith, stressing that general faith involved more than just an evident truth. He went on to explain that the doctrine of justification and the habit of faith was of particular assurance and was opposed to the Papist doctrine. The habit of faith followed as a consequence of justification. He asserted this on the ground that we cannot know that we are justified until we have been justified and go on believing that we know that we are justified. This, he concluded, involved applying the promises concerning righteousness that Christ Himself had given.

Mr. Price spoke concerning justifying faith. He first of all defined its object, which lay generally in promise and specifically in the promise of Christ, as contained in scripture. Secondly he defined its nature as a "fiducial assent". In general, assent is required which is not only belief in Christ, but requires the specific uniting with Christ. Finally he dealt with the acts of justifying faith. He pointed out that a man may be justified and still be lacking in something. There is a dual action, primarily in receiving such things as justification and sanctification, and secondarily in working. Inwardly purifying yourself and outwardly doing acts of love.

Dr. Temple reaffirmed that fiducia or resting and relying was the justifying faith, though he did not ignore general assent or assurance. He stressed the need to confute Papists and Antinomians and also to assist those Christians who had been taught that faith is an assurance. Therefore he urged the inclusion of "laid hold on by faith" to show that the soul believes the truth of the gospel, casts itself on Christ for salvation, and then is obedient to His law.

Mr. Goodwin said that he wanted to find the best expression to define both the object and the act of justification. Concerning the object he said that he did not want to see a number of the phrases so far suggested included, as they did not sufficiently stress that the righteousness was always only belonging to Christ, and that the individual had only that which was imputed to him. This came as a result of the absolute obedience of Christ, which resembled that of a sinner.

He went on to deal with the act of faith, suggesting that there was no way to differentiate between the acts of temporary and permanent faith, because the difference lay in the "spiritualness" of the act. The best way to express it, he advised, was in scriptural phrases. Having said this he went on to assert that the act was of the will, and it was this ability to respond to Christ that separated men from angels, and also enabled him to trust and rely on Christ. He went on to substantiate this by appealing to instances in scripture which were used to argue for "general faith", from which he showed that they all referred to applications of the will. In commenting on Romans 10:<sup>9</sup> he argued that belief involved an act of will as well as of understanding, and in 1 John 5:<sup>10</sup> it is the act of will, he suggested, that men had to apply. Indeed he argued that where the scripture used phrases such as "coming



to Christ", this involved the will. He went on to cite "Christ with His righteousness being apprehended and rested on for salvation" which, he said, should be included within the Article as meaning "trusted in only by faith for salvation".

Dr. Smith stressed the fact that God's imputation of righteousness must be met by some human response. He then explained that "imputation" was a technical term employed by accountants as that giving account of their stewardship. It is this meaning, he argued, that is found in Romans 8:<sup>18</sup> where the "afflictions of this life" are referred to, though Paul knew also the glory of heaven. It is this point that he argued should be taken note of when the Article is framed, the whole obedience of Christ which is laid hold upon. He cited a verse from Proverbs 4:<sup>7</sup> in which the fear of the Lord is maintained as the beginning of all wisdom.

Mr. Chambers accepted that Christ was the object of justifying faith, though as mediator, and not the final object. Referring to 1 Peter 1:<sup>21</sup> he suggested that the Article should have some reference to the mercy of God. Mr. Hericke suggested the words "trust" and "stay" be included as they were used in scripture. Mr. Wilkinson (Sen.) wanted the inclusion of the word "application" because he believed it was the application of the blood of Christ to the conscience that was the most effective remedy to spiritual distress, and therefore of great moment.

The Prolocutor was opposed to the idea that our relying on Christ preceded justification. He supported his position by an illustration. If reliance on Christ were seen as a hand, and we hold up our hand to receive this hand, then the sense of "free mercy" being

offered and responded to is safeguarded. If our relying is attributed to an act of grace, then we see God's love towards us. If we see that sanctification is a product of God's grace following after justification, then we see that God's gift is that of a friend and not of an enemy.

He answered the question -- by which faith was Paul justified? -- by referring to Galatians 2:<sup>20</sup>, supporting this with a citation from Melancthon, in which was involved the remission of sins. Accepting that justification preceded sanctification, he expounded Calvin's view that fiducia in this context is a product of faith. In weaker Christians much distress may be seen in their spiritual lives unless help is given to them; in this way they are strengthened.

He then raised two questions; whether reliance on Christ is a work of grace, or of flesh, and if it be of grace, is it bestowed by a friendly or angry God? In answer to these questions he posed a further question of how anybody could call God "Father" if he did not believe it to be true, thus he established the relationship between God and Man.

Mr. Walker then supported the inclusion of the word "application" though Dr. Stanton stressed that "free grace" is the principal object of justification and should therefore be included in the definition. Mr. Palmer denied this, arguing that while scripture said that love lies behind our faith, it nowhere attributes faith to the mercy of God.

Mr. Palmer proposed that a condemnation of the Antinomian concept of repentance be included in the Article. Dr. Gouge thought it would be better reserved for the aspersions. Mr. Bayly seconded Mr. Palmer and explained that he wanted a marginal note made that God only justifies sinners who repent. He went on to ask that a second marginal note be included which explained that "by faith" referred to justifying faith which involved resting upon Christ for righteousness and remission of sins. He said that this was necessary because of the diversity of the use of the word faith which often confused Christians, and suggested that it would be a good method of correcting the false teaching that was found in various popular catechisms.

Mr. Vines urged that the confutation of heresy be undertaken by the Assembly as a whole, not just a sub-committee. Dr. Gouge agreed that the matter would best be dealt with in immediate discussion. Mr. Palmer, however, objected that the consultation of books would be needed and therefore a sub-committee would be a far better place to undertake this. Mr. Rouse further suggested that as the London ministers had had the most dealing with the heresy then they were the ones best able to deal with it. Mr. Gataker urged that as the problem was of great urgency then the full Assembly should deal with it before it spread.

Mr. Goodwin suggested that a few members be delegated to precis the discussions of the Assembly and present them to the House of Commons. He further suggested that a committee be instructed to look into the Antinomian allegations presented by Mr. Rouse, and also to compare Antinomian teaching as found in the books of Antinomians with Scripture and the Articles of faith, and then to report to the full Assembly.

A number of delegates were then instructed to meet that day at 2.00p.m. at the Dean's House.

Dr. Gouge objected that aspersions had been cast on William Perkins, who was accused of contradicting himself.

Dr. Hoyle said that Mr. Pierson had told him that he regarded the phrase "full assurance" as excessive. Mr. Bayly, while he stressed his regard for Perkins, produced his evidence to support his suggestion that Perkins had contradicted himself.

Mr. Palmer said that he had received a motion which wanted repentance to be expressed in the Article. Mr. Goodwin did not think that the Assembly would want to enter into debate as to whether repentance came before or after faith. Though he said that Augustine excluded repentance from faith as they had defined it.

Mr. Gataker sought to distinguish between repentance and remission, though he did not want to do so by arguing that one was prior to the other in terms of time. Nor did he believe that they were different in nature, as both were involved in the doctrine of regeneration. He argued that by the satisfaction of Christ the mind is enlightened and the will is healed and enabled to do what is required of it by God.

He cited Matthew 21:<sup>31-37</sup>, where he argued repentance from disbelief and belief in a positive sense were combined, and should not be separated. He drew the analogy with thunder and lightning, pointing out that while they were both together, one was seen before the other, so, while repentance and belief went together, often repentance was noticed before belief. He further sought to distinguish between that repentance which brought about remission of sins when somebody had already

been justified and is no longer under the condemnation or power of the law; and repentance before the act of justification. For, he argued, that although a man may be justified he may still need remission of sins.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 56

The Prolocutor opened the session by welcoming the Scottish Commissioners to the Assembly. He stressed the unity of faith that existed between the two nations and looked to the Scots to provide help in the task of reforming the Church of England. He made mention of the fact that the Scots could provide better help than some sons of England, and he looked to the Scottish church to provide an example in matters of doctrine, worship and discipline.

Dr. Hoyle went on to outline the unity of the churches in Christ and emphasised the fact that those churches that God had prospered were those that had left the Roman church, and had followed the way of the word of God. He cited Calvin as supporting this thesis, and the Scottish church as an example of one of those churches so prospered. The way in which reformation should be undertaken was exemplified by the German churches where the principle had been for the bad to be cast out, rather than for the good to add themselves to the bad. He then thanked the Scots for attending the Assembly, and showed from classical history that there were abundant precedents for one nation seeking aid from another. In the case of the Scots any aid given was reinforced by the unity of being of one island, one language and one faith. He concluded that as the Scots came as helpers, and not as betrayers, they were the more welcome. Mr. Case then seconded all that had been said and expressed his confidence that God would bless the joint work of the two nations. He produced various texts to encourage the Assembly to zeal and loyalty to God's word. In this way he saw the compassion of the Scots bearing real fruit.

Mr. Henderson then responded for the Scottish Commissioners

explaining that the Scots had been encouraged before they came to see such an Assembly meeting and that they were even more impressed having attended some of its debates. He also expressed his confidence in the power of God to bring the nation through the difficult days, even as He had helped His people in the past. He assured the Assembly that in any such work of reformation they could count on the good offices of the Church of Scotland. He referred to the overtures that Scotland had made to the king, all of which he had rejected, but now it was God that had overruled. He took as a sign of this blessing of God, the fact that there was so much opposition to the meeting of the Assembly. He also mentioned the Covenant that had sealed the two nations in the work of God, and which he saw as having the double purpose of delivering the church and kingdom, and of preserving the king. Mr. White wished the phrase "against the common enemy" entered in the covenant, but Mr. Gataker said that the wording had already been discussed and that to scruple now at it could not be permitted. Mr. Goodwin spoke and was then followed by Mr. Nye who reminded the Assembly that they should speak with due reverence when they spoke about a sister church.

Mr. Gataker then returned to the debate on the nature of justification, using Psalm 32 and Romans 3 as the basis of his discussion. He began by pointing out that the apostle was not attempting to define justification. He posited a division between remission of sins and justification as being of different natures. He then sought to define pardon as freedom from the penalty of sin, which is consequent on the justification of a sinner by an act of God's free grace. He emphasised that Paul was establishing a connection between pardon and justification, pardon being the consequence of justification. Thus man is unable to

lay claim to having done or deserved anything as is shown in the fact that even Abraham was unable to rejoice in his own activity. Justification thus lies with God as it involves remission and non-imputation of sins, and can thus in no sense be regarded as a work. He drew examples from Abraham and David showing that they were unable to glory in their own works. Both these examples confirmed that by believing, and not by working, is faith imputed as righteousness, and that anyone who claimed to have been justified as a result of his works, is not justified at all. This he maintained incontrovertibly established that justification was not a product of man's works.

Dr. Burgess then explained that the House of Commons had forgiven his actions over the signing of the Covenant, and had allowed him to enter the Assembly again. He explained that any cause for grievance had been removed and that he had given satisfaction to Parliament, which had seen fit to restore him.

Mr. Seaman asserted that the apostle had expounded sanctification and glorification in the fifth chapter of Romans. Mr. Hearle objected that the word "freely" had been left out of the Article, and that it was important, as it opposed the Papists.

Mr. Goodwin defended the idea that justification came from God and the emphasis should be to defend the Divine initiative in the sending of the Holy Spirit, rather than the reception of the Spirit by men.

Mr. Vines stressed the connection between justification and regeneration as being immediate to the point of being one and the same thing.

Mr. Bathurst referred to the part of the Article which referred to Christ as saviour.



ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 57

Dr. Featley opened the session by observing that there was both supposition and proposition to be found in the Article. Mr. Walker argued that texts previously presented proved the truth of the Article. He said that because Christ is spoken of as righteous then it followed that He had made satisfaction for sin, and that the same thing is imputed to us as was imputed to Abraham. He then asked how we could claim God as our reward except in Christ. Mr. Ratner said that Romans 4:<sup>5</sup> proved the imputation of righteousness, but that other texts would be needed to show the source of that righteousness. Dr. Hoyle contended that obedience and righteousness were synonymous.

Dr. Burgess pointed out that some argued that Romans 4 proved that it was faith which was imputed as righteousness. Dr. Hoyle, while admitting that there was a link between faith and righteousness, warned that to make them synonymous was to risk making faith a work.

Mr. Palmer objected to the suggested order in which proofs were presented, and urged that they begin with obedience.

Dr. Smith claimed that the righteousness proved from Romans 4 was both active and passive obedience. Dr. Hoyle said that Philippians 3:<sup>9</sup> removed all doubt. Mr. Calamy agreed that righteousness was imputed as he did not believe that faith properly understood could be imputed, because it would mean we were then justified by an inherent righteousness. Such a position allowed no room for the doctrine of election, he asserted. It would also mean that our justification was provided by an imperfect self that was in need of justification.

Dr. Smith, while agreeing, did not think that it was pertinent, rather he cited Romans 4:<sup>24</sup> as making a valid answer to any objections.

Mr. Goodwin wanted to begin with Romans 5:<sup>18-19</sup>, while Mr. Phanell wanted to add Romans 5:<sup>9</sup> to these.

Mr. Goodwin also wanted Romans 5:<sup>17</sup> to be reviewed because he thought the whole set of texts dealt with a comparison of Adam's sin with Christ's obedience. From these verses he suggested that the merit and efficacy of Christ's obedience were immediately observable. And that while Adam only transmitted one sin, the obedience of Christ saved many men from many sins. Also he thought that the verses show the extent of what is meant by full satisfaction. He drew an analogy with the bread left over after Christ had fed the multitude, asserting that there was a superfluity of righteousness as great as the remainder of the bread. He concluded that if men were made more abundantly righteous in the second Adam, it was because the obedience of Christ was both active and passive. Dr. Smith objected that these questions had already been dealt with and that the proper order should be kept to. He maintained that if the places produced were sufficient, then no more were needed. As to Romans 5:<sup>5</sup>, he did not believe that it spoke of an abundance of grace, but rather the acts of God.

Mr. Gataker objected that the Greek word for righteousness had other senses than the one employed by the Assembly. Also he asserted that the word obedience comprehended both active and passive.

From Hebrews 5:<sup>7</sup> he argued that Christ's obedience was "to death and suffering" and from Romans 3:<sup>25</sup>, that we are justified by His blood. The ground of our justification being the blood of Christ, it would be superfluous, he said, to find another ground in the verses following. Having thus established that the ground of justification lay in Christ's obedience to death, he argued that it was not sufficient to say that the

the obedience "may" be taken to be whole obedience, but rather it should be insisted upon.

Mr. Walker cited Romans 5 as sufficient argument. Dr. Featley pointed out that dicalomai /sic/ was never used to mean making amends between parties, nor, he said, was Aristotle's method the best one to use in the interpretation of scripture. Dr. Hoyle said he could allow no restrictions on the obedience to death. Mr. Bathurst insisted that the simple sense of the word was a general principle of interpretation. In the case of obedience the plain meaning was active obedience. In the case of righteousness, the plain meaning was the conformity of action to law. The definitions should, he asserted, be the ones that were held to, unless they impinged upon the work of Christ.

Mr. Goodwin, citing Philippians 2:<sup>8</sup> and Hebrews 5:<sup>8</sup>, maintained that the obedience of Christ was lifelong and not just in His last sufferings, and, further, he suggested, that His whole life was one of suffering. If he had not suffered all His life in active obedience, how could He have any merit.

He drew an analogy with Jeremiah to show that it was the sufferings of his youth that prepared him for his final sufferings. He then drew two points from his texts; that God had ordained that Christ's obedience should be active, through suffering, and even in this suffering which led to death, His obedience was active, as He displayed His patience in silence. Though he agreed that Christ's obedience was necessarily both active and passive, as He was the perfect saviour, he observed that His example should promote obedience.

Dr. Burgess said that one question remained unanswered. If Christ's blood was sufficient for justification, what need was there for

anything further? He answered this by referring to Romans 5:<sup>9,11</sup>, where, he argued, that "not only so" denied that justification came exclusively by the blood. This, he said, made room for the benefits of the active work of Christ.

Mr. Vines defined obedience as answering to a covenant, and pointed out that it was binding on the church as well as Christ, because Christ Himself had foretold His future rule after the time of Antichrist.

Mr. Palmer argued that synecdoche must be made use of where one thing is mentioned it should not be taken to mean that another is not implied as well.

Mr. Goodwin asserted on the basis of Hebrews 5:<sup>8</sup> that Christ offered up an active obedience to God, and that He learned, as a result of His sufferings, a more intense obedience.

Mr. Gataker accepted the point about synecdoche.

Mr. Wilson quoted scriptures to establish that both hearing and suffering were involved in the obedience of Christ. Thus, he said, this suggested that both active and passive obedience were required. Christ was, he said, actively obedient before His death, in His role as a servant.

Mr. Gataker affirmed that the ransom was Christ's blood, and pointed out that there were no scriptural references which claimed that the obedience of Christ was the same thing as ransom. He further asserted that as the apostle had previously established the ground of justification, there was no need to try and find any other; the first having secured for men the righteousness of God.

Mr. Walker said that he had answered all the objections before.

Dr. Hoyle said that the passive work of Christ was found in

the fifth chapter of Romans, but that other texts had to be adduced to assert the active work. If the active obedience were to be found in the chapter then it would be sufficient, though he appears to have wanted to warn the Assembly that to allow this was to allow that God imputed righteousness on the basis of something other than the blood of Christ.

Mr. Bathurst reminded the Assembly of the essential integrity of the epistle.

Mr. Vines suggested that "faith imputed as righteousness" might contain the answer to some of the difficulties. He adduced scripture to show that a man would be accounted as righteous by believing. He then raised the question of the nature of righteousness. He concluded by affirming that he believed that God accounted men as righteous on the basis of their justification, not on the basis of their faith, because he believed that God only imputed what He had received atonement for.

Mr. Hearle wanted to add Isaiah 53:<sup>11</sup> as proof of "satisfaction".

Mr. Gataker raised the difficulty of 2 Corinthians 5:<sup>21</sup> where he did not know whether to translate "sin" as "sin" or as "sinner" because, properly speaking, Christ died to justify sinners, not their sin.

Mr. Case felt that the passage held out more than that Christ was just a sin offering, for Christ was not a sinner in that He did not commit any sins, yet He was "made sin for our sakes", in the same way we are made righteous. Mr. Walker agreed that He was a sin offering. Mr. Seaman pointed out that Beza had originally given such an interpretation and then changed it to maintain that Christ was made sin in the

same way that men are made righteous. Mr. Wilkinson said that in this he was following Augustine. Dr. Hoyle agreed that many fathers accepted that it was a sin offering, but he raised a difficulty concerning the reconciliation of this idea, and that of imputation.

Prolocutor allowed Mr. Palmer to speak on his addition to the 11th. Article.

Mr. Seaman then suggested an addition on the nature of justifying faith.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 58

The Assembly decided that each of the two assessors should take turns in chairing the sessions in the absence of the Prolocutor.

Mr. Hearle wanted to discuss the meaning of the word "wholesome". Mr. Gataker said it referred to true teaching, rather than comfortable teaching. Mr. Wilson pointed out that the epistles were written to bring truth and comfort to the congregations. Mr. Palmer added that the word "wholesome" must refer to the effect any teaching had, rather than simply its truth content. He also lamented the absence of a doctrine of necessary repentance before any remission of sin, and urged the Assembly to remedy the omission.

Mr. Case pointed out that this lay within the nature of justification, and a new Article on this subject had already been proposed. Dr. Temple urged that this should not inhibit mention of repentance in other Articles. Mr. Herricke objected that repentance was comprehended within the doctrine of sanctification and it was improper to include it within the doctrine of justification.

Dr. Gouge pointed out that as long as they did not change the substance of the Articles already voted on, they could add to them. Mr. Gataker thought that the next Article would be the best place to deal with the nature of justifying faith. He reiterated that there was no scriptural warrant to assert that repentance had any influence on justification. Mr. Coleman suggested a committee to deal with the problem, and was supported by Mr. Case.

Dr. Gouge objected that they were not allowed to compose new Articles. Mr. Wilkinson suggested two or three members to prepare another Article. Dr. Smith suggested that a conclusion be added to

any new Article, in which comfort for penitents should be included. He also suggested that it was a suitable point to include the work of the Holy Spirit.

Mr. Vines pointed out that the purpose of the Article was not to bring in all possible doctrines, but he suggested they should warn the ungodly man of what he lacked. Mr. Tuckney added that in the justified man there was always repentance, though not always the immediate witness of the Spirit.

Mr. Palmer, Mr. Gamer and Mr. Vines were elected as a committee to produce an addition on the nature of faith and repentance. Also they were charged to see if there was anything in the "Homily's" that could help with the problem.

Mr. Goodwin warned of the danger of not allowing the remission of sin until a man repented. But also warned of those who would accuse of Popery anything that appeared to make remission dependent upon a work of man. He then told the Assembly that he believed faith and repentance to be the condition for justification, and to be so intimately connected that belief without repentance would avail the sinner nothing. Mr. Gataker believed that regenerate men would always be repentant, as it was the sign of their understanding the gravity and full implications of their sin. Mr. Goodwin reiterated his opposition to anything that made justification dependent upon a work of man.

Dr. Hoyle asked for clarification as to what sort of repentance preceded faith. Mr. Palmer adduced various texts to show that men should not continue in sin and used the example of Solomon to establish that mere confession, even of Christ, did not avail a man who persisted in his sin.



Mr. Vines accepted that justification came instantly upon believing and was opposed to the idea that justification depended upon repentance.

Mr. Palmer replied that the motions for new Articles were unnecessary as the Assembly still had liberty to change the Articles as it wished. His understanding of the debate led him to believe that what was needed was another term to encapsulate the point that a man like king Herod needed to repent of his sins before he could believe or be justified. He then considered some alternative phrases - "evangelical repentance" - but decided that all repentance was by nature evangelical. Then "the Law" - but decided that this implied a covenant of works which precluded any repentance. He also pointed out that the positive function of the law was to provoke sorrow in the lawbreaker, and to demand repentance for failure to maintain its precepts. This was, however, something other, and less, than the grace of Christ. He concluded that a man must recognise his actions to be sinful, as judged by an absolute standard, and to be brought to repentance.

Mr. Herricke objected that to assert that repentance go before remission of sin was both heretical and dangerous.

The reports on the 12th. and 13th. Articles were read and an alteration made in the 13th. Dr. Stanton and Mr. Valantine proposed word alterations.

Mr. Vines warned of the danger of neglecting present responsibilities by following questions that were not of present relevance.

At another point he spoke of those who mistakenly believed themselves Christians.

Mr. Hearle accepted that what was proposed was against the Antinomians. He also spoke of the antiquity of some of the wording in the Homilies. He concluded that the confession was an important work which demanded care.

Dr. Burgess urged caution as a scriptural principle, since men could abuse true doctrine only to their own damnation.

Mr. Case suggested that the newly proposed Article would be the proper place for the doctrine propounded.

Mr. Goodwin made the point that the words of the Homily had been departed from.

A committee was appointed to draw up a draft Article.

The Twelfth Article was accepted.

The report on the 16th. Article was read.

Mr. Gataker proposed that the last two Articles should be given to the two committees who were now without any work. This was accepted, and the 18th. and 19th. Articles were given to the committees and times and venues were made for their meetings. It was also decided that a report on faith and repentance be prepared and that the committee should consider the case for a new Article.

The debate on the 12th. Article was then opened by Mr. Herricke who claimed that faith is a good work and could not therefore be a fountain of good works. Mr. Wilkinson took issue with him on the ground that faith was one of the bonds which tied a man to Christ, and as such could be a principle from which good works grew. He supplemented this argument by asserting that faith and good works were both commanded by scripture, and were linked with the blood of Christ.

He maintained that faith was the first link with Christ, as it was the channel of grace by which men first laid hold of His sacrifice, and rested in Him.

Mr. Seaman explained that good works were sometimes understood as internal acts of obedience, and at other times as external proofs of faith. With any division between faith and works, works are seen as the product of faith. He supported his assertion by citing a text from Galatians where certain works are taken as the fruits of faith.

Mr. Vines maintained that faith activates latent graces within, and so combines to produce both evangelical confession and gracious good works. Mr. Walker affirmed that all good acts are initiated by the Spirit of God.

Mr. Bathurst feared that it cast some shadow on the Spirit of God.

Mr. Herricke voiced a general opinion that it was unsound to suggest that faith was the root of grace. Mr. Hearle reiterated that he did not believe that there was any justification in the context of the Article under discussion, to describe faith as the root of grace. Then he adduced a text to support his assertion that faith was the fountain of good works. Dr. Featley raised the question as to whether faith was the immediate cause of the good works or the mediating channel of grace.

Dr. Burgess maintained the distinction between faith, regeneration and sanctification. He regarded faith along with repentance as that which prepared the soul. Faith drew virtue from Christ, and, paradoxically, is that which first makes a man move towards God, and also that which makes love become active. He concluded that faith works by love and that God works by faith.

Mr. Gataker disagreed, believing that faith was an observable sign of sanctification. He argued that grace in man before the Fall consisted of conformity to God, and dependence upon Him, but that sin had changed this.

Mr. Hearle distinguished faith as the instrument of regeneration, from the first cause. Mr. Hall confirmed this though he added that it had also been a command.

The report from the committee on Antinomianism was read.

Dr. Temple asked, in the light of the danger from this source, if there were not more recommendations that could be made to the House of Commons. He then listed some of their wrong teachings. He saw

these ideas striking both at the power of the civil authority and at the doctrine of free grace. He regarded as a duty to defend the honour of God, even in adverse circumstances.

It was then ordered that the committee consider Dr. Temple's reasons and submit some draft to the Assembly.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES ~ SESSION 60

Held on September 21st, in the morning  
admitted Mr. Maynard as a member of the  
Assembly.

No debate is recorded.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 61

Held on September 21st., in the afternoon.

Text of the debates missing from

Manuscript Minutes.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 62

After the presentation of the report on the Antinomians, Mr. Selden informed the Assembly that the House of Commons intended to act, not only against the views presented in the Antinomian writings, but also against those who held these views. He pointed out that Parliament could act against those clerics who held the Antinomian position by refusing preferment within the church, but that this could only be done in accordance with the law, and the Antinomians could be charged only if they were proved to have been guilty of immorality or heresy. If the House of Commons was to proceed against the men then the Assembly would need to substantiate its accusations of heresy.

Dr. Burgess warned the Assembly that they would need to be clear in their presentation of the case and avoid using terms that would not be understood other than in the Assembly itself. Mr. Selden added a further warning to the divines that they should not simply seek to adduce passages from books of their opponents that were out of context, just to procure their condemnation, for this, he maintained, was an idolatrous approach.

Mr. Hearle warned of the danger of judging heresy on too narrow criteria, and adduced from the example of the Galatian church that a position could be erroneous without being heretical. He argued that there was a difference between schism and heresy; the first merely divided the schismatics from the rest of the believers, the second divided the heretics from God Himself. He asserted that the doctrine of the sacrificial death of Christ effecting full salvation should properly be the test of heresy. On this test, he maintained, the Roman Church was seen to be heretical. He then catalogued various positions



which he believed were contraverted by the Antinomians.

Dr. Temple stressed the importance of such work, and wanted to urge Parliament to make punishable anything that attacked the new covenant, for such he regarded as heretical.

Mr. Gataker wanted to make a distinction between that which men called heresy and that which was so designated by scripture. On the basis of his exegesis of Acts 24:<sup>5</sup> he maintained that there was no difference between schism and heresy, as they were inter-related. He suggested that it was easy to prove the Antinomians factious and, therefore, heretical. He then attempted to assess heresy as legally defined, and showed how difficult this was, as there was a debate as to the right to burn anybody for heresy. He concluded that there was a discrepancy between legal and scriptural definition of heresy. He did not, however, regard the new covenant as coming within the injunction on heresy.

Dr. Hoyle reminded the Assembly of the heresies condemned by the sixth general council of the church, which included Antinomianism. Though Mr. Calamy reminded the Assembly that error was not necessarily heresy.

Mr. Goodwin, one of the committee on Antinomianism, told the Assembly that he was opposed to giving the heretics the right to speak or propound their views, but that he did not think that it was the right of the Assembly to punish them, though he acknowledged the right of Parliament to do so. He reminded the Assembly that the heretics should rather be convinced of their error than punished because of it. He argued that the magistrate had the power of discipline in ecclesiastical affairs, whereas the church was paramount in spiritual.

affairs, and that excommunication should only be used if the church failed to convince the heretic of error, as the bringing about of repentance was the first desire of the church. He suggested that this principle could be applied by Parliament before punishing any offenders.

Mr. Palmer pointed out that their interest in the matter stemmed from their consideration of the seventh Article, and suggested that there was no other way to proceed, except against them. Mr. Walker added that it was easy to convict them of heresy.

Mr. Seaman thought it a strange thing to argue that magistrates and Parliament should take their pattern of action from the example of the church, especially if they had to suspend their judgements until the offenders had been afforded a second opportunity to repent. Mr. Goodwin responded that this was not his intention, but that if they sought the advice of the church, then the church was bound by scripture, and could only expound what scripture laid down.

Mr. Arrowsmith objected that not to deal harshly with the heretics was to foster the heresy, as it acted as a leaven amongst the truth, and corrupted men's minds. He suggested following the Jewish example of having three levels of punishment; "inquisitic", "extermination", and "execration". He also maintained that there was abundant evidence to obtain conviction. Though he wanted to defer discussion and condemnation until the books had been examined.

Dr. Burgess thought that there should be immediate punishment, though he stressed that he did not know of any member of the Assembly that he regarded as guilty.

Mr. Herricke wanted to be further convinced as to the difference between error and truth, and also to distinguish heresy from disagreement

amongst men on spiritual matters. Mr. Seaman also warned of precipitate action, adding that the church should take the spirit of meekness exemplified by Christ as its pattern, and not always act as offended brothers. He also wanted to distinguish between private and public activity.

Mr. Goodwin reminded the Assembly of the duty of prior admonition.

It was resolved then to send to the House of Commons a copy of the reason for condemnation of certain of the books of the Antinomians, and to assure the House that they would continue in their investigations.

It was agreed that this should be done the following day.

Held on September 25th., appointed an order of service and participants for a service with the House of Commons in St. Margaret's.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 64

The Assembly welcomed the return of a Parliamentary General.

Then Dr. Gouge proposed that the members of the Assembly should undertake to explain any absence from the Assembly. Mr. Gataker apologised for his failings and offered his room to anybody who was more able.

Mr. Soleway argued that anybody who came late should be regarded as not being present at all. Mr. Seaman stressed that the Assembly should be well attended if it was to work efficiently. He then suggested that the Assembly should meet at 9.00a.m. and go on until 2.00p.m., Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Full meetings with the various committees of the Assembly were held Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Dr. Burgess expressed the hope that members would curtail their preaching in order to attend the Assembly.

It was then suggested and accepted that Mr. Gataker and Mr. Wilkinson should be excused if they were unable to attend.

Mr. Palmer seconded everything that had previously been said. Mr. Hearle supplemented suggestions by adding that daily scribal records of attendance should be submitted regularly to Parliament. This was accepted. Mr. Seaman complained that the Assembly did not meet enough. He also suggested that committees were too large, and that their work could as well be done by 4 as 24. This was seconded by Mr. Goodwin, who asked for less sessions, but that there should be greater preparation. Also he wanted more convenient times instituted; as a result of which the Assembly was ordered to meet at 10.00a.m., and that those absenting themselves should give their reasons to the other members.

The Assembly also resolved that anybody seeking to have his

name entered on the roll of plundered ministers should first have been subjected to an examination by the Assembly, and one of its committees, such examinations to take place at 9.00a.m., and a certificate to then be presented to the House of Commons.

A committee was then appointed to prepare new rules for the Assembly proceedings.

It was further decided that Mr. Palmer should be added to the committee to deal with the Scottish Commissioners, and that this committee be empowered to receive all relevant papers.

Mr. Francis Warham's name was then submitted as one to be examined the next day.

Mr. Carter then signed the Covenant.

Held on September 29th., at which a number of delegates who had not subscribed to the Covenant, did so. Also new members were appointed to serve on the committee to draw up a petition against the Antinomians. Two ministerial appointments to the counties of Essex and Kent were approved.

The debate on page two centred around Job chapter 9 with Mr. Bridge arguing that man's own injustice was the cause of his position before God. Mr. Walker maintained that Job did not attempt to justify himself on the basis of his own righteousness. Dr. Hoyle added a text to the debate. Mr. Seaman argued that the texts he cited summed up the argument with God. Because of God's dealings with His people, Job believed that even if he were righteous, none the less it was God's right to do as He wished, and that God acted under no constraints save that of His own will, and it was on this basis that all His judgements and afflictions came to men. Job realised this, whereas his friends did not, and so he was able to wait patiently for the last judgement.

Mr. Coleman stressed that Job did not ever appeal to his own righteousness even though that appeared to be the teaching of the twelfth and thirteenth chapters.

Mr. Calamy disregarded the question of Job and stated that only two alternatives were possible on the question of sanctified good works; either God accepted Christ whose obedience had perfected our works, or God had accepted our imperfect works on the basis of Christ's merit. He returned to the topic after Hoyle had spoken, and argued that Christ's merit must have perfected our good works. He cited a Dr. Taylor who had been attacked for accepting this view, and concluded that it was an attack on the justice of God to imagine that He could accept anything that was imperfect.

Mr. Wilkinson suggested further texts for discussion. They were, however, rejected.

Mr. Calamy moved that the additions be accepted. He maintained



that good works on their own could never stand before God's righteousness, and even though presented by Christ, if they were imperfect, they would be rejected.

Mr. Case accepted the motion, because he believed that for God to accept imperfect works implied a two-fold justification where both the sinner and his acts were justified and he believed that such a division served only to belittle the righteousness of Christ. Mr. Walker objected that there could be no sense of belittlement in saying that Christ's righteousness was sufficient to cover the sinner and his sins.

Dr. Hoyle repeated the alternatives.

Mr. Hearle argued that it was necessary to say that Christ justified our works because the Antinomians claimed that while God knew sins to be sins, He chose not to see them, whereas the position being advocated contraverted this by asserting that though before our justification our acts were sins and could not bear the scrutiny of God, now even these were justified.

Mr. Gataker argued that any acts prompted by the Spirit of God would be acceptable to Him. Mr. Herricke corrected this by adding that God's Spirit both promotes acts and also sanctifies habits in all His work.

Mr. Walker said that all acts performed by faith pleased God.

Mr. Woodcocke asked how works were complete in Christ, whether it was by forgiving or perfecting the imperfections.

After Mr. Bridge, Mr. Gataker and Mr. Walker had spoken, Mr. Herricke accused the argument employed of being "popish". Dr. Gouge felt the Antinomians could rejoice if it was accepted that the works of

Christians were unable to stand the scrutiny of God because of their imperfections. Mr. Hearle said that the first alternative did not sufficiently oppose the Antinomians as they agreed that good works were not sufficient for salvation, though he thought that the Assembly was providing a basis for justified works to be a plea for salvation.

Mr. Seaman said that if our works are justified by a two-fold act of God in the single act of Christ's death, then this surely was sufficient. Agreeing that the standing definitions were inadequate to meet the Antinomian position, Mr. Goodwin suggested that the solution was to add that God sees all good works as imperfect. Mr. Bridge asked if the subject did not warrant further discussion.

Mr. Hearle disputed that faith flows from any instrument, and he said that in this case faith was the instrument. Mr. Goodwin agreed that faith was the instrument of justification but did not see that it precluded the possibility of it being the root of sanctification. He then adduced texts to support this thesis. Mr. Hearle retorted that faith was the means of our abiding in Christ and, as He was the root, it was impossible to suggest that faith could be the root, even of good works.

Mr. Arrowsmith said that faith could be called the root of good works in a secondary sense, in the same way that the apostle was called the foundation of the church. Without faith nothing was possible, as without faith nobody could have any part of Christ. Mr. Carter added that if faith could be called the root, Christ could be called "the Rock".

Dr. Hoyle, in warning against abusing the use of metaphor, pointed out that Paul had spoken of rooting in both faith and love,

and that arguments against one could as easily be applied against the other.

Dr. Burgess thought the suggested phrase was good and made clear the fact that all works are accepted by God through Christ, but flow from faith.

Mr. Calamy said that this was the position of the committee, though they also believed that all faith exhibited itself in good works. Mr. Catakter commented that this made faith a working grace. Mr. Hearle remained unhappy.

Mr. Price suggested a text to prove the assertion. Mr. Herricke said that both Balasam and Judas could have exhibited the marks of faith and that this did not prove anything. Mr. Goodwin explained that obviously true faith was referred to. He also explained that Paul in 2 Corinthians 3:<sup>5</sup> was not attempting to show how faith produces good works, but having spoken he explained his motivation and action. Mr. Woodcocke defined knowledge as having some ideas about God without being in a saving relationship to Him.

Mr. Seaman said that good works were evidence of faith to both God and man. Mr. Goodwin added that God knew the real fruit. Mr. Walker then introduced Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac as an example of a work which evidenced faith. Mr. Price drew the distinction between professing and true Christians.

Mr. Arrowsmith explained that he understood "by works made perfect" to mean that by good works men knew that you had been made perfect in Christ. Mr. Gibson said that it was easier to know who did not have faith than to know those who did.

Mr. Woodcocke disagreed, but Dr. Burgess retorted that those

who disputed that, would soon dispute that Christians could be known by their actions. Mr. Woodcocke objected that in its context Christ was only referring to prophets. Dr. Burgess agreed with him, but maintained that it was true as a general principle, and if a prophet was known by his sound doctrine, then a Christian was known by his good works. Mr. Palmer supported this with texts.

Mr. Seaman called the Assembly back to its original question.

Mr. Goodwin said that he understood that some men scrupled to say that signs could be taken as the proof of faith, and said that it should be made clear that good works evidenced faith only to the man that performed them. If this was accepted he did not think that anybody could object.

Mr. Philips accepted that this was often the case but sometimes we could not tell whether our actions were the result of faith or not: and some men did not know of their justification. In such cases, he asked, what good works proved? Referring to a continental debate he concluded that only God's Spirit knew how to differentiate between the good works of the true Christians and those of professing Christians.

Dr. Burgess said that the Article did not require that definition be given as to the type of confidence.

Mr. Hearle suggested that they use the word "apparently" rather than the word "evidently" as the latter word implied a certainty that the Assembly could not establish.

Mr. Seaman envisaged the case of a man whose faith was not apparently verified by his works, as highlighting the limitation of the definition. Mr. Bridge proposed that they omit "as evidently known".

Dr. Smith said that as the Article was using a metaphor the limitation was that evidence would always be personal, and not always the same, and so only general guides could be laid down.

Mr. Seaman supported the first recommendation.

Mr. Sey reported on some absent delegates.

The Assembly ordered Mr. Ashe and Mr. Marshall to accept and sign the Covenant.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 67

The Assembly heard that following an examination by Mr. Coxe, Mr. Harison was to be admitted as a member.

Mr. Lightfoote raised the question as to whether women should take the Covenant, to which Dr. Gouge responded that such a decision rested with Parliament. He then raised the problem that many people believed wrongly that the Covenant objected to every act that bishops had brought in. Dr. Smith pointed out that though he did not doubt that Dr. Gouge had answered such criticism, all should remember that the Covenant only abolished episcopal church government. Dr. Burgess agreed that it was the duty of all ministers supported by Parliament to expound the Covenant. Mr. Seaman added that the Covenant urged speed on the members of the Assembly in the execution of their duties. To which Dr. Smith added that if the delegates were all of one mind then things could move at a faster pace.

Mr. Palmer, in referring to the Parliamentary demand for reasons why they should move against the Antinomians, explained that he could only give particular grounds in dealing with individual cases.

Dr. Hoyle wanted further information before he would confirm any action.

Mr. Herricke then spoke concerning episcopacy.

The Assembly was then adjourned until the following day.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 68

Before the debate, Mr. Channell and Mr. Storry both took the Covenant. Dr. Burgess related the rules of the Assembly, and reports were heard on the 12th. and 19th. Articles.

Mr. Bridges then opened the debate by arguing that the word "remain" had been left out of the Article because the word implied a permanence that was not true. Works are always to be regarded as imperfect in the sight of God, Who accepts them only "in Christ", otherwise they remain imperfect, even within the context of justification. Dr. Smith seconded such a position. Mr. Hearle added that to include "remain" would be to raise a further difficulty with respect of the removal of macula as an element within sin, as was the opinion of many of the divines. He also pointed out that it was an error to suggest that our works were ever accepted because of any intrinsic merit or worth.

Mr. Walker pointed out that God always judged things by the standard of Christ, and so accepted even imperfect sanctification, as being perfect "in Christ". Dr. Hoyle added that justification included men's works, and cited Calvin as his authority.

Mr. Arrowsmith adduced Colossians 4:<sup>12</sup> as a text to be discussed. Mr. Seaman wanted some dismissal of Socinian teaching included.

Mr. Wilson referred to Exodus 28, and argued that the main emphasis was upon the persons of Aaron and his sons rather than upon their works. Dr. Burgess cited Romans 8:<sup>3-4</sup>, as texts which established that Christ was the reason and basis of man's acceptance by God. Mr. Coleman explained that it was not included by the

committee that had prepared the Article because it did not mention the imperfection of man and his works. Dr. Burgess replied that the imperfection was obvious if not explicit, and that other criteria should be admitted. Mr. Price then introduced a text from Chronicles for consideration.

Mr. Goodwin commented that authors often expounded the doctrine of Constantine rather than the doctrines of Christ.

Mr. Goodwin then expounded Romans 8:<sup>3</sup>. He explained that the verse supported the position that our acceptance before God resulted from Christ being present with us, and His presentation of us. An example of this, he maintained, was that our imperfect prayers were accepted by God, and this only because of Christ's presentation of them. Christ was acting as a High Priest, who entered into the Holy of Holies, and once a year burnt incense before God. This took place amidst an attitude of prayer and fasting. He urged that the High Priesthood was a type of the Priesthood of Christ, with the addition that prayers offered were accepted in and for Christ.

Dr. Gouge reminded the Assembly that they were defending their belief, and should be content to be led by it into its necessary consequences, but urged them not to forget that they also were going to have to face adversaries of their doctrine, and pointed out that there was a danger in that there was no mention of the imperfections of man.

Mr. Seaman and Mr. Price both introduced texts for discussion. Mr. Seaman then expounded the text, maintaining that it taught that pardon involved the remitting of any punishment. Mr. Price added that there was almost no place in the New Testament where Christ



healed anybody without pardoning their sin. Mr. Herricke referring to the text in Chronicles suggested that it was making reference to a neglect of proper ceremonial. Dr. Hoyle added that the burden of the text was to show God's graciousness in listening to Hezekiah's prayer. Mr. Lightfoot pointed out that the original language used the word "expiate" rather than the translation "pardon". Dr. Gouge replied that the healing was a sign of pardon, which he supported by a New Testament illustration. Mr. Seaman agreed, providing further texts in support.

Mr. Hearle expressed his disagreement with the previous exposition of the passage, and added that there were various exegetical points that had been missed out. He pointed out that there were various grounds for prayer rather than one particular basis. Also he noted that the people came primarily to join in a solemn sacrifice and that they were drawn from various parts and that they were all under some legal reason for being unclean and therefore unacceptable to God. To people in this situation Hezekiah came as a saviour; one who had a pure heart and proper intentions to God and could therefore intercede with God for them. He further maintained that there was no temporal retribution pending from which they needed salvation, consequently God forgives their backsliding rather than averts some catastrophe.

Mr. Wilkinson introduced Revelation 8: <sup>3-4</sup>, as a pertinent text. Mr. Palmer suggested the consideration of 2 Chronicles 30: 18-20.

Mr. Goodwin drew a distinction between the typology of the texts in Exodus and Revelation. The first, he said, was a true type, whereas the second was a type applied. He said that the Revelation

texts talked of an angel, but in reality referred to Christ Himself. He went on to show how references in Revelation, such as the altar, were often in reality referring to Christ, and concluded that He was His own sacrifice, priest and altar. He showed how all the symbolism referred to some part of the work or person of Christ. He finished by drawing a comparison of the high priestly role of Christ as found in Revelation with that found in Hebrews, where He is seen as standing in the tradition of the Exodus, and removing the guilt of sin.

Mr. Gibson corrected Mr. Goodwin on the point that the golden altar did not stand in the Holy of Holies, but rather in the Holy place, and was not therefore the concern of the high priest. Dr. Hoyle also objected to the idea that the angel was Christ Himself, though he said that the argument remained true even though this was not.

Dr. Smith wanted to add Romans 8 to the discussion in conjunction with the texts from Revelation. He argued that there had been a silence in the praises of heaven until the prayers were heard, and accepted.

Mr. Goodwin retracted his exposition.

Mr. Tackney thought that the references were made to the day of expiation.

The Assembly then ordered that the rules prepared by a special committee be submitted.

Also the 19th. Article was left aside for a few days.

Mr. Ley then reported on the indisposition of some of the members.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 69.

A number of members were given certification by the Assembly, and an order was made concerning some other men.

Dr. Burgess, as acting Prolocutor, ruled that only one argument was admissable at any one time.

Mr. Nye explained a procedure of the House of Commons whereby the whole House could act as a committee. He objected to the desired regulations of Parliament whereby they sought to limit discussion through the Prolocutor and his assessors. Dr. Burgess assured the Assembly that the assessors did not desire this power, and then went on to supplement what Mr. Nye had said. He explained that the Commons only transformed itself into a committee when a matter arose which had not first been to one of the Commons' committees and, even then, the House was only a committee for the duration of the discussion on the specific topic. He added that the Assembly did not require such a procedure, as they could always refer difficulties to a committee.

Mr. Bridge reminded the Assembly that one of the Parliamentary regulations was that the Prolocutor should take no part in the discussions of the Assembly. He stressed that he wanted a procedural guide that conformed to scripture, and he cited as an example the council described in Acts 15, where there was no stunting of discussion. He remarked that the reputation of the Assembly would suffer from such an ordinance, as people would not believe that the Assembly was a free one if its discussions were limited, as all other meetings that were told to be silent were not free.

Dr. Hoyle said that the object of the Assembly was to seek out truth and that anything that did not hinder it would be acceptable

to him, though he warned of the danger of verbosity. Dr. Burgess argued that whereas in a church, ministers could rightly go on as long as they wished, in an Assembly, though there was ample freedom for discussion, it was necessary that decisions be made and some restrictions applied. Dr. Temple said that he did not believe that restriction on the number of times a delegate could speak would solve the difficulty of protracted decision-making, as the length of speeches would only increase, and thus prevent others from saying anything.

Mr. Goodwin complained that because the Assembly or its committees met every day then there was not adequate time for the delegates to prepare, and so they had to speak extemporarily, which meant that they spoke for a longer space of time. He compared their conditions with those of other assemblies where time was provided with no meetings. He continued that while this did not matter greatly as long as they were agreed, and generally they were, when they disagreed it became that much more serious. He acknowledged that the Assembly was one of divines rather than scholars, but still their aim was to arrive at the truth. Therefore, there should be no restriction on a delegate's speech, as it would be a constraint on his conscience. On the question of asking for leave of the Assembly to speak more than was permitted, such a rule would only deter delegates, and could not so serve truth as it was, a man only spoke out of turn at his peril.

He concluded that the only way of obtaining unity in doctrine was to be allowed to debate until all men were persuaded, and had agreed, to the truth of an argument. He also said that the free debate

hoped for, where unlearned persons would not be led astray by conflicting opinions, would be jeopardised if the majority were able to suppress debate at the expense of any minority.

Dr. Burgess said that it was never the intention of anybody to prevent full and fair hearing to all men, but he wanted to know at what point a fair hearing could be said to have been given. Mr. Wilson said that he would abide by any decisions, but he did not want them to have force, as he did not think that an Assembly such as theirs required to be reprimanded for impertinency in speech as they were aware of the gravity of their task. Also, he objected to any curtailment of discussion merely because it was time-consuming: this placed a greater premium on time than on truth. He also complained that already there was inequality, as some spoke more than others.

Mr. Hearle objected that a rule against impertinency of speech would imply a need for such a rule to those outside their number. And that this could only bring disrepute upon the Assembly and upon the Parliament that had assembled them. There were, he reminded the delegates, many who would be pleased to see the Assembly discredited.

Mr. Sey argued that they must recognise that perhaps these faults existed, and if they had rules, then not only would these things be curbed, but there would be nobody able to reproach the delegates, as these things would not then happen.

Mr. Sterry made two points: first of all that private or individual liberty should not be sacrificed in the name of greater public liberty, and that removal of the right to speak was an infringement of liberty. Secondly that freedom of speech did not mean that time was lost. As long as the Assembly closed a discussion when all

salient points had been thoroughly reviewed, then it did not waste time. He claimed that there had not been an adequate exposition of the apostolic approach.

Dr. Burgess said that all discussion had ignored the need for speed in their work. To which Mr. Burroughes countered that what the Assembly did see was that there was a need for free and unrestricted speech.

Mr. Young introduced two examples into the discussion on the regulating of speeches. The first was the example of the early church council at Jerusalem. Here there was freedom of debate. He therefore deduced that the only alternatives open in the matter of the curtailment of speech, was that the speaker himself should restrict his remarks, or that the Prolocutor with the Assembly, terminate them. The second example was that of the Council of Nicea, where only certain chosen representatives of both parties spoke after initial discussions, and where those, unlearned in the topics, were discouraged from participation. This view he rejected as he suggested that after a delegate had spoken his allotted number of times he should only be allowed to respond to questions or criticisms.

Mr. Palmer summed up the objections raised against limiting speech, though the Apostle had not debarred restrictions, to limit discussion was to substitute inquisition, even though it be inquisition of the majority, for debate. Another reason advanced was that earlier councils had accepted limitation of discussion. He pointed out that this was because of pressure of work. Even though the Assembly had less to discuss, there was none the less a parallel and if no guide was established discussion could erode all the time that was available.

As regarding the exact number of times that a man could speak, though the regulation proposed a maximum of three times, it did not specify in what; a man could speak three times on one text, or in one session, or in one argument, though curtailment of discussion would save time. And without some curtailment nothing would be done.

He went on to say that provision should be made for anybody who was dissatisfied with the result of curtailed debate to state his reasons. He also thought that sometimes one person should be charged with the sole defence of a position [thus ensuring thorough preparation and non waste of time].

Sir John Clotworthy informed the Assembly that the House of Commons had arranged a meeting on the following day, and that they required some delegates from the Assembly to speak at it as it concerned the Covenant with Scotland, with all its religious implications.

As many of the members wished to attend, and as the business for the next day was not pressing it was decided that the Assembly would adjourn to enable a large attendance.

Dr. Burgess suggested that five of the Assembly should be empowered to speak on their behalf.

Mr. Nye commented that the break in the discussion came at an opportune moment.

Mr. Burroughes wanted to know if he and the committee were empowered to speak in the name of the Assembly.

The Assembly ordered that a full attendance was required at the meeting with the exception of those who were members of the declaration committee.

It was ordered that the 13th. Article should be the subject of debate on the Monday, and then the Assembly was adjourned.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 70

After Mr. New had taken the Covenant, Mr. Palmer accused Mr. Simpson of openly encouraging the Antinomians by denying that there was any need for confession of sin. Dr. Temple urged the Assembly to renew their appeal to Parliament, as nothing was being done. Mr. Gallaway said that part of the delay was caused by Mr. Rouse's illness. Mr. Gallaway replied that he would report on the matter the following morning.

Mr. Sey reported that Mr. Gilbert had been appointed to Hemstead, and that Mr. Thomas had preached and been certified.

The debate commenced on the 18th. Article with Mr. Palmer questioning whether it was sufficient to say that all men were sinful. Mr. Bridge agreed that there were additions required as in its present state it did not deal effectively with either the Arminians or the Papists. Neither did it prepare men to receive grace.

A proposition was received that the phrase "before the grace of Christ" be changed to "before justification". Mr. Hearle accepted the change as he believed that this proved a more effective counter to Antinomians. He also pointed out that non-Christians could be interested in Christian things.

Mr. Bathurst, however, pointed out the danger that in popular opinion faith preceded justification, and that this would only exacerbate matters. It would be better, he suggested, to use the word "regeneration" rather than "justification". Mr. Goodwin maintained that justification followed on as a consequence of believing, though he said that many people performed good works before they became Christians, but that these works were not acceptable to God, because



He first accepts the person and only then their works, and that only as a consequence of believing.

Mr. Palmer mentioned that if they left out the word "justification" from the Article, then they would have to change its title. Mr. Price suggested that the Article should read "before justifying and sanctifying grace of Christ".

Mr. Goodwin clarified his remarks by saying that good works never obtained a man his salvation; when he believed then they became part of his response of faith, but even before that they existed as a preparation for the yielding of his life to Christ.

Mr. Walker remarked that the prime work in salvation was regeneration. Mr. Seaman urged that the Assembly compare this Article with the eighteenth, as both were concerned with good works. He explained that he thought that the twelfth Article was the positive side of good works and this one the negative. Dr. Temple suggested an insertion. Mr. Goodwin took issue with Mr. Seaman asserting that two different types of good works were being referred to. The first was a good work done after justification, this concerned good works that were done as a preparation to justification. Dr. Gouge thought that the Article should stand. Mr. Price thought that it was only repeating the former Article.

Mr. Lightfoote reminded the Assembly that the word "inspiration" was nowhere used in scripture.

Mr. Palmer did not think that it was proper to refer to faith as a work prior to justification. Mr. Hearle disagreed and said that there were many reasons to show that faith came before justification in time.

Mr. Goodwin argued that some divines said that preparatory good works were accepted by God, as they were works of humility. He acknowledged that this came close to the Arminian position. Goodwin in fact did not want to go into the subject, but rejected the position that claimed that there were good works prior to a man's justification, and censured Aquinas for so teaching. He said that Aquinas maintained that such acts merited grace: he thought that they rather merited glory. The reason he gave was that the preparatory works were the cause of what followed and that faith necessarily followed. Goodwin denied the truth of this argument saying that it amounted to man working himself towards God. He concluded that preparatory good works were not acceptable to God. Dr. Gouge agreed with him, adding that only in Christ were any works acceptable.

Dr. Smith argued that philosophy was a higher discipline than theology, and that the casual connection offered by Goodwin's philosophical method could be accepted. Mr. Goodwin did not wish to continue this dispute, as he said that he hadn't the time. He said that the Arminian position was that there were various degrees of works, and that some of them could have an influence on the man coming to faith, though Mr. Goodwin could not accept these views, as he did not believe that God accepted such works, and certainly not as meriting salvation.

Mr. Wilson defined vocation as that whereby men seek to be united to Christ, and placed it before justification and sanctification timewise, but he qualified himself and said that it would also extend after justification. Justification, he said, came from communion.

Mr. Seaman said that there were works that preceded

justification, redemption and faith, and that led to conversion.

Conversion was, he claimed, a great thing whether it came from God or man. Mr. Gibson drew a distinction between acts and persons, and said that acts that were commanded by God, which were moral acts, had to be acceptable to God regardless of the persons that performed them.

Mr. Hearle distinguished two parts to the preparation. Mr. Seaman objected to a distinction between persons and their works. He said that it was impossible to consider works apart from the people that did them, as it was a person that was accepted to eternal life and not a work. He argued that it was possible to do acceptable works before God and yet still not be accepted as a person, as was the case of Cain. To say otherwise would mean that the quality of any work would qualify it for God's acceptance, whereas the truth was that God was not bound by anything at all. All that sinners could do was to throw themselves on the mercy of God, as it was not possible to do or will anything that demanded God's commendation. Dr. Hoyle said that the example of Cain was only properly applicable to the situation of the unregenerate man.

The Prolocutor maintained that the best preparation for grace was for the sinner to know himself in need of Christ, and that the best means of this was the law, which showed sin up in its true light and proved every man a sinner. Even in the preparation, he argued, we are always passive, always receiving, even the Spirit of Adoption. Thus the limit, which the law, which is the preparation of the gospel, can go to, is to convince the sinner that unless God have mercy on him, then he will perish.

Dr. Temple summed up the position on which there was general

agreement; that works done before justification were never such that could bring about salvation.

Dr. Burgess pointed out that the Assembly had, on previous occasions, sent difficult problems to a committee, and he listed some of the longest debates. He stressed the need for latitude of interpretation concerning the degrees of preparatory good works that lead to salvation. He also commented on those things that were needed to make a man even passively capable of receiving God's grace; amongst these he listed, a natural moral inclination, an acquaintance with the law, and an awareness of the enormous consequences of his sin. He then suggested that the topic be sent to a committee. Mr. Sey immediately pointed out a difficulty in this procedure. He also showed that God had recognised the integrity of Abraham.

Mr. Whitaker seconded Dr. Burgess' motion, as he regarded the problem as one of some consequence with implications in many fields of ministry. He listed five doctrines that were related to the topic under discussion, that of grace, of glory, of sanctification, of the fall and of man's final perseverance. All of them were related to the idea of merit. He then concluded with a quotation from St. Augustine in which it was made clear that grace and mercy are not synonymous.

Mr. Seaman was sure that scripture supported his view that the person and his works were acceptable, and therein lay the root of the two-fold love of God.

Mr. Wilkinson moved the Article be sent back to the committee, as it was obvious that the Assembly could do nothing to improve upon it.

Mr. Newcomen objected that the Article would reverse the order

of scripture by which God first intended and then accepted good works. Mr. Gibson also asked that the words "pleasing to God" be omitted.

Mr. Sterry argued that there were prime and secondary tasks; the preparatory good works were a part of the doctrine of regeneration, and were not simply natural acts, and that these preparatory acts could be divided into three sections.

First of all he accepted the distinction between the works and the person, though he argued that there remained an intimate connection. Then he posited that acceptance of the person was either total, or limited, and if limited then it was in respect of some particular thing.

Secondly he distinguished those good works that were preparatory to regeneration from those which were only imitation preparatory good works. The apparent, and not real, preparatory good works, whilst they showed a good sense on the part of their originator, were not acceptable to God.

The third point that he made concerned faith and justification, and which of them came first in time. This he saw as one of the most important of theological questions. He said that they were resolved in eternity, and asked if there may not be an answer on human terms. He added that there was a three-fold influence of justification, in the heart of God, in the person of Christ, by work of the Spirit. This operation led to conversion, which he claimed on the authority of the fathers, was the applying of Christ to the individual at a specific point in time. He noted too that there was a difference, in moral terms and on an overall viewing, between union with Christ and communion, but in a strict sense they were inseparable. He then proposed that when God worked on men, it was in such a way that men joined with God

to act, and so any acts that were then performed were acts in which both God and men participated.

There then followed a large gap in the text which lasts for over half a page at the end of which an unknown speaker challenged Mr. Sterry to explain himself. Mr. Sterry then appeared to acknowledge that there was a general desire amongst the members for clarification. He explained that his efforts had not been intended for his own use, but for the general use of the Assembly, to deal with as they thought fit. He also explained that he had never sought to exclude faith from his considerations, though he admitted that he may have missed some things out of his explanations.

Dr. Temple mentioned that the sentiments expressed by Mr. Sterry were being propounded in the city. The Prolocutor commented on the strangeness of the argument which seemed to confute justification and sanctification. Mr. Seaman said that the only reason that he had been silent in the debates on justification was that he feared that the Assembly might move against him and so injure their work.

Mr. Sterry saw that there was a strong measure of opposition to him from those that had already spoken and that this prompted him to ask the Assembly not to press him to defend everything that he had raised for their consideration.

It was resolved to send the Article back to the committee that had first presented it.

Mr. Sey introduced Mr. Tanely to a church in Essex.

The Assembly ordered that nobody should be certified for the ministry until they had been approved by them, and the acceptance published in the Assembly.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES -- SESSION 71

After a paper had been read against Mr. Simpson, Mr. Palmer reminded the Assembly that they had bound themselves to the Covenant, and pledged themselves to work for its acceptance, as a remedy for any profanity. Dr. Burgess then suggested the formation of a committee to deal with Antinomian difficulties.

The Assembly appointed members to such a committee, and charged them to provide a petition to be presented to the House of Commons urging immediate action against the Antinomians, as delay in implementing the previous recommendations could only result in God's anger resting upon the nation.

Two members then took the Covenant.

Dr. Gouge introduced a text from Titus which was aimed against unbelievers. He was supported by Mr. Tuckney, who added that the text was directed against the Cretans.

Dr. Smith said that even in their evil they still performed some good works, and there was the problem as to whether they were Christians or not. Dr. Hoyle said that the text referred to both Jews and Gentiles. Mr. Bridge pointed out that there was nothing in the men that was pure, but the apostle had said that they knew God, and the only explanation that he could offer was that the teachers did not understand the truth that they taught, and he cited verse 16 to prove his assertion. Mr. Simpson put forward the further suggestion that there were a number of real Christians amongst the church and that there were others whose minds and consciences were sinful, and who exercised malice towards the true believers. This interpretation fitted in with Romans 14, in which case these men were evil and of whom

nothing good could be expected. Mr. Gibson supported this with a quotation from 1 Timothy, and described them as worse than infidels.

Mr. Price said that he thought it a particularly opportune text as it showed how completely bad all the actions of these men were, and how inconceivable it was that their works could ever be acceptable to God.

Dr. Gouge said that this was a general principle, that embraced a number of issues.

Mr. Whitaker reminded the Assembly that this was a position which the Jesuits jeered at. Mr. Lightfoote pointed out that the text referred to a Jewish context, and to the hate of the Jewish leaders, and that it did not seem hermeneutically proper to apply it to those people who were fringe members of the church. To which Mr. Bathurst added that the text was obviously addressed to members of the church who were advised to beware of Jewish teachers, and thus provided a definition of those who were pure and who were not pure.

Mr. Goodwin said that the Jews referred to appear to have been devout men following their own faith, and that the context did not lend itself to an imputation of impurity to their actions. He agreed that they were wrong on the matter of faith, but they could not be charged with unbelief, nor could there be impurity in their actions, as they kept the Sabbath as well as any Christian, though from the wrong motives. The real reason for their impurity was, he said, that their minds and consciences, the highest parts of men, were impure, as it must be in all unregenerate men, and so they could only progress into deeper wickedness.

Mr. Wilkinson believed the text to be very useful, as



exemplifying the doctrine that there was nothing that was pure or clean outside of Christ. Faith, he argued, is the distinguishing mark of the Christian, and it is the only thing that makes acts of men acceptable to God. Even though Christians and non-Christians perform the same acts only those of the Christian are acceptable before God.

Proverbs 21:<sup>27</sup> was offered as a text for further discussion.

Mr. Sey introduced two men to parishes in the name of the Assembly, and Mr. Goodwin suggested prayer for them.

Mr. Seaman defined a wicked man as one who actively committed degenerate acts, rather than suggesting that all men were born wicked, and these men, he said, were opposed to the righteous. Dr. Hoyle said that anybody outside of Christ was wicked. Mr. Lightfoote agreed with Mr. Goodwin by saying that a wicked man was known through his evil actions and life. Mr. Gibson agreed that this was made clear in the last verse of Psalm 1.

Mr. Seaman argued that the context of the verse made it clear that the words righteous and wicked were employed in a moral sense, rather than a spiritual sense.

Hebrews 11:<sup>5,6</sup> were then suggested for discussion.

Mr. Goodwin commented that the verse spoke about the need for general faith in spiritual things, rather than a specific faith in Christ. Dr. Smith claimed the support of Christian fathers when he said that the verse was an important one in expounding the meaning of faith in Christ.

Mr. Bridge urged the position of Christ being the only Way to God, because the faith that admitted the existence of God was not

acceptable in the sight of God.

A Committee report was read.

Mr. Eridge and Dr. Gouge both spoke and were followed by Mr. Goodwin, who was concerned that the Antinomians should not only receive justice, but that they should be convinced of their error, and brought to repentance. He was aware, he said, that their teaching was dangerous, and of the need to check its spread, but the fact that individual members had spoken to some of the heretics did not absolve the Assembly of a duty - to try and restore them.

Mr. Gataker disagreed and stressed that the time had come to suppress the whole sect. Mr. Seaman reminded the Assembly that they were bound by oath to try and convince the Antinomians of their error.

The Assembly then resolved to send another petition to Parliament, together with a message from the committee that had drawn it up.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 72

Dr. Burgess reported an answer from the House of Commons regarding the proposals on Antinomians<sup>7</sup>. Hebrews 4:<sup>2</sup> was then proposed for discussion. But Mr. Carter objected that this verse did not prove anything as in it the apostle was speaking about the heathen and the rest which they did not enter into because of their unbelief. He also asserted that there was no reference to works being accepted or not. Dr. Hoyle said that the same faith was spoken of here, as was spoken of in Hebrews 11, and it was the faith of believers. Mr. Taylor thought that the verse was a good choice to establish the point that was being asserted. Mr. Palmer agreed that the context was as the previous speakers had claimed it to be, and that it was a sound argument to say that the word being preached didn't profit anybody unless it was conjoined with faith. This, as far as Mr. Palmer was concerned, proved that preparatory works were not taught in scripture.

Mr. Gataker objected that the text did not refer to the acceptance of works, but was concerned with the ordinance of preaching. He also mentioned that the apostle reminded the Hebrews that they had refused to believe God when He had promised to establish Israel in Canaan, indeed they had scoffed at the promise. He went on and cited Psalm 116 as an example of how David had believed in God's promise given through Samuel and how it was only found wanting when David failed to believe it.

Dr. Gouge maintained that the main point of the epistle was to encourage the Hebrews to accept Christ and lay hold of Him by means of faith. He made the point that because faith was lacking,

many of the Hebrews had fallen away and regarded this as a warning, and exhorted men to believe. He applied the example, as he believed the apostle to have done, to Christians and suggested that even the hearing of the gospel would be of no avail, as it did not avail the Hebrews without faith.

Dr. Smith pointed out that as one of the purposes of the Article was to oppose the Papist doctrine of works, this verse, containing as it did a positive doctrine of the preaching of the word as preparatory, was a useful text. Mr. Wilson was at pains to point out that the burden of the text was to show the work of the preacher, which was not profitable to them because of their lack of faith, however the hearers in this were merely passive. The text established that the lack of faith was unprofitable, not that their work of hearing the word was unprofitable.

Mr. Hearle objected to the verse because the Article maintained three things that the verse did not. He said that the Article had as its subject unregenerate man, that it was concerned about the place of origin of good works, and whether good works done by an unregenerate man were pleasing in the sight of God. The verse that was cited, he said, had as its subject men who had fallen after first believing, and that their good works emanated, not from a justifying faith, but rather from a temporary trust in a passing promise, and as such was only a type of the real faith. He also claimed that such works were in this case neither pleasing or profitable. He cited Jeremiah 23:<sup>32</sup> as an example to prove that regenerate men need not always profit from the word preached, and that they could also miss something of the promise, but this was not the fault of the prophets.

Mr. Carter did not believe that the apostle would encourage believers, who were exercising their faith, to believe in Christ, but rather he was speaking to them as believing members of the church, who had sold their Christian birthright of rest in Christ, and consequently their only rest lay in the Sabbath day.

Mr. Goodwin reminded the Assembly that the Article was about works before faith, and such, he maintained, were not acceptable to this verse, as the subjects of this verse lacked any faith. But in this case the lack of faith was accompanied by a positive unbelief, which prompted the apostle to beg the church not to harden its heart. He went on to show that the Article used the word "pleasing" whereas the scripture used the word "profitable", which highlighted the difference in meaning, the Article referring to works done by the unbelievers, the verse referring to the word preached to them. Paul had written to them as unbelievers, said Goodwin, and as such they were under the wrath of God, and would not enter into His rest. He concluded by making the point that regenerate men in the Old Testament could be types of New Testament believers or unbelievers, and he cited Ishmael as an example of the latter, as one who many thought were saved by the prayer of Abraham.

Mr. Bathurst was most definite that the context was that the gospel was preached to unbelievers, as the words used were of the passive tense, this made those to whom it was addressed hearers, not such as had faith. Mr. Porter disagreed and said that though it was translated preached, it had to be heard, and this was not passive activity.

Mr. Seaman argued that if faith was needed to make preaching

effective, then how much more it was needed to make works acceptable, especially if the learning of the word required faith, then all other most certainly did. Mr. Carter was definite about the place of the preaching, that whether it was a duty or as a means of grace, it was still very important. He said that the letter did not explain why the work of hearing was not accepted, it only gave the reason why the word did not accomplish a work of grace in those that heard it.

Mr. Delamarch regarded rest as a temporal blessing, which was a type of the rest to come. Mr. Bridge said that the arguments so far presented argued to certain conclusions; that if the word was profitable then it must have been pleasing, and if it was not pleasing it was because faith was lacking, and therefore any works without faith could not be pleasing.

Galatians 5:<sup>6</sup> was then suggested for discussion. Dr. Temple did not think that it was any better than the last text as the context of the verse suggested that it dealt with the question as to what made a man acceptable to God. The Jews claimed that it was their circumcision that made them so, which the apostle rejected. Temple then considered what made a man acceptable to God. The first thing, he said, was that the Jews depended upon certain presupposed privileges. Secondly that the Gentiles claimed their salvation depended on their own intrinsic value and worth. The third alternative was that of the Christians, who disregarded the postures of the other two and said that faith alone could make a man acceptable to God.

Dr. Gouge said that love comes from faith, and that no works which are not done in faith can be acceptable to God. Mr. Goodwin agreed with this after having said that the apostle dismisses the idea

of the Jews, that they could by their circumcision be acceptable in the sight of God. He had argued that circumcision stood for their own efforts, which eventually would not avail them for salvation. Only faith, working by love, was acceptable and this did not result from being justified by the Law.

Mr. Gataker objected to the verse, as he did not believe that circumcision could be used to stand for a work of the Law. It stood simply as circumcision, which was all the apostle had said. He claimed that Paul believed that nothing availed before God, by which he meant that it did not matter whether a man was circumcised or not; it would neither prejudice or avail his plea with Christ.

Dr. Hoyle believed it a useful text as it established that all good works, [that are acceptable] flow from love, which in turn has its root solely in faith.

Mr. Seaman adduced certain positions to support his claim that the Assembly had already rejected positions that it now sought to espouse. He spoke about "a new creature". He first of all clarified that by circumcision and uncircumcision the Assembly was referring to all the claimed privileges of the Jews and Gentiles. He then said that all these claimed privileges were of no avail, as in reality neither Jew nor Gentile had any right to claim them. He then added as a third position that in Christ alone justification and sanctification could find their origin. This was the position of the reformers, he argued. Luther emphasised that justification came by Christ alone, through faith, and that Calvin argued that sanctification depended upon a primary acceptance by Christ, and not simply a number of exhibited good works.

Mr. Hearle claimed that the Article was about preparatory works that lead to Christ, and the text concerned those already in Christ, as he showed by adducing similar terms used by the apostle to describe his own status. He maintained that the works that were accepted by God were always the works of the person who had been accepted.

Mr. Price asserted that what the apostle was doing was contrasting works of faith with works of circumcision and uncleanness, and showing how the works of faith were different in essence to any other works, even those done with absolute conviction.

Dr. Burgess supported the text as being useful to the subject under discussion. He stated that a man in Christ had the status and privileges of a Christian, whereas the Jews and Gentiles for all their claims to privilege, were not able to provide real alternatives or solutions to the claims of Christian justification or Christian liberty. He concluded by saying that faith was opposed to circumcision.

Mr. Herricke accepted the text as a proof. He went on to show how the apostle always emphasised the already existing unity between those who confessed Christ.

Mr. Rayner reiterated the position that all good works come from Love which has its root in faith. And that no act performed without faith could be pleasing to God. Mr. Gibbon asserted that a place was acceptable when the proposition was also the conclusion of a syllogism.

Mr. Bridge brought out the point that some commentators equated being "in Christ" as being in the Kingdom of Christ. Others claimed that it was part of the doctrine of sanctification, because it was



used in argument which is continued into the next chapter, where the phrase "new creatures in Christ" is used. He held that the text spoke of justification and sanctification. He said that the weight of the whole law is felt by those who transgress any part of it, and that this principle applies equally to the Jews and the Gentiles, regardless of their claimed privileges and immunities.

After Dr. Hoyle had spoken Mr. Palmer said that the text was about justification, and that works had not part in that, though works were added to it because it was by nature an active faith, as was illustrated in Galatians 6:<sup>15</sup>, where the kind of person that a Christian is, is described. This should be compared with 1 Corinthians 7:<sup>19</sup>, he advocated, where it is seen that only the keeping of God's commandments is required. But from comparison of the texts it is obvious that only Christians can fulfil this requirement, because only the Christian is the "new creature" and it is only he that is accepted. Mr. Bathurst defined being "in Christ" as those whom Christ claimed, and said that their privileges were outlined in Acts 2:<sup>18</sup>.

Mr. Sey reported that a certificate for Mr. Edwards was being prepared.

Dr. Burgess suggested that because of the time that they had spent in debating the Articles so far, that they be hasty in their examination of further texts.

Mr. Palmer approved the phrasing of certain parts of the Article.

Mr. Woodcooke explained that works were not rejected simply because their perpetrators were unregenerate, but because they were guilty of wicked acts. The Prolocutor elaborated that Piscator understood "bloody hands" to encompass acts of oppression and not just

acts of murder.

Mr. Seaman believed that the cited text established the point, and also made clear that the Jews were for the greater part unregenerate.

Mr. Young suggested that the last two propositions be joined in one debate.

Mr. Goodwin said that God required men to have broken and contrite hearts. And whereas men who killed were penitent, those who disobeyed this injunction were not and this failure showed that they did not either keep God's commandments fully, nor understand the gravity of their sin.

It was ordered that the debate continue the next day.

Dr. Burgess introduced a motion asking that Mr. Sterry give account of his apparent Antinomianism, as soon as he returned, and that he give better expression to his views on the doctrine of justification, so that he should satisfy the Assembly. This was because of his unorthodox presentation at the last Session.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 73

It was ordered that no members should be allowed to leave the Assembly to certify ministers unless the Assembly remained quorate without them. Mr. Sey then read a testimonial for Mr. Tandy, and other members did the same for Mr. Spratt. Mr. Sey informed the Assembly that Mr. Wilkinson was being sent to Epping and Mr. Sheffield to Tonbridge. The 15th. Article was then debated and ordered, and the 16th. Article was debated, with some alterations being proposed.

Mr. Coleman said that the point at issue was whether God-given habits could be increased or supplemented. He then asserted that habits could be increased either arbitrarily or on the basis of desert, and concluded that God could allow an abatement of this grace without any loss to His justice.

Mr. Goodwin attempted to answer some objections. He began by stating the argument of those he wanted to attack, who said that because grace was a quality, it could suffer increase and decrease, and then he went on to consider how such a thing could happen. If it was by a natural law that governed qualities, then it implied that sin had the power to expel grace [and grace] must be dependent on the will of God, by way of desert. But he rejected this because he said that he knew of no place where God had ever threatened any such thing.

He went on to argue that if preparatory good works were rewarded, and this reward could never be lost, it was therefore not possible to lose the reward of habitual grace. These were, he claimed, part and parcel of the same thing. The preparatory graces were the root, and the habitual graces the branch. We are by habitual grace being

prepared for salvation and for glory.

If it were the case that a man lost the reward of his habitual grace, then it was possible for a man, whose spiritual life had declined in his last years, to be brought to repentance and yet this repentance would not serve to restore him to his former position. Citing texts from 1 John, he saw that there were principles in the world that should be avoided, and not persons. Because of this, the law, as a principle, was written in men's hearts, and every degree of grace applied this principle of the law to men. Indeed he saw it as an argument that men could not fall from grace, and that the law was written in the hearts of believers eternally. If all the degrees of grace are applications of the law to men's hearts, then they too will stand for all eternity. Again, he saw this principle as being that one could be increased and diminished while the other could not. Rather he observed the "particular habit" declined when a man failed to use what he had already attained to. So by disuse it diminished. Therefore he suggested that the Article should read "and may faile of the grace of God attained."

Mr. Gibbon explained that a habit was only a help to a faculty which could come in one of two ways, either it was acquired, or it was infused. In the case of infusion, he said, superadded grace could itself come in two ways. He asserted that acquired habits could be lost, both in a gradual manner, and at a specific instant. The superadded grace, that was given to a man as he tried to live a Christian life, could be added to and detracted from, and the grace that was gained by works could be lost.

Mr. Bathurst reiterated that gifts come before repentance,

and he used justification and sanctification as examples of such gifts. But he would not conclude that there could be a decay in grace. Mr. Rayner took up the question of infused habits and boldly asserted that anything that God infused could be overthrown by the recipient. He expanded on this by showing that if a man neglected the means of grace then his Christian acts would diminish, and if the corruption continued unabated then grace could be overborne, but that there would be no diminution of the salvation of God, and that this was different to the natural way of things.

Mr. Herricke commented that this involved an unchangeable double work of God, in Himself and in us. Citing scripture, he asserted that the habits of grace have no degrees in them, and they are immutably eternal. Mr. Woodcock produced a second text from Hebrews to support the position that there could be a diminution of grace, though he confessed that he did not understand how the habit of sin could be increased but the habit of grace could not.

Mr. Seaman said that the proposed alteration to the Article gave occasion for a debate on the nature of grace. He further described grace as being under the concept of "non-essentials". The subject was always a rational creature, who may or may not be the recipient of grace, as was the case with devils, who, while being angels, were totally deprived of grace. Men also fall. On the basis of this he deduced that grace, whether it was infused or the product of human endeavour, was capable of being lost as it was an "unessential" attribute of man. Grace even in the unregenerate man may be lost, because of its very nature. Grace, when considered according to the will of God, however, was two-fold, and seen to be necessary both by

reason of its end and by agreement. But this he supported by the fact that the grace was infused into the "new creature", and it did not come naturally, thus, being heavenly, it should partake of the heavenly state and be called a glory. He compared this state with the sun, which was eclipsed but never removed. So it is with the sun of God shed in men's hearts by the Holy Spirit, though it may suffer occasional eclipses it cannot pass away.

He raised the question as to when the word of God was found to be in men's hearts, and paraphrased a verse in which a regenerated man was seen as being different to grass and the flowers thereof which will pass away, whereas eternal life lasts forever. He made two further points, stressing the fact that both root and branch were united in sharing in eternal life, and that he saw no reason why the accumulated merits of a man's earthly life should go with him to heaven.

Mr. Hill claimed that the gifts of God came without man's repentance, and if the degrees of grace were gifts of God, then they too could come without repentance. He went on to equate the image of God with grace, and maintained it was not possible to destroy entirely this image, and even though it were clouded, this did not mean that the degrees of grace were in any way impaired or annulled.

Dr. Burgess reminded the Assembly that the debate had arisen because of two suggested alterations in the Article, though only one of these was being discussed. The main thing was whether it properly expressed the idea of departing from grace already given. He said that if things were carefully discussed then the problem would be resolved. He stated that the issue and fruit of God's Spirit could not be lost. The problem was whether it could be increased and

supplemented, because if it could be, then it could also be diminished. He said that the same principles applied in the case of the regenerated man as in the case of the natural man. He argued that there was a universal disease which involved all men, having the proneness to do evil, and that this breaks out in the individual at birth and that it grows with them. He also asserted that a man multiplies his evil acts until he becomes intoxicated by them.

He went on to maintain that regenerated men had the seed of God in their heart, though this is variously termed in scripture as "Spirit" or "new Spirit". "The new Spirit" is the remedy promised by God, and it is this that is infused into a man at regeneration. This results in a man exercising those Christian virtues that are described in Galatians 5:<sup>22</sup>. Out of this universal habit, a man may learn to exercise grace, which becomes a way of living, as in Hebrews 5, where it is defined as "particular habit". He explained that he did not see the difference between the particular habit and the universal habit recognised, was a different way of looking at things; no longer was grace an "unessential" but was necessary to make a man a Christian. A Christian was not judged as having degrees of Christianity, as he may lose every degree of grace, but his salvation, eternal by nature, could not be lost. This was established in the argument, and commanded general agreement.

He then turned to an earlier topic where it had been claimed that God had never threatened. In response he said that where the promise was given, then a threat could be supposed, as it was implicit in the promise.

Mr. Price argued that if grace could be called the image of God, and this could be lost, then the Article was wrong because it

claimed that it was only impaired. He believed that God would never withdraw His divine nature, but in man, as all nature declined, so also did the divine nature.

He then said that there were two seeds, and one of them was the seed of grace in the soul, which came by the word of God. If anything was likely to impair this grace, it was afflictions, but this was seen to be false because the godly find strength in their afflictions. The seed could only be impaired in the same way as water impaired lime or oil. It was true, he said, that gifts came without repentance, but God could recall any of these gifts. He saw there existing a parallel with the sun, which could never be totally eclipsed, or even like the moon which, though it lost some of its light, never lost it all.

Mr. Coleman said that habits must be subject to being impaired because they could be increased. He then adduced various texts, including one from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which spoke of the prevention of falling.

Mr. Goodwin recapped saying that regenerated men had received grace, and that men could depart from this grace, and all superadded grace could be lost. The question that he was concerned to raise was about the grace that men had not gained for themselves. He also pointed out that the shock of the loss would remain. He said that a man could appear to lose all his grace but would always have some.

He made the point that by nature Paul was self-disciplined in everything, as was shown by his continence. He maintained that a natural principle existed whereby growth could not go back. This was the case in nature and also with grace. A grown man, even though he decline, can never become a dwarf. He reminded the Assembly of the



parable of the talents where the servant was rewarded not only with a gift from his master, but also with what he gained by his own efforts.

Goodwin made clear from scripture that the effects of Christ's death on sanctification were eternal. He explained that Christ had died to bring to man salvation, and to establish man in the "fulness of stature" and that this could not be lost. He then turned his attention to the point already made that a promise contained within itself a threat. To this he replied that it was promised that men should not fall away, and no contrary threat was ever made.

He answered those that argued that God punished with a loss of grace, by pointing out the temporary duration of this loss, and by saying that God punished His people with a loss of joy, and explained that it was possible to have grace but no joy. He reiterated that a removal of joy was a temporary punishment in the temporal life; and to say that God would remove grace was not temporary but dealt with eternal life.

Concerning the acquisition of grace through human activity, he showed that it was possible to confuse zeal with grace, as was most obvious in young Christians. These often had more zeal but necessarily lacked acquired grace. He concluded by admitting that there was one objection that he could not answer and that was that the increase in the habit of sin led to decrease in the habit of grace, and confessed to personally having experienced the truth of Paul's assertion in Romans 6:19.

Mr. Seaman argued that there were no degrees of merited grace necessary to bring men to salvation. Mr. Goodwin disagreed and said that not only were the degrees of grace necessary to put a man in a state of grace, but they were also necessary for salvation.

An order was received from the Houses of Lords and Commons ordering the Assembly to move on the question of discipline.

Mr. Sey reported that Mr. Carter had been examined and certified, and a testimonial was brought in and attested by Mr. Palmer.

The Assembly ordered that it should lay aside all business on the next day and decide what was to be done with the order from Parliament.

ANALYSIS OF DEBATES - SESSION 74

Mr. Sey reported that a recommendation had not been in order.

Dr. Gouge reminded the Assembly that there had to be an outward call for preaching, as well as the administration of the sacraments, and it was in the task of advising on how new ministers could be appointed that the Assembly could help.

Mr. Rayner agreed with what had been said and added that because there was no system of receiving a call, then if the Assembly tested men's call, it would provide some basis for ministry.

The House of Commons ordered that this should be done.

Mr. Palmer then reported from the Committee of the Declaration.

He read out a list of churches and appointed various members of the Assembly to go and preach at them, and to encourage the members to take the Covenant. The Scribes were assigned the task of writing to the churches to make all the arrangements.

In other churches the Church Wardens were to be contacted to make the arrangements.

Mr. Sey then reported that Mr. Sheffield had been certified by three members of the Assembly, and that he was recommended to Tonbridge.

It was moved and resolved that the following Monday should be a day of fasting and prayer for the Assembly. It was to last from nine until four, with three members appointed to pray and two to preach.

August 4th. 1643<sup>(1)</sup>

Report on 14th. Article

Mr. Palmer: Those places may be taken out of Math.<sup>(2)</sup>

Mr. Gataker: This is marked. Chosen. Because of the Fall.

Ness of it.

Mr. Valentine: 1 Col.<sup>(3)</sup> Caietane<sup>(4)</sup> and Catharicus<sup>(5)</sup> aledge this text to prove the workes of sculper<sup>(6)</sup>. Liranus<sup>(7)</sup> his answer: corpore proprio et [ ] is answered to it, but inquire whether this be satisfactory.

Dr. Hoyle: St. Paul saith nothing against us or our question, which is whether Christ's suffering be sufficient for the [ ] [ ] That is believed but not said for satisfaction. We must suffer too, but for another end: he to merit and satisfy; we doe good dutyes for another end. All that I can conclude is only

Mr. Walker: The Scriptures brought overthrow all that can be called obedience for it.

Mr. Sampson: For that 5 Math. 48. It is not brought by any of our divines against this doctrine of the Papists. It is by some of our divines cleare, otherwise by Cameron<sup>(8)</sup>. This place is brought by the Papists for the workes of sculper.

Mr. Walker: This is brought by Chamire<sup>(9)</sup> and others against those workes. The commaundment is "to be like God", as neare as we can, in all things, and thus we are commaunded. If perfection itselfe be sub precepto then ther is nae. For that of the Papists, we

beate them with their owne weapons.

Mr. Woodcocke: It's a plausible interpretation. It's only to be confirmed to matters of mercy and forgiveness.

Dr. Hoyle: There cannot be perfection in one duty, but in all other too.

Mr. Gataker: It is not barely of mercy, but of love, which is the fullfilling of the sense and substance of the Law.

Dr. Gouge: It is usual with Scripture to prove particular points by generall propositions, soe as the conclusion may be particular and therefore the prooffe may be good for generall.

Mr. Fare: It's frequent in Scripture by way of Simile<sup>(10)</sup> to put one duty for all.

Mr. Horle: I conceive this place is not sae pertinent. This is the conclusion of what Christ hath given by way of interpretation of the Law, and having shewed the outward act, he shewes ther is murder. He aimes at sincerity: be perfect .... add the inward man to the outward man in your service.

Mr. Walker: Christ shewes that the Law reacheth further than ever the Pharisyes expressed.

Mr. Gataker: The words have relation to what went before - having aleadged the example of our Heavenly Father before, not only in case of sincerity, but love to enemies and those the most malicious; not only prooffe sincerity but a great height of affection and a high strain of perfection in your love.

Dr. Featley: Those words are a generall rule, and refer to the whole chapter.

Mr. Vines: There is no example shown of God in respect of the parts

of the moral Law, but in doing good to them who do evil and  
[ ] be perfect; how? Not as God is perfect in the  
Law, but in His ways and dealings towards evil men. But how it  
therefore follows there is no evangelical counsels - I do not see  
how it follows.

Dr. Gouge: All thing wherein we must follow God we must be perfect  
as God is.

Mr. Walker: Christ gives us an example of good that seems to go  
beyond what is required in the Law.

Dr. Hoyle: Seeing love is the fullfilling of the Law.

Mr. Carter: Some of those texts that speake against voluntarie  
workes and human injunctions should be added. Censure - Job 9:<sup>21</sup>  
Gregory the Great.<sup>(11)</sup> Many excellent passages upon this place.

Mr. Gataker: The place itself may be questionable. Job rather  
speaks in way of justification of himself than otherwise.

Mr. Walker: This doth rather confirm this than infringe it.

Dr. Gouge: Job hath to deal with God and his friends; in regard to  
his friends he justifieth himself, but in this he has to deal with  
God, and that casts him down.

Mr. Coleman: This doth clearly hold out this truth so far as a  
particular example can hold it out.

Dr. Featley: Calvin, in his 1 of Institut'es<sup>(12)</sup> hath reference to  
this place and doth illustrate it excellently.

Mr. Palmer: Those evangelical precepts were not then received, and  
so, though under the O.T., then were none. That there may be under  
the New.

Mr. Walker: The Papists themselves do not make this shift.

Mr. Whitaker: Many of the Papists do bring examples out of the O.T. for those words. As that of eunuchs.

Mr. Herle: The words following seem to speak of an imagery, and not real perfection, "for God destroys."<sup>(13)</sup>

Mr. Coleman: It is only that "all come to the grave - all die."<sup>(14)</sup>

Mr. Whitaker: The texts before in the first prove that they are not counsellors of perfection because all counsellors fall under precepts.

Mr. Vines: Those workes of sculper as far as they do a supermerit, so these texts do prove sufficiently in matter of merit, yet it doth not follow that therefore there is nothing to be done ex concilio. Yet whether some things may not be said to be of counsellor that are not clearly commanded.

Dr. Hoyle: The Papists in this suppose it possible to keep the Law.

Mr. Whitaker: If I am bound to love God all I can, what then will be left of counsellor, if any counsellor can be?

Mr. Vines: As that in matter of marriage "he doth well and he doth better."<sup>(15)</sup> All acts individuated are of necessity and fall under precepts.

Mr. Colamy: We are entered into a very large field, and yet the Article will necessitate us to it, because in the Article it is said, "cannot be taught". To teach it in the Popish sense it is true, but whether there is not a way of teaching of voluntarie workes as under counsellors, doing things I may choose and am not guilty of. Divers media to this perfection and the media though equally conducing to this end as my love to my neighbour may be shewed either in building an hospital and not a church. Dr. Davenant<sup>(16)</sup> saith there may be a counsellor in a good

sence cum grano salis.

Dr. Gouge: We need not bring this at this time, because the Article is cleare: "workes which they call supererogation".

Mr. Walker: Two ways set before me for doing a worke of charity, if I doe that I am able unto all, this comes under command at last.

Mr. Wilkinson, Sen: Two places I would lay together that may conduce to the conclusions in hand. Rom. - "we all fall short of the glory of God"<sup>(17)</sup>. If ther be a deficit in the best, then ther can be nae supererogation: one defect makes the worke evill, though good must come ex causis integris. Psal. 49:<sup>7</sup> - a man can by nae means redeeme his brother, all men and all men's excluded from matters of meritt.

Mr. Calamy: That in the Corinthians<sup>(18)</sup> doth not referr to matters of counsell but his judgement.

Dr. Featley: Ther is a double controvercy: betweene us and Papists and amongst Protestants as Montague<sup>(19)</sup> and Hooker<sup>(20)</sup>. As that of Ananias and Saphira<sup>(21)</sup>. Those though not particularly and individually commanded, but in the generall, else I doe not love God with all my strength.

Mr. Vines: Paul (1 Corinthians 9) "to preach the gospell free". To bring this under a precept will be hard.

Dr. Hoyle: Simpliciter et secundum quid posito hoc, he saith he had and aimed, if he had not done sae because an abuse of his power.

Mr. Vines: Wher doth the command by that binds him, he had power and he had power to do otherwise.

Mr. Hill: The command that did engage Paul to beware of scandell.



did oblige him to preach the gospell freely.

Mr. Seaman: Three distinct questions before you. (I) Whether workes of supererogation; (II) whether any such things as counsellis; (III) whether ther be anything morally practically indifferent. To the method of our proceeding, we should keepe close the first of those workes of super, and in reference to a counsell whether somethings are not to be done ther is only a mistake in the notion though this or that may seeme to be arbitrary or of command, the second depends upon the third whether anything individually considered be indifferent or nae. Some authors have handled this question express as Savonarola (22) Scotus (23) their what I doe, I doe as electione et ex concilio that I doe is done upon some swaying reason, When we speak of morall things ther is naething in it, naething a man doth in a morall way but it hath some degree of virtue or vice in it. If I marry or not, it is with reference to the glory of God and sae must have something of God's will in it.

Mr. Herle: This, this last question be not now in the Article, yet it will not be inadmissable to debate this last question. Four things required to merit. But own due hold a proposition.

Mr. Walker: Propounds two places that backe the worrys of 8 Roms. 3: For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh. . . it shewes an impossibility in man to fullfill the Law, therefore he cannot dae more than is commanded. 11 Rom. 35: For who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again.

Dr. Gouge: The position of the adversary is such as that it cannot reach the man in his entire estate. The impossibility in the Romans is: "by nature I am of the flesh".<sup>(24)</sup> It is not only because of our owne disability, but if we had the greatest ability that could be, we could not doe it. Rom. 11:<sup>35</sup> this.

Mr. Goodwin: This concerns election. Nae man did either counsell of God, nor was there anything foreseene by God in the creature to move him thereunto. That any should be the cause. Sae that it will nae way reach matter of command.

- (1) As all other Sessions in the Mss. Minutes are recorded as having taken place in September, this seems to be a mistake.
- (2) Matt. 5: 48
- (3) Col. 1: 24
- (4) Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, Epistolae Pauliet aliozem apostolorum and Grecam veritateri castigate, et per Reuer endissimum Dominu Dominum Thoman de Vio, Caietanum Cardinalem Sancti Christi, iuxta sen sum literalum enarrate, pp CLI - CLIII.
- (5) Casparis Contareni, Opera. Ad Collossenses pp 497-9.
- (6) "Sculper" is the word most often used in the text when supererogation is meant.
- (7) Martin Luther, Ad Libram examii magistri nostri magistriam brosii Catharini defensoris sil vestri priera tis acer rimi. Responsio Martini Lutheri. pp 2f.
- (8) I. Camararius, The New Testament. Translated out of the Greek by T. Beza. With brief summaries and expositions upon the hard places by I. Camararius and P. Lofeler Villerius. Sub, Matt. 5: 48.
- (9) Daniel Chamier, Contraversiarum papasticarum, quae his quatuor panstratae, IV Argumenta Catholica 10. Pro iisdem rationes Papisticae. p 768.
- (10) Reading doubtful. "Simile" could be this word, if understood as the comparison of one thing with another. In which case it may stand in the text as a figure of speech.
- (11) Gregory the Great, Morals on the Book of Job, IX, 36 & 37, pp 533-540.
- (12) John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, III, 12, 1-5 pp 60-64.
- (13) Job 9: 22
- (14) Ps. 143: 2
- (15) 1 Cor. 7: 38
- (16) John Davenant, Praelectiones de Duobus in theologia controversis Capitibus de iudice contro versiarum, primo: De iustitia habituali et actuali altero, XLII, Ultimum theosos membrum demonstratur, pp 480f.

- (17) Rom. 3:<sup>23</sup>
- (18) 1 Cor. 7:<sup>38</sup>
- (19) Richard Montague (1577-1641). Became Bishop of Chichester. His controversial works defending a High Church position provoked bitter Puritan attacks. (D. N. B. 38, pp 266f)
- (20) Richard Hooker (1554-1600). As Master of the Temple, and apologist for episcopacy became involved in a disputation with Walter Travers, a Presbyterian. Hooker in this disputation seemed to adopt an anti-Calvinist position, which made him a target of Puritan criticism. (D. N. B. 27, pp 289f)
- (21) Acts 5:<sup>1-11</sup>
- (22) H. Savonarola, Expositio orationis dnice fratris Hieronymi Savonarole Ferrariensis ordiis Predicatorum. Et sermo eiusdem in vigilia natiuitatis domini coram fratribus habitur, sig.a4v.
- (23) Joannis Scoti, Opera quae supersunt omnia. pp 355f.
- (24) Rom. 8:<sup>23</sup>

15th. Article reported and read.

11th. Article reported and read.

Reasons of the alterations in Art. XI.

Addition "in the sight of God".

In respect of a three-fould justification to show which has here spoken of.

Addition have "remission of sins".

The parts of justification - 2. The Article omitted the latter, therefore made it full.

The transposition of the negative caused, giving it the precedency. In this they imitated nature itselfe - privation goes before habit and art is selfe.

Divinity itselfe doth see.

That see [ a papist that lookes upon this Article might see their doctrine condemned.

Because faith, the instrumentall cause, would not come in see fitly nor the denyall of workes see appositely otherwise the opposition would serve betweene workes and faith, not workes and Christ.

Added the efficient cause of which the Article was wholly silent.

"Freely by His grace".

To the meritorious cause more fully set downe, thus taking away the word merit because of an ambiguity by the addition of the word imputed, it would follow that we ware did merit.

The formall cause added to hould out both the active and passive obedience of Christ.

To the instrumentall cause they have made an addition of the word apprehended.

The last clause they have made an asserture which was before illature.

Omitted the reference to the homily.

Partly they grew out of print.

To this other is no such homily with such a title: and perhaps in future times not of such authority.

They have extracted the substance of the homily, and confirmed the Article by scripture, a stronger evidence than the homilyes can be.

Debate on the title of the 11th. Article.

Mr. Gataker: If anything added or altered in this justification of a sinner in the sight of God, of a sinner being in some kind different from the justification of a man by inherent righteousness.

Mr. Wilkinson, Senr: I did desire a definition of Justification added upon the title, to have shewed what we understand in this Article of Justification.

A man is justified in the sight of God, i.e. that God doth accept as guiltlesse, upon remission of his sins through Jesus Christ and upon the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. In this we have the full definition of Justification which is proved out of the 4. Romans. The not imputing of sin doth imply by Saul's construction out of David. Romans 4: 3, 22 and therefore it was imputed to him as righteousness the imputation of righteousness.

Mr. Coleman: This was presented to us to be put into the title, but every part of it being in the body of the Article, they thought better to let it gae as it is.

Mr. Wilkinson: The definition will come together naewher but in the title.

Dr. Hoyle: The title is for the rest of the definition. The reason why we put in "the sight of God", is because of 3 Rom. 20 - "nae flesh justified in his sight", and 3 Gal. 11 but no man is justified by the law in the sight of God; it is evident; for the just shall live by faith, which words dae cleare all seeming differences betwixt Paul and James. (1)

Dr. Gouge: To putt in "a sinner" is very fit.

Mr. Herricke: It is better as in the title because an opinion that divides man and sinner are termini convertibiles.

Mr. Coleman: Put it "of sinfull man."

Mr. Gaiver: Paul useth the word "man" and not the word "sinner".

Mr. Gataker: I dae not except against the addition yet I conceive this doth not help us to reconcile James and Paul who are at nae variance one with another. St. James doth speake of justification in the sight of God as well as of man. God saith of Abraham "now I know that thou dost feare me, I have by this act of thine taken an experimentall prooffe of thy sincerity."<sup>(2)</sup>

The differences betweene them ly in another kind, it is in another question, if the question whether a man be a sinner he must be justified by faith. But if the question be whether Abraham be a sincere Christian or guilty of being a heathen, here a man may, by his workes, as they are evidence of his faith, be justified - fides justificat hominum, opera justificant fidem.

Dr. Hoyle: That is very well spoken, for the difference betweene Paul and James, but for what are we accepted and esteemed righteous before God, man looks upon our workes, God without all consideration of workes.

Mr. Hodges: I would we might consider that phrase. Some hold that God sees no sin in His children; they will make some advantage of this expression.

Mr. Coleman: This Article houlds out nae such thing; the error is not met within this Article.

Mr. Seaman: Because nothing in the Article meets with that opinion it is fit to take something in either the title or body of the



Mr. Seaman: (continued) Article.

- "Of a sinner" or "a man in the sight of God" is an ambiguous expression, because it doth not determine whether you meane an actuall or intentionall justification; nae appearance of anything in the Article of actuall justification.

Dr. Gouge: Title's use is to be generall. If anything needfull to meet with an error, it is contained within the Article itselfe.

Mr. Hodges: They will make use of this; they will say that before ey of God's omniscience God doth not, cannot, see not only the ey of His justice.

Mr. Taylor: Justification of "a sinner before God."

Mr. Vines: Those 2 places may be rendered "in the sight of God" and "with God". It is good to expresse it in the title, as the Scripture doth, but in the Article you may meete with this error.

Mr. Hodges: Before God's tribunall.

Mr. Power: This Article is not a proper place to meete with their opinions in; theirs referres neither to sanctification, better meet with all in other Articles. As the 15th. Article, <sup>(3)</sup> see the 16th. Article. <sup>(4)</sup>

Mr. Seaman: I would faine the title should determine whether the Article doe speake of actuall justification. Those phrases may relate either to God's purposes or His actuall justification.

Mr. Sey: The manner of antient counsells was to meete with present errors, therefore needfull to meete with the Antinomians. <sup>(5)</sup>

Mr. Woodcocke: I like the motion for the definition.

Mr. Vines: This we have, "or may have" sufficiently in the Article.

Dr. Smith: Justification cannot well be understood otherwise than of actuall justification, and see this is set out very well. As for the title, there is nae reason to alter the title.

Dr. Hoyle: We are justified that is  $\int$  7.

Dr. Temple: We need not put "actuall" in the title, but fit to make some addition to the Article in respect of the Antinomians and to make some difference between seeing of sin and imputing of sin.

Mr. Seaman: Ther is nothing in the Article that doth clearly hould out unto us what is meant by actuall justification.

Mr. Walker: Justification signifies an act of God and it is actuall.

Mr. Young: It hath been desired to have some deffinition: the latter doth cleare it.

Mr. Walker: Something should be inserted in the Article to shew when he is justified.

Mr. Seaman: This seemes to hould out that the use of faith is only to apprehend that which is already done, which doth entirely agree with the opinion of the Antinomians that a man is justified before he repents and believes.

Dr. Temple: I concurre in this.

Mr. Vines: If in this Article ther ly any meaning as of faith did aprehend in justification already made, then ther is something in it. But if aprehended by faith be meant of the satisfaction

$\int$

7

Mr. Hill: A double aprehending as of an ey or hand. Antinomians grant it by an ey but not by a hand for justification.

Mr. Palmer: The wordes dae plainly hould out another sense, aprehended must relate to satisfaction and obedience; ther is a double act,

Mr. Palmer: (continued) of God imputing and of man apprehending. I  
move to recommitt it.

Mr. Herle: For the intentionall justification, it is sufficiently  
cleare in the words, which cannot be understood of a pre justification.  
It was considered in the committy, the Antinomians doe deny the  
direct act. "Apprehended by faith" must needs follow "imputed"  
in place. But the sence is not we apprehended a justification, but  
the satisfaction. I propose a humble motion that no man offer a  
repeale except he offer something to stand instead.

Mr. Case: Ther is no such danger of giving advantage to them if all  
the causes be expressed. All the danger is by reason of the  
equivocallnesse of this word apprehended, therefore the English  
of it may be put in "Layed hold on by faith".

Mr. Gibson: Put in "sae soon as we repent and believe we have  
remission of sins and we are accounted righteous".

Mr. Seaman: A parenthesis his whole obedience.

Mr. Bathurst: It is an exegesis of what went before.

Mr. Vines: One word would heale it, for justification as righteous-  
nesse.

Mr. Hill: Read it thus "who imputes to all that apprehend".

Mr. Gataker: After these debates I desire to speake a word concerning  
that which is inserted in the former part - "remission of sins".  
It was affirmed to be an antecedent, and by the reporter, a branch  
and part of justification, and many divines doe sae commonly make  
it. Some place it wholly in remission of sins, as Olivins<sup>(6)</sup>,  
Piscator<sup>(7)</sup>, Scultetus<sup>(8)</sup>, and words to that effect in some of the  
publicke confessions - French<sup>(9)</sup>, Belgicke<sup>(10)</sup>, etc. Yet I

Mr. Gataker: (continued) apprehend it to be a thing distinct from

justification. I confesse that's in the mold of the Article is most true, our sins are remitted for the merit of Christ and it doth always accompany justification, but it is no part of justification but a thing distinct from it. Reasons:

1. From the signification of the word, justify in noe language signifies to remit, pardon or forgive; in our English it rather signifies the contrary, to defend or to declare a man righteous. In Latin we cannot find the word in any classically author: it is only found in the Latin translation of Scripture and those that have thence medled with it, but for the Greek and Hebrew, in them I find noe place wher the word is taken necessarily to signify to pardon or forgive. In antient Greek writers the word is never used as in Scriptures. In them it is used sometimes de rebus, as to acknowledge a thing to be equall and right, to passe a sentence of a thing. Of persons, it is so far from signifying "to pardon" as that it signifies "to condemne", "to passe a sentence against a man" etc. Longinus<sup>(11)</sup>, a discourse, cites of [ ]<sup>(12)</sup> a place in Thucydides<sup>(13)</sup> mistaking both, wher the word signifies cleare contrary; if you show mercy to them you shall condemn yourselves.

Lindas<sup>(14)</sup> signifies to execute in the same author. But in the Word of God, [ ]<sup>(15)</sup> in the Hebrew [ ] taken 2 wages morally, but seldome, or judicially, ordinarily, morally to make a man habitually justified; 12 Daniel<sup>(16)</sup> make men just; 22 Rev. about 17<sup>(17)</sup>

Mr. Gataker: (continued) be just; and 3 Titus<sup>(18)</sup> being justified by

His grace some understand it in that sanctified; as on the contrary Hebrews 10<sup>(19)</sup> sanctified put for justified.

Generally the word is taken judicially.

25 Deut<sup>(20)</sup> --"justify the just."

82 Psal<sup>(21)</sup> --"justify the poore and needy not pardon  
but doe them right".

16 Luke<sup>(22)</sup> --"you justify yourselves before men, noe  
men will say pardon yourself before men."

If the word be never soe used then remission cannot be a part.

2 Rom<sup>(23)</sup> ["which shew the work of the law written in their  
hearts, their conscience also bearing witness and their  
thoughts meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."]

2. To justify is an act of justice, no [sic] pardon is an act  
of favour [not] of justice, and soe either of an advocate  
or a judge or jury who defined or acquite a man as guiltlesse.

If a man can plead satisfaction he pleads not guilty,  
but if a man plead his pardon the jury cannot say not guilty.

Justification is aposite either to crimination, as the  
act of an advocate, or condemnation, as the act of a judge.

3. Those things that are found different in subject are different,  
but ther may be justification wher ther is noe remission, and  
remission wher ther is noe justification. 70 Psal.<sup>(24)</sup>

"when he slew them" etc. and justification wher ther is noe  
remission 106 Psal.<sup>(25)</sup> Phineas.<sup>(26)</sup>

Though it be wher God justifies a sinner, ther redemption  
is a necessary consequence of sin. Reconciliation another  
effect of justification but a thing distinct.

Mr. Walker: A great deal of learning shewed concerning words and signification. And very well shewed that remission of sins may in some sence be a consequent of justification. This word "justify" signifies "active" - God's making of us righteous.

Passive justification.

Declarative justification, not in that sence as before man, but declaring us in foro conscience and before men. I take it our Article here speakes of justification in one kind and doth excellently set it out.

Immediately upon this union ther followes a communion soe as that whatsoever is Christ's is ours, as in marriage.

Active justification is as Luther actio individua. God by that Spirit by which He doth make us unto Christ He doth worke faith in us, makes us new creatures. When thus united unto Christ, we actually apply Christ with all his benefitts and soe are come to be justified, to lay hold upon Christ, enjoy and possess Christ, and soe have a fruiture or possessive justification, and this is that which is here described. Now when we are thus justified by faith, if at any time Sathen kept us, then by faith we fly to the righteousnesse of Christ and soe we are justified in foro conscience proprie and then we gae on and show our fruited and that is declarative justification.

It may signify making, reputing, and God's absolving us in our owne consciences and at the last day. Rom. 5 all these things expressed.

For the article as it is expounded, it is very well.

Dr. Hoyle: A few words. There is a great difference betwixt the tribunall of man and heaven. The 22 of Rev. <sup>(27)</sup> is not soe as quoted. 13 Acts <sup>(28)</sup> Paul's first penned sermon. Here is justifying from which argues pardon of sin. There is not a difference among divines about non peccator and justus. Consider where pardon be not the taking away the whole guilt which is to cast us out of heaven and soe to cast us into hell.

Justification without remission and remission without justification. 78 Ps. <sup>(29)</sup> There is a double pardon a deferring for a time and for such it doth not come to our question we doe not speake of deferring.

I may forgive a man and not acquit him, i.e. not the fact. Soe doth not God; sin is still sin. § Rom. <sup>(30)</sup> "who shall lay anything .... it is God that pardons". Pardon is an act of grace, justify an act of justice. It is said "justified freely by His grace."

Mr. Cataker: That in the Rev. it is plaine let him be justified for that in the Acts (Acts 13: <sup>39</sup>) justified from those things. There is noe necessity that it should signify pardoned, but acquitted. For that justification is an act of grace - true, in regard of us, but in regard of Christ, an act of justice and soe it is alwayes an act of justice. For that 78 Ps. 78: <sup>38</sup>.

I only say thence - justification may be put wher ther is nae remission.

Remission of sin as a delinquent must alwayes be a necessary effect of justification. Justification doth not only free a man from condemnation but also from the guilt of it.

Mr. Wilkinson: I intend not to speake anything in opposition but only that which is the very believe of my soule, it is said in the 1 John <sup>(31)</sup> "Christ came among his owne but they received him not, but to as many as received him" - this made them happy.

Now in the justification of a sinner, I must bind myself unto the word of God.

By justification I understand not the making of a man just by personal inherent righteousnesse, but God's acceptance accounting a sinner as righteous because he doth forgive his sins and impute Christ's righteousnesse unto him, and this manifests itself - the God justifies a man upon a most valuable consideration.

Prolocutor: We need to take heed of opposing the Antinomians lest we make Calvin Cuvier an Antinomian too and many others. Justification becomes sanctification, and faith a grace of sanctification.

Ordered that the recomittment of this hinder not the debating and voting this Article the next day.



- (1) There was a controversy as both Paul and James used the same example to establish different points. These points are in apparent contradiction. Paul (Rom. 4: 2,3,9,12,13) argued that Abraham exercised faith, and this was counted as being the cause of his being saved. James (Jas. 2: 21,23) argued that Abraham was saved because of his works. The divines were providing glosses for these texts to remove the appearance of contradiction.
- (2) Gen. 22:<sup>12</sup>
- (3) Appendix 1
- (4) Appendix 1
- (5) While Luther was apparently the first to use the term Antinomian in his controversy with Johann Agricola to describe the rejection of the moral law as a relevant part of Christian experience, Antinomianism is found in the New Testament where Paul refuted the suggestion that the doctrine of justification by faith alone leaves room for persistence in sin. There are two main forms of the Antinomian rejection of the law. Some, like Agricola, maintained that the moral law is not needed to bring the sinner to repentance. Others accepted the pedagogic use of the law to convince the sinner of his sin and lead him to Christ, but insist that the moral law had no place in the life of the believer who is not under law but under grace. (N. I. D. C. C. Blaire p 48).
- (6) The reference here is probably to the contribution made by Casper Olevianus to the statements on justification to be found in the Heidelberg Catechism 1563. In articles 60-62 the question of justification is dealt with. (Schaff 1 pp 529-554; 3 pp 307-355)
- (7) J. Piscator, Commentarii in Omnes Libros Novi Testamenti; Antehac separatim editi: nunc vero in unum volumen collecti, pp 136-7.
- (8) I have been unable to check this reference, given in British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books 217 p.899. A. Scultetus, Delitue Evangelicae Pragenses hoc est Observationes grammaticae historicae, theologicae, in historiam Jesu Christi nati, educati, baptizati, tentati; Ejusdem Sculteti oratio de conjungenda philologia cum theologia, Delitiis praemissa.  
Hanover 1620.

- (9) French Confession of Faith 1559. Article XVIII deals with justification and remission of sins. (Schaff 1 pp 490f; 3 pp 369f)
- (10) The Belgic Confession 1561. Article XXIII. (Schaff 1 pp 502f; 3 pp 409f)
- (11) Longinus, Dionysii Longini ... liber de grandi sive sublimi orationis genere. Nunc primum a F. Robertello ... in luce editus, ejusdem annotationibus Latinis in margine appositis. pp 202f
- (12) In an edition in the British Museum (144 p.200) an edition exists with notes provided by I. Casaubon. (1088 M.2) This could possibly be what is referred to.
- (13) Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, 7, <sup>84</sup> p 540.
- (14) Lindas - Lindanus - Lindt, Willem van der. Bishop of (1) Roermond; (2) Ghent.
- (15) Text indecipherable.
- (16) Dan. 12: <sup>10</sup>
- (17) Rev. 22: <sup>11</sup>
- (18) Titus 3: <sup>7</sup>
- (19) Heb. 10: <sup>10, 14</sup>
- (20) Deut. 25: <sup>1</sup>
- (21) Ps. 8: <sup>24</sup>
- (22) Luke 16: <sup>18</sup>
- (23) Rom. 2: <sup>15</sup>
- (24) Ps. 70: <sup>31</sup>
- (25) Ps. 106: <sup>13</sup>
- (26) Exod. 6: <sup>25</sup>, Num. 25: <sup>6-15</sup>
- (27) Rev. 22: <sup>11</sup>
- (28) Acts 13: <sup>24</sup>
- (29) Ps. 78: <sup>38</sup>
- (30) Rom. 8: <sup>33</sup>
- (31) John 1: <sup>11</sup>

September 7th. 1643.

Report of the first committee of the Article recounselled and was brought in.

Mr. Greene: One most uncomfortable error cannot be so certainly met withall in any Article as in this certainty of salvation and falling away from grace, whether it may not be fit to add something for this, especially for the former.

Mr. Coleman: Falling away from grace comes in the 16th. Article, The other will come in the 17th. Article.

Dr. Gouge: It is stated "we are justified": that is, we are accounted righteous.

Dr. Featley: This word    seems to give a definition. There are 2 things of great difficulty to be defined, the highest and the lowest things: former because of perfection, the other because of imperfection; the former not capable of definition, the other none can be given of it. Justification, I referre to the former kind, see in the Bohemian article<sup>(1)</sup> Hoc est caput etc. though it be difficult to give an exact definition, yet that ought to sharpen our edge, not dull it. Distinguish of a 3 fould righteousness. Perfect, but not inherent of this. 2 Cor 5:<sup>21</sup> Inherent not perfect: 1 Luk 15. Perfect and inherent 12 Heb. 21    of just men. The first, by which we are justified, 2 by which we are sanctified, the 3 by which we are glorified.

Definition:

An act of God whereby He doth acquit and pronounce just every believing and repentant sinner.

Dr. Featley: (continued) It meets with all the doubts and confronts all the errors apposite, as the error of the libertine expressing repentance [ not imputing sin. Arminians,<sup>(2)</sup> Socinians,<sup>(3)</sup> perfect satisfaction and Papists imputation of Christ's perfect obedience, not any worke nae not faith itselfe. Because the Papists chalendge any before Calvin and Luther to hold that a man is justified by another man's righteousness. He then cited Justin Martyr<sup>(4)</sup> "on unconceivable mercy." St. Jerome<sup>(5)</sup> upon those words in St. Paul "righteousnesse of God in him." St. Austen<sup>(6)</sup> upon John 3:2 ; 21 Psal - (7). St. Bernard in his concio ad Templarios<sup>(8)</sup> - 61 Sermons upon Cant.

I only except one passadge: how can we say "by workes" if that rech unto faith which is said in the very letter by faith?

Dr. Hoyle: "By faith only"; it is meant all things in us excluded save only faith. When we say "by nae workes" we meane with the Scripture exclusion.

Mr. Gataker: Divers of these things will be considered of [ and ] debated in their place.

Those words to me seeme something ambiguous "to be accounted righteous" before God, as containing the formality of Justification [ and ] the reason is because the like phrase is used in Scripture. Concerning Sanctification - an expresse place, 1 Luke 6 in that worthy elogium given to Zachary and Elizabeth, both just in the sight of God - the meaning is they were sincere, not justified persons - As Ambrose upon the place<sup>(9)</sup>. See the words following expand it, the reason is given because they walked unblameably in all the commandments of the Lord, justifiable

Mr. Gataker: (continued)

in regard of sincerity and in integrity before God. In some sort the wickedest man in the world may be justifiable before God, as in case of wrong accusation.

Dr. Hoyle: This is not to expresse the formality but the generality of justification. The formality follows. We doe not take this as a whole definition.

Mr. Coleman: That of Zachari and Elizabeth that justification in workes are expressed to be ingredients but excluded in this. That in the Article will stand very well, for it is proper only to justification. It cannot be said of sanctification, we are accounted holy.

By workes, though faith be a worke, yet it is not a deserving worke.

Mr. Seaman: I think the latter words may be very well spared, as if to be accounted righteous and justified were all one, which I doe not think to be true. That we are accounted righteous is a truth, but [ ] ]

Mr. Walker: [ ] ]

Mr. Palmer: It is very convenient. It should stand as it doth.

One of the first controversies betweene us and the Papists whether to justify signify an act of justification or of judicature. This latter we hould and therefore ought to express it thus.

Mr. Walker: If it gae thus we are justified and accounted righteous. It's an imperfect division, to say that to justify is either by [infusion] or verbum forense, for ther is a justification by communion of the righteousness of Christ.

Dr. Gouge: The "we are justified" was added to be the definition.

The words following have not reference to it alone, but [to]  
the whole Article.

Mr. Seaman: The word "justify" - 2 senses, to make just either  
forensically or by way of infusion [and] both these are distinct  
from "accounting righteous". Here is not only definition added  
but an explication which is exceeding short.

Mr. Bathurst: We do not sufficiently cleare up the justice of God  
in this Article. In those words are sins done away?

Mr. Gataker: To be accounted righteous doth imply rather a matter  
of favour than of justice.

Mr. Tuckney: If it did end in those words it were true, but the  
whole doth satisfy this fully.

Mr. Bathurst: That which sticks with me is the preposterousnesse  
in the expressions, that accounting righteous should be expressed  
before remission of sins.

Dr. Smith: Though in description of things we must put one thing  
after another, yet the order is very good, because all at one time.

Mr. Vines: It will be safe for us to speake according to the word of  
God, "shall many be made righteous."<sup>(10)</sup> Imputency of righteous-  
nesse to us is very frequent. But this [verse] is but "the  
making of me righteous," whereas this phrase "we are accounted  
righteous" etc. [is not there]

Dr. Hoyle: Consider when this Article was made and against whom;  
about the end of the Counsell of Trent<sup>(11)</sup> and against the Papists.

Mr. Gataker: Justification and remission of sins are 2 distinct things  
and therefore the Article will run well if "accounted righteous" be  
left out.

Mr. Wilkinson, Senr: Ther is a difference between justification and sanctification because in justification we are accounted righteous by imputation, [in] sanctification by infusion of grace, etc.

Mr. Taylor: I conceive we have gone in the right order. Our sins are therefore forgiven because of Christ's satisfaction.

Mr. Seeman: Here seems to be some difference betweene the first and last part of the Article in the [ ] without having any righteousnesse imputed we may be imputed righteous.

Mr. Walker: The apostell doth use the phrases indifferently - imputing and reputed.

Mr. Coleman: First saith we are accounted righteous, the words show how. Whole obedience.

Mr. Vines: Our absolution from guilt and freedome from condemnation and title to life and heaven is not in parcells to be sought in Christ's obedience, but His whole obedience.

But whether His whole obedience be the matter that God imputes whereby we are accounted righteous [ ] that it doth [ ].

I do not restraine the passive obedience of Christ; ther was some action in that. I doe also conceive that not only to our justification we may account our obedience passive but all other whether penall or if we may call them servile.

But I make some question whether that obedience that Christ as man being man might be bound to performe.

That which sticks with me [is this]. It hath seemed very much sporting with the whole force of Scriptures to assigne our justification, taking it for the remission of sins, to the

Mr. Vines: (continued) passive obedience of Christ.

"For if he was obedient"<sup>(12)</sup> [ ] ]  
the passive sufferings of Christ the proper matter imputed. -  
"Making peace" - "redeemed by his blood"<sup>(13)</sup>, "sit forth in blood"<sup>(14)</sup>,  
"without blood nae remission"<sup>(15)</sup>, "blood of Christ purifyeth us  
from all sin".<sup>(16)</sup>

For Christ's purity of nature - you will not say that  
[ "it" ] is imputed for justification and sae for those acts of  
obedience as pure man.

All doth some way conduce as "the lambe must be without  
spot" but it is not that which makes it a sacrifice, but blood.

That obedience instanced 5 Rom [ Romans 5: 19 ] disobedience  
was of one man one disobedience, once acted, and sae opposed to  
an obedience.

Dr. Hoyle: Whether the 2nd. person in Trinity was tyed to keepe the  
lawe. It cannot sae easily to deny Christ's purity was imputed.  
But I will not count a falcy of division.

The Scripture syneck dockes - doth meane his blood but  
that in 5 Rom was His obedience. Adam's disobedience was an  
active disobedience sae Christ's obedience.

Mr. Walker: Adam's act of offence though it was but one yet it  
striped us naked, made us guilty of sin, and bound us over to  
death, maede us sinners.<sup>(17)</sup> Now in this it could be sufficient  
for Christ to bring righteousnesse [ out of unrighteousnesse ]. To  
make me without sin is nae thing except who made me righteous.  
You cannot separate Christ's active and passive obedience.



Mr. Vines: The suffering of Christ must not be compared with other sufferings. Christ was active and obedient in suffering if our sins be pardoned. We are not like dogs and horses. With such reasons I am not satisfied.

Whether the active righteousness of Christ be imputed to make us righteous, or a title given. It may be another question whether this be seen fully and clearly held out in the New Testament as in the other.

Mr. Bathurst: "Making righteous" is more than mere "making Innocent". Other places: 1 Cor 1:31 : 2 Cor 5:21 -- "made sin for us that" etc. Righteousness of God [is] not in ourselves but in Him: His righteousness [is] imputed to us. 4 Phil. (18) "not my own righteousness."

We have not answered this fac/to/hoc, we must answer it in our surety.

The active and passive obedience of Christ directly meets with our [ ] .

Mr. Sey: Those places lately quoted [are] pertinent to prove the active obedience of Christ as imputed to us. Those that hold justification to consist in remission of sins must hold an active obedience because remission is not only of sins committed but duties omitted.

Mr. Woodcocke: I am unsatisfied with this expression in the Article "whole obedience." If the whole obedience of Christ be imputed as my obedience then there is no place left for pardon of sin.

Mr. Gataker: It was said, Christ as the second person. The taking of Christ's humanity to subsist together with His deity in one

Mr. Gataker: (continued) person doth not excuse the humane nature of Christ to cease to be a creature [ and ] then Christ as man did owe a duty to God his Creator.

Christ might have been perfectly holy though He had not performed those servile offices upon earth. "Forme of a servant" -- in those words the apostell doth speake of halcing our human nature.

Christ stood bound to Love His Father "with all His soule"<sup>(19)</sup> or might, etc. Christ's obedience.

I doe not accept from matter of satisfaction those things which by nae law He was bound unto and sae especially His suffering. Those will go together to make up the satisfaction etc.

But those things that did pertaine to the integrity of His nature, those actions or those affections cannot come within the compasse of that reasone.

Said we "by faith" apprehend all Christ and a union and communion betwixt us. It is most true, but it doth not therefore follow that ther is a communion of all things. For this or that, particular and [ ]. Whatsoever God sent [ was ] good. To require [ Him ] to make satisfaction [ for ] man's sin, that went altogether. Now whether ther be not sufficient matter of satisfaction in Christ's passive obedience is the question. If it be sufficient, I see not why we should require either the sanctity and holynesse of Christ's nature.

The dignity of Christ's person adds to the merit of Christ's person, the bloud of God.

[ He ] said we must not only be made guiltlesse but just.

Mr. Gataker: (continued) I am not able to find a difference between Justonem and Justum, in the reasonable creature. 20 Dut, [Deuteronomy 25:1] "He that cannot be charged with any breach of the law is perfectly righteous."

Said this must bring in an active obedience of Christ. That which frees me from all sin must put [me] into a state of righteousness, but "the blood of Christ" (20) etc. - it is Martinus' argument. (21)

Mr. Herle: It is said that Christ was a creature and see not only a son of Adam but of Abraham [and] so doubly bound. When the humane nature was assumed it was not deified, but the obligation is not betwixt God and nature, but God and a person. The person in whom this human nature lyes is not a creature.

This error or heresy, call it what you will, is of great danger. It riseth as high as most errors and falls in with the Papists, that Christ did merit something for Himselfe. The active obedience of Christ was a part of His mediation. In original sin we have stated it. 4 Gal 4 (22) "made under the law to redeeme"... [i.e.] not redeeme only by His passive obedience.

10 Heb 6 "Loe if I come to doe thy will", to do the will of God must have reference to our redemption. The bare suffering of His will is not proper. Then it cannot stand with remission etc., this is the Socinian example. It is true ther is a full satisfaction made by another person, but it is a free word, in the provision of it and in the acceptance of it.

(23)  
Dr. Smith: That in the 5 Rom often urged in its thought, fit to be urged againe. But more in it than yet I heare [and] I thinke

Dr. Smith: (continued) more than in all places urged.

This [text] speakes of two thinges.

"By the righteousnesse of one" must be understood the active obedience of Christ, and the reason [for this] is because the word is frequently taken in the auld Testament for the morrall law and see 1 Iuk 6.

There is a communication [of] the workes of Christ, His active and passive obedience.

Mr. Walker: - 2 doubtts -

1. Christ though man [God] was a creature [and] therefore bound to fullfill the law, if Christ took our nature [and] was layed in the manger who could not say what doth He in a manger [and] flying into Egypt. This doth a little savour of Socinianism. Why did Christ take our nature upon Him? - it was for us. [ sin of omission hath 2 things: want of righteousnesse which I ought to have [ ]].

Mr. Wilkinson: When Christ came to John to be baptized thus: it behoveth us to fullfill all righteousnesse.

Mr. Seaman: The matter of debate is not whether we stand in need of the obedience of Christ but whether this whole righteousnesse be imputed. All that Christ did was in reference to us [and] the obedience of Christ began in the instant of the union, and nothing in Christ can doe us good further than its an act of obedience. Though as under the law he was bound unto it, yet his being under the law was voluntary.

Mr. Hericke:

Dr. Hoyle: It is a dangerous opinion that Christ should as a creature be compared to angels or tyed to dy.

Mr. Walker: To be righteous and innocent is all one. Is a very strange speech.

Mr. Carter: It was said ther is nae medium betwixt part of sin [and] righteousnesse if pardon of sin makes a man righteous with Adam's righteousnesse, whether doth it put him into a heavenly state.

1 Cor 15:<sup>47</sup>

Take Adam in his pure naturales [and] imagine that righteousnesse in Paradise - this would not raise him. The rule by which he comes unto it is in the law [and] the power is by Jesus Christ.

Mr. Gataker: It is a deep charge to charge all those with heresy that hould all these.

Some devines named others may be added - as Tilenus,<sup>(24)</sup> Camero,<sup>(25)</sup> - to say that Christ being as man inferior to God did in that regard give duty to God I see not why erroneous.

That 4 Gal<sup>(26)</sup> made under the law, bred, created, brought into the world while the law yet stood. To redeeme those that are under the law, it is not spoken of redeeming from the curse of the law, but the pedagogy of the law. That we might receive the adoption of sons, that we might be in a freer state than 10 Heb - to doe what will not the law. The pactum betweene God and man, but special pactum betweene God and Him. Instance Christ expressly 14 Joh<sup>(27)</sup> and, "what the Father hath [and] me let us gae hence".

By which will we are sanctified - discharged from the guilt of our sins<sup>(28)</sup>. Rom 5, chapter, nothing of the active obedience in this.

1 Cor 30 - "made redemption" - how? - by paying the price. What

Mr. Gataker: (continued) is the effect of this price? - Justification and sanctification.

2 Cor 5:<sup>21</sup> "Make sin" - a sin sacrifice.

The making of Him a sin sacrifice makes us to be the righteousness of God in Him. - Difference between pardon and justice - true there is a great difference but justification is not pardon, they are several things.

Discharge from all guilt of sin and justice. There is nae medium between them. He that hath done nothing against the law is justified. If asked how we come to a right to heaven "doe this and live"<sup>(29)</sup> - covenant with Adam before the fall and see if he did continue in his integrity he was to live; that is to continue in that happy state in which created, but for translating to heaven - I find not in Scripture. But how doe we come to have right to heaven - I answer - "by adoption". By justification we are raised to nae higher estate than Adam before the fall. If adoption is by Christ merited for us and that by His death and sufferings, for Christ meriting for Himselfe [

] those that have maintained this are not to be ranked amongst the Papists, but I desire not to affirm it.

Mr. Wilson: I thinke we have another title to heaven than adoption - also 1 Eph speaks of the title of redemption: Adam's sin and disobedience ther is opposed to this. That which was Adam's was by imputation [ and ] see by the like reason [ ]

Mr. Palmer: - A motion to apoynt a committee.

In the numbering of the pages

194

was inadvertently omitted.

Mr. Herle: By way of retraction - I acknowledge the word heresy was too much, otherwise then it falls in with the Nestorian heresy, (30) I had nae intention to chardge it upon that Reverend Brother. I am very sorry for it, he is one whom I doe very much honour.



- (1) Produced in 1575 by Pressius and Krispin the Second Bohemian Confession was a joint protestant confession. It was framed by Lutherans, Calvinists and Noe-Utraquists. Melancthonian in spirit it consisted of twenty-five articles. (Schaff 1 pp 579f)
- (2) Theological system named after Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609). A professor of theology at Leyden, he entered into dispute with Gomarus on the doctrine of predestination. After the death of Arminius his followers issued the remonstrance of 1610 which outlined the system. The major points of departure from strict Calvinism are that the Holy Spirit must help men to do things that are truly good, such as having faith in Christ for salvation; that the decree of salvation applies to all who believe in Christ and who persevere in obedience and faith; and that God's saving grace is not irresistible, it is possible for men who are Christians to fall from this grace. This teaching was condemned at the Synod of Dort, 1619. The teaching spread to England under the influence of Archbishop Laud. (N. I. D. C. C. 70, Clouse.)
- (3) A rationalistic movement that grew from the thought of Lelio Sozzini (1525-1562) and his nephew Fausto (1539-1604). Their attempt to restore primitive Christianity led them to reject the Roman Church, and they were forced to seek refuge from persecution in Poland. Socinianism taught a rationalistic interpretation of Scripture with an emphasis on the early part of the O.T. and the N.T.; an acceptance of Jesus as the revelation of God, but nevertheless solely as man; non-resistance; the separation of Church and State; and the doctrine of the death of the soul with the body except for selective resurrection of those who persevered in obeying Jesus' commandments. These principles were enshrined in the Racovicen Catechism of 1605. (N. I. D. C. C. 912, Clouse.)
- (4) Justin Martyr, (c. 100-165). A Christian Apologist with three extant works; Apology, Second Apology, Dialogue with Trypho.
- (5) St. Jerome, Opera Omnia, X Novum Testamentum, Epistola ad Corinthos Secunda, pp 803-804.
- (6) St. Augustine, In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV, Tractate XI, P.L 35, pp 1474-1484.
- (7) St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos, XXI, P.L 36, pp 167-182.
- (8) St. Bernard, Sermones in Cantica Canticorum, Sermo 61, P.L 183, pp 1070f.

- (9) St. Ambrose, Exposito Evangelii Secundam Lucam, P.L 14, pp 1539f
- (10) Rom 5: 19
- (11) The Council of Trent met from 1545-1563. Decreed by Bull "Laetare Hierusalem". The Council met in December, 1545 to settle the religious disputes brought about by the Protestants, to reform certain ecclesiastical abuses and to begin a crusade against Islam. (Jedin, History of the Council of Trent, 2 pp 196f).
- (12) Phil. 2: 8
- (13) Rev. 5: 9
- (14) 1 John 1: 7
- (15) Heb. 9: 22
- (16) 1 John 1: 7
- (17) Rom. 3: 23
- (18) Phil. 3: 9
- (19) Deut. 4: 29
- (20) 1 John 1: 7
- (21) M. Luther, Lectures on Deuteronomy, pp346-351.
- (22) Gal. 4: 5
- (23) Rom. 5: 18
- (24) Daniel Tilenus (1563-1633). Professor at Saumur 1602-1618. He attacked Camero's teaching on grace, and supported the decisions of Dort. The French National Synod at Tonneia ordered the dispute to end. Tilenus was later offered a bishoprie by James 1, but died in Paris. (R. G. G. 6 p899 Moltmann).
- (25) John Camero (1560-1625). Taught at Saumur and attempted a theological reconciliation between Empiricism and Federal Theology. He rejected the evolved system of Nature Law and Grace. He also rejected synodical authority and sought a reconciliation with the Arminians and Catholics. (R. G. G. 1 p 1603) (Moltmann).
- (26) Gal. 4: 4-5
- (27) John 14: 31
- (28) Heb. 10: 10

(29) Luke 10:28

(30) Nestorianism is the heresy taught by Nestorius which split Jesus Christ the God-man into two distinct persons, one human, one divine. (Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching 1908)

Dr. Hoyle: To call the Lord Jesus Christ a creature is too neare  
 hearise, though His humane nature was created yet to say He was  
 a creature it was as if Jesus Christ did not suffer for Himselfe.  
 Some say He did suffer Himselfe.

10 John<sup>(1)</sup> this commandment true, the commandment to  
 suffer, but was that all?

Arg: Jesus Christ's bloud, crosse and worke named, they must  
 imply a syneck doche - so the accurate divines of Germany - active  
 obedience must gae with the passive. We are tyed to two things:  
 (1) To keep the law of God, if not a forfeiture. Jesus Christ  
 was as man to doe both .. "as by the obedience of one man"<sup>(2)</sup> ..  
 and this not answered yesterday 1 Joh<sup>(3)</sup>. (2) This not named yet.  
 Jesus Christ the just. His righteousness is oposed to our sin.  
 Suffering of Jesus Christ was the catastrophe, to the death.

Mr. Gataker: Apologise for what I spoke yesterday now grated upon as  
 a dangerous expression. Jesus Christ as man and creature, and soe  
 did owe some duty to His creator. I suppose this noe irregular  
 or dangerous expression, the rather because I find it used by the  
 ancient fathers. So with Tertullian<sup>(4)</sup> in divers of his orations,  
 Ciril<sup>(5)</sup> the principall of nestorius in his Comt; upon John; 2 Lib  
 92 chaps, - Adorantibus ador ab Christus ab homo; Christus ab servus  
ab creatura. Testimony of one or two writers of note, Gomarus<sup>(6)</sup> -  
 12 thesis of his disputation De justifi; peccator esse - his words  
 go further than I spoke yesterday. Junius<sup>(7)</sup> against Bel<sup>amine</sup>; 7;  
 2 Comt; ilib; 16 chap. by the law of a created nature.

French Synods in Epistola ad Piscatorem<sup>(8)</sup> desire those  
 things may not be wrested beyond the intention of him that speaks it.

Mr. Vines: I confesse I sticke at this whether the active obedience of Christ be imputed to us for justification. I have never delivered it in publick because I thought ther might be something in it, sae many learned men of that mind. I dae not deny that the perfections of Jesus Christ both in nature and actions doe conduce to this end .. that he might be a perfect sacrifice; sae that it not as conducing to justification for as I said of a lamb, the resurrection, ascention and intercession doe conduce to this.

Jesus Christ in His passive obedience was not merely passive but active too - He did the will of His Father in suffering. But when we inquire .. what is that obedience imputed as the matter of His righteousness, it seems to me to be His passive, His personall or formall sufferings the accomplishment whereof is in His death and r[esurrection], because the whole current of the scriptures seems to me to run this way. This insisted upon when justification is touched as Rom 3:<sup>24</sup>(9) (Rom 3:<sup>26</sup>) .. that whereby God is just and a justifier is that whereby we are righteous .. but that is by Christ as a propitiation. Rom 5:<sup>10</sup>.

That which the legall purgings and expiations in the time of the law did foresignify was blood and that was necessary to be.

That which purgeth all sin and leaves noen that is our righteousnesse which they seale. If redemption and justification be by His blood, we are justified by that by which we are redeemed. But this is not by His active obedience. If an imputation of His active, it must be ratified in His blood.

The originall of that mostly in His blood and death. Two distinctions I have heard:

Mr. Vines: (continued) (1) Sins of omission taken away by active.

(2) Title to heaven [ ] in the active obedience of Jesus Christ - non est distinguendum, ubi lex nil distinguit - is not the omission [of] a sin that carries guilt, and the guilt is not expiated without attonement. For [of] the two wher lyes this distinction? In the scriptures is not everlasting life derived unto us from the passive obedience of Jesus Christ, we do not enter heaven but by blood. If the loss of heaven be the fruite of my sin and imperfection of sanctification be the fruite of my sin, these must needs be taken away by the death of Christ. The foundation of our title lyes in adoption and sonship and this comes under meritts.

How the active obedience of Jesus Christ is imputed to me that I am invested with it see that upon that I may claime heaven is apoynt, that a man may draw strange consequences from it. As ther is nae midle place soe ther is nae midle state for the Scriptures.

"Thus it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness"<sup>(10)</sup> this place doth not belong to this businesse.

The meaning is thus; it becomes thee and me in our places and offices to fullfill. For that 5 Rom: if you hould the passive obedience is not excluded why doe you bring on from Adam His active obedience.

The text afords me ground for such correspondance - obedient to death not untill death, for it follows the death of the crosse.

This obedience must relate unto some will of God, Heb 10:<sup>10</sup> to doe thy will sanctified.

The will to which He was obedient was by the offering of

Mr. Vines: (continued) His body once.

4 Gal. 4 "under the law may be under the malediction of the law", but I conceive it relates to that in the former chap<sup>ter</sup> under the law in those observations and elements the church receive the adoption of sons.

Mr. Walker: Desire they would not think we yeld the cause because we do not answer things answered before.

For that of omission it was a mistake in omission ther is first a sin and then an absence of righteousnesse soe farre as its a sin satisfied by the sufferings of Jesus Christ but for the other a necessity of the active obedience of Jesus Christ.

For that of right by adoption and therefore not by justification true right by that but it never goes alone if we could imagine a man adopted not to be such a son as God required.

Dealt with us as the Antinomians doe, bring many Scriptures. [

54 Esa: <sup>14</sup> this righteousnesse is a part of that which they possesse as an inheritance. ]

Esa. 61: <sup>10</sup>

Take away active obedience of Christ how can workes and dutyes of sanctification be made complete in Jesus Christ..

Mr. Wilkinson: The words set down by the committy give occasion to handle this question whether the active righteousnesse of Jesus Christ be to be taken in [ ] For my part I doe exceedingly approve of those arguments brought to magnify the passive righteousnesse of Jesus Christ, yet I cannot exclude the

Mr. Wilkinson: (continued) active obedience.

Jesus Christ as mediator is a prophet, priest and King: now there are poynts of active obedience in all these three offices with more [ ] ] concurre to the salvation of a sinner, as a prophet He is to instruct His church the justification is by publication of God's consell and this is a part of His actuall obedience: that spirit spoken of [which] did give that church into saving knowledge but Jesus Christ coming He added to the [ ] ]. 2. As priest 2 parts to be considered. Satisfaction take that in the passive obedience, though this be yelded yet ther is a second part. Intercession - an actuall obedience as He is our mediator and as being our mediator a priest.

The prayer is 17 Joh.

3. As King He governs the church and illuminates the church. Those are acts. I doe as truely lay hold upon those as upon His death and passion.

When we speake of justification God in this businesse deals with us as the prodigall with his son; first strips us of the polutions of sin and then clothes us. Illustrate it by Joshuah; 3 Zach. (11)

Jesus Christ is the Messiah not only to take away iniquity but to bring in eternal righteousnesse.

Mr. Gibson: Our brethren speake but be that of remission of sin but Paul speakes of both of a further gift righteousnesse [ ] ].

The comparison in the 19 is a full comparison ther is both the Protasis (12) and Apodasis (13).



Mr. Gibson: (continued) It tends more to the glory of God to take in both parts the righteousnesse of sanctification will not serve our harm for ther is grace and corruption mixed.

Mr. Goodwin: By way of answer.

The first thing was sayed.

Acknowledges that the active obedience conduceth to justification as a qualification as Mr. Forbes.

Ther must be more in the active obedience to qualify His person the dignity of it and that habituall grace in it the first moment assuming our nature was qualification enough to make His passive obedience acceptable and ther was nae need of a chane upon that. Ther is a concession in both but in that place Roms.6: 19 ther is harmlesnesse and holynesse mentioned but nothing of active obedience.

That place doth not speak of Him offering Himselfe but His intercession. Whenever our justification is treated on ther the passive only.

Beza the Epistle to Romans (14) handles the doctrine of justification most exactly in all the parts. Remission of sins are part of it in the 4th. chapter in 3 ch: 31 he had said we establish the law and this he will make good by ∫ it is not fully established by remission of sins. The law that requires ther must be a righteousnesse that is 5 Rom. The question is whether the active be not excluded though active intended here. It is true the passive is not excluded though active intended and that for 2 reasons.

1. From the opposition betweene Adam's sin and Jesus Christ's

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) obedience, Adam's sin is called one disobedience and of one man but 17v oppositely to this one sin abundance of grace. If passive obedience only meant that was but one offering but this hath many parts of righteousness.

In 18v it is called a justification of life. The right to eternal life also founded in His blood thus these two parts of the law established. Having spoken of inherent corruption remaining - in the 7 ch, then what shall justify him from this. - 8 Ch.<sup>2(15)</sup> by the law of Spirit and Life opposed to the law of sin and death, the law rewritten in the heart of Christ.

The holynesse of Christ's nature opposite to the sinfulness of our nature. Having shewed those parts of justification thus orderly then his conclusion is that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled - here you have the whole righteousness of the law.

Objection - the blood of Christ [not] mentioned.

- the reason, because the last part of the point and the great peril of it. It is true that without blood no remission [of sins], the active obedience would not save us without this.

Objection - [We are] justified by what we are redeemed from.

- we are redeemed from the whole law.

Objection - [There is] no type of active obedience in the old law.

- 5 Heb:<sup>1</sup> offer gifts and sacrifices for sins, 8 Heb:<sup>3</sup> more expressly gifts and sacrifices. Therefore it is of necessity that this man have something to offer both of gifts and sacrifices.

Compare 4 Heb.<sup>(16)</sup> - mercy for pardon and grace for acceptance.

I will not urge the peace offerings for that Christ as

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) a man and creature soe [He] owes His obedience.

We may grant it and if ther had been nae other, His obedience could not justify us. But take another consideration as Adam's sin served for both sae might Christ's obedience.

1. Consider the state the Second Person was in before He did assume our nature. He was an equall with God; He needed never have assumed man's nature, though He was free to assume it. He did it by covenant; He took it to noe other end but that He might save and justify us.

2. [There were] many parts of the morall law which as a man He was not subjected and bound unto. All the duties of the second table He is not bound unto, nor some of the first. He was made under the law not natus but factus not borne under it, considering the dignity of His person.

He is called the Lord of the law and that as son of man He is Lord of grace as well as Lord of glory. Therefore for Him to subject Himselfe to this law [].

2 more considerations.

1. The maine subject of this obedience is the person. Therefore called the bloud of God. It is the obedience more than a creature.

2. The humane nature united to the Son of God, He had a propriety in this nature which the Father and Holy Ghost had not. This is united personally to the Son of God and He can call this His owne, which is not soe of the other persons. Therefore an emphasis upon that His own bloud.

Mr. Herle: Something by way of answer to him that first spake - [do] not exclude the active obedience but as still conducing to []

].

Objection 1 - It can nowher be found that this active obedience is imputed. That which was typified by types of ould law - nothing but blood.

The fault of the argument is Ignoratio [Elenchi] (17) - that before us is this imputation towards righteousesse and not remission of sins. "By blood" - this most famously set down in Scripture - the active obedience of Christ could not be imputed to us sinners till His death.

3 Math (18) this place he understood [] this is not a safe expression that John should share in the fullfilling of righteousesse.

In Romans 5 - it could not hould in the affirmative because it could not hould in the negative. This we cannot hould in the way of a rule because this is impossible - Adam's passive disobedience - ther is noe such thing. For this is the end of the law - the perfection of the law - is obedience not passive obedience.

Piscator (19) himself was the author of this opinion [and he] saith [on] page 42 of his "Considerations" - "we are still bound." 2 Gal. (20) - it is said to be spoken of the Jews under the ceremoniall - but writting to them and saing "us", it is not probable that he should mean them.

10 Heb. (21) - "loe I come."

This will or this what he doth to this will is active and this law is written in his heart.

Mr. Herle: (continued) For the imputation - whatever we were bound to doe and did not, Christ did for us and must be imputed to us.

But we were bound to active obedience - 2 Col.:<sup>10</sup> - complete in Him. That we did owe an active obedience to the law no man will question, but the Antinomians.

For that Christ being a creature He was under the law - it is a questionlesse and dangerous manner of speaking and some have given it a high censure thus we give to Piscator a counsell it's the doctrine of the counsell of Trent: 6 ch. 7 sess. (22) it's

Mr. White: C-----

Mr. Gataker: It is said that justification is a judiciall act; that I have allwayes stood for.

For the 3fould charge I suppose there is but one charge.

1. Holynesse required.
2. An activating of this holynesse.
3. Transgression.

Those are not 3 severall charges for the former is what he ought to have and to doe. But now comes the crime and offence - you have transgressed thus. What must this man plead now?

It is true I am unholy and soe lyable to a penalty - nay I stand guilty I cannot plead not guilty. If I plead not guilty as the believer may doe - the answer is easy - the blood of Christ doth purge me from all iniquity and soe the jury cannot find me guilty, and the judge must acquit me.

That of Christ qua homo.

Actus sunt suppositorum but it is respecta maturarum

Mr. Gataker: (continued) confound the acts of duty and humanity we shall fall in with the heretiques that speakes of 2 wills in Christ.

It is said in sins of omission ther is 2 things, this goes beyond my reach. That man that is reputed to have omitted nothing must be esteemed to have done what is required, for that of adoption. It doth not go alone [ ]

I see not how this concerns the poynt in hand, God adopts none but those he fits for heaven and how doth he fit them but by sanctification.

Osiander<sup>(23)</sup> did dreame of an essentiall righteousnesse. Ther needs nae celestiall righteousnesse according to the honour of the law.

- Divers places not spoken of by any.

54 Esa.<sup>(24)</sup> "in righteousnesse shalt thou be established". I doe not conceive this any whit. Read to the end and "be farre from oppression".

61 Esa:<sup>10 (25)</sup> "I demand what this isspoken of, every tongue in you shall condemne. I will maintaine those servants of mine against all opposition."

61 Esa:<sup>10 (26)</sup> Ther is no necessity of this illustration "put off the ould man and put on the new." The same strange [arguments] that [made] those places soe ambiguous, should be brought to prove such an Article as this. Who denies Christ to be our righteousnesse. 17 Psal.

Ps 17 - I know not how those places follow.

24 Ps.:<sup>5</sup> Righteousnesse common in Scripture for the renewal of righteousnesse.

69 Psal. [ ] as God saith I will not hold him guiltlesse never assoyle him. This is said because of the stains

Mr. Gataker: (continued) whether these staines be not all taken out by Christ's blood - 7 Rev. 14.

Mr. Palmer: [I do] not [want] to trouble you with anything spoken this day. [There are] 4 things [I want to say].

1. Those arguments that seeme to require because we must have a righteousnesse therefore the active righteousnesse - these are not in use yet.

2. The capitall argument brought is the current of the Scripture for the passive righteousnesse. You have already determined the sufferings of Christ's soule are part of the satisfaction: you doe not find this in the current and stream of the Scriptures which speake of His body. I doe believe the places urged to prove that are sufficient, but yet they doe not, of themselves, as that soule [was] heavy to death - nothing more ordinary.

I believe the sufferings of Christ in soule are comprehended in all those because then there are other cogent arguments as that "drops of blood"<sup>(27)</sup>, my God etc., we must be redeemed, sae in this when we have layed downe sufficient ground to prove the imputation of His active obedience, the same general place will serve the turne.

2 places to argue.

1. 5 Rom.:<sup>10</sup> "by the righteousnesse of one" - the active righteousnesse of one. I believe you cannot find the word in all the scriptures to signify His sufferings. If it doe but include the active righteousnesse. It is an improper expression to say His righteousnesse by way of suffering.

- (1) John 10: 18
- (2) Rom. 5: 14
- (3) 1 John 2: 1, 2
- (4) Tertullian, Adversus Haereticos, P.L 2
- (5) St. Cyril, Commentarium in Evangelium Joannis, 2, 9, 30 P.L 73 pp 386f.
- (6) F. Gomarus, Opera Theologica Omnia, 3 Disputationis Tractus theologici. Tract 18 De justificatione, contra Pontificorum errores pp 114.
- (7) F. Junius, Opera Theologica, 2 Anamadversiones ad Robert Bellarmini Societatis Iesu ut vocant contra versian primam, de verbo scripto et non scripto, (1) p 16.
- (8) J. Piscator was enjoined by the French Reformed Church at the Synod of Gap 1603, not to trouble the church with his letters and books. His teaching was then condemned. (Quick, I p 227)
- (9) Rom. 3: 26
- (10) Matt. 3: 15
- (11) Zech. 3: 1f
- (12) A proposition or promise.
- (13) The concluding clause of a sentence as contrasted with the introductory clause.
- (14) T. Beza, Annotationes, (1598), Epistole Pauli, Ad Romanos pp 25f.
- (15) Rom. 8: 2
- (16) Heb. 4: 16
- (17) Ignorance of God's commands.
- (18) Matt. 3: 15
- (19) J. Piscator, Analysis logica sex Epistolarum Pauli, Epistola ad Galatas pp 1104.
- (20) Gal. 2: 16
- (21) Heb. 10: 9



- (22) Probably Session VI On Justification, Chs 7-9. (Cannons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, pp 34f)
- (23) Andreas Osiander (1498-1565) German Reformer. He attended and participated in the Colloquay of Marburg 1529. He sided with Luther against Zwingli. He became a Professor at Konigsberg where he attacked Melancthon on forensic justification. He advocated that in Justification the new believers become partakers of the divine nature. (N.I.D.C.C. 736 Meyer).
- (24) Isa. 54: <sup>11-14</sup>
- (25) Isa. 34: <sup>14</sup>
- (26) Isa. 61: <sup>10</sup>
- (27) Luke 22: <sup>44</sup>

September 8th. 1643.

2 Scribes; Mr. Prolocutor

Mr. Vines

Mr. Sey

Mr. Power

Mr. White

Mr. Rayner

Mr. Bayly

Mr. Channell

Mr. Langley

Mr. Tisdale

Mr. Young; Mr. Clarke.

Dr. Gouge )  
 Mr. Gataker )  
 Dr. Temple )  
 Mr. Wilkinson )  
 Mr. Palmer )

Or any three of them, a committy to  
 prepare for the Assembly the names of those  
 ministers of the Assembly fitt to be first  
 considered in the receiving of the money  
 allotted to them by the Parliament.

Mr. Goodwin )  
 Mr. Walker )  
 Dr. Smith )

To be a committy to have power to dispose  
 of the hundred pounds allotted by the order of  
 Parliament to such persons as they shall find  
 to have most need thereof, for supply of their  
 present necessitiyes according to the order of  
 the committy to that purpose. And they are  
 to meet as soone as may be after the rising  
 of the Assembly.

Mr. Wilson: About this whole obedience of Christ. The destruction of both active and passive is not [ ] they are we joined together.

The things of Christ are not to be taken membratim, we can hardly make a distinction in poynnt of justification. I lay downe my life ther is action in it, wher Christ is presented to us as a sacrifice, He is presented as innocent.

A sacrifice this not only a qualification but the satisfaction itselfe.

Justification many means in scripture in divers respects, as "called", "redemption", "remission of sins", as reference to the penalty and debt, and, as considered in the state of enmity, it is called reconciliation. Not to insist upon that distinction as either for our good or in our stead. Whatsoever philosophy may say in deo ther is not any great difference to be made. Christ as Christ is wholly for us, He was a publique person.

I doe not know what Christ did for us as a mediator, but He did it for us and for our sakes. In thinking of those things urge a place or two in scripture;

1: 5 Rom 19 .. Adam's disobedience was imputed to us and that was active, therefore by a parallell ... this place seems fully for the active; Adam's disobedience without limitation is imputed, therefore Christ's obedience without restriction.

2: 9 Dan 24 .. Christ came "to bring in everlasting righteousness"<sup>(1)</sup> His coming was with this intent .. justiciam seculorum .. and what righteousness was there in any ages but this?, which is called

Mr. Wilson: (continued) everlasting to appeare farre beyond that of

Adam which was but temporary, remission of sins is mentioned before

[ suffering of a  
penalty is not sae much the working of righteousness but the  
fullfilling of a just law.

[ 3:7.. 10 Rom<sup>(2)</sup> .. Christ is the end of the law for righteous-  
nesse, the end not in regard of abrogation but of imputation.

2 Phil 6-8.

From that time that "He took the forme of a servant" to  
His death all He did [was] for us [ ]. Many  
passadges in the life of Christ wherin He was active and those for  
us. Though dying is suffering "yet willing to dy is action". "He  
humbled himselfe, He took the forme etc."<sup>(3)</sup> all this was active.

[ 4:7 4 Gal 4,5 .. "under the law", some say under the state of  
the law, if Christ was under the law of circumcision; if sae then  
5 Gal 3 if under the law, much more under obedience to it.

Mr. Price: [ ] substantial part of text missing from Mss.

some ill consequences; ]

1) they that deny the imputation of active obedience deny the  
imputation of Adam's sin if one truth fall, we loose the other.

2) most of the arguments exclude also the imputation of passive  
obedience. If a surty will undertake to suffer that for me I  
should, or pay the debt I am ingaged in [ ]

].

Mr. Vines: Come to state the question. I confesse that Christ  
being God, His very taking upon Him our nature doth imply all that

Mr. Vines: (continued) obedience of His from His very conception or birth. I take those two things immediately opposite 2 Phil 6 that He was a publique person "borne under the law for us, He was borne to us"<sup>(4)</sup> etc. .. all those relate to us and for us. Christ was full of all perfection, inward holynesse and outward obedience.

2) Christ did performe this active obedience to His father to the full

3) all that Christ did tends to our good and for our use.

But herin is the thing wherin it stickes:

1) I question whether Christ's active obedience is a "proper" distinct foundation of title to heaven.

2) How this may be proved by scripture as Peter Martyr<sup>(5)</sup> in another case of the equality of joys in heaven.

3) Whether the imputation of Christ's active obedience can come under the name of justification.

That notion of justification which is not properly opposed to guilt, to accusing to condemnation. But it is not opposed to guilt and condemnation. We doe not exclude the merit of Christ, other things besides this are founded in the merit of Christ, as adoption. I doe not deny that any personall act of Christ did goe to make His doings meritorius, the personall dignity of Christ was sufficient for that.

Ther is another use why He should performe obedience in the time before His apearing in His office, and in this time He must obey and He could not have sinned .. that He might be a fit sacrifice. Law is the law established by Christ's passive obedience, as to pardon. This, I take for granted, imputing of

Mr. Vines: (continued) righteousness is in the third of Rom. and

soe if this argument be good, that will be the last for that Adam's sin. "One and of one man's and abundance of grace, and gifts of righteousness." (6). (Rom 5: 11-18).

A: "abundance of grace" v. 17 may be an Hebraisme. Abounding grace soe called with reference to sins, the world of sins.

18th. verse (7) obedience imputed in the matter of our justification. The apostle is very eloquent in that expression. Those words righteous and obedience need not in the mutation of the word indicate a change into a passivenessse. But the question is of the thing ... justification of life, and that denotes active obedience.

A: it doth not follow. The apostle had reason to use the word be cause of the words before ... "condemnation and death." v. 16 I come to that in which lyes the stroke of the argument. 8 Rom. when the apostel begins .. "ther is nae condemnation .. the law of the Spirit .. the righteousnessse of the law".

A: in the Romans here is an active and habituale holynesse in Christ which censures my sin, imperfection, and impurity. But here it seems to me but a recollection of the totall summe of what discoursed before "ther is nae condemnation". Those described that are not condemned they walk "after the spirit".

I hold that from that "fountaine that is in Jesus Christ" ther is derieved unto me satisfaction. I am not cleare that here is spoken of a holynesse of Christ's nature imputed.

Dr. Gouge: Brought this in from Dr. Burgess (9), you may please to say from Dr. Burgess that he is sorry for the unadvisednesse of

Dr. Gouge: (continued) his proceedings in his late petition, although he  
noe way guilty of any designe against the kingdom or our brethren  
of Scotland or to asperse the Assembly. And desires them not to  
hold him guilty of what he hath not done nae more than he doth not  
justify all that he hath done.

Mr. Goodwin: [ ] to establish this place of Romans and  
connexion.

3 chapters we establish the law, though the righteous-  
nesse we are justified by is not the righteousness from the law  
yet it is the righteousness of the law.

8 Rom<sup>(10)</sup> ... "what the law could not doe Christ was to  
doe" [Rom. 8:3]; 10 Rom. ... "wherin the law failed Jesus Christ  
performed it"<sup>(11)</sup>.

Two parts of the law .. preceptive and appendix. I  
confesse if it can be made good that we are not bound to obedience,  
simply as creatures, or left to a liberty sub conditione as the  
lawes of man, then this argument will not be made good.

I desire likewise to be considered if the passive  
obedience of Christ only that ware imputed it would but set us in  
the same state which Adam ware in, the moment of his creation.  
Though the passive cut at all the ommissions past, yet I must have  
an eternal active righteousness see Adam was to have and wher shall  
we have this unlesse it be active. The place in 4 Dan<sup>(12)</sup> favours  
it much. First to take away sin then to bring in [duty]. As in  
sanctification to sanctify a sinner ther more than to [

] . The righteousness we are justified  
by is a righteousness fully answering to the law, therefore said

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) "we establish the law."<sup>(13)</sup> I will not stand to parcell out this righteousnesse. Justification is not an opposite part to taking away guilt but a distinct part from it. The law is to be established in justification in all parts taking away sin. And that is the 4<sup>th</sup> <sup>(14)</sup>. But it is said that the word imputation of righteousnesse is used in that to pardon of sin. A: ther is an imputation to take away sin as well as the active. The whole concures to the whole as an instance of sanctification; we ascribe the whole Christ and yet we say that mortification is by His death and vivication by His life. Yet sae as remission of sins is eminently the chief thing held out in that. 5 Rom. <sup>(15)</sup> active obedience more especially held out. The apostle doth seeme clearly to make the opposition betweene one offence and a multitude of righteousnesse....."Abundance of grace" of the mercys in pardoning and therefore it is joynd with the gift of righteousnesse.

"Justification of life" I did not mean of Christ's life, but this, wheras eminently our title to eternall life is founded upon the active because suited to the law which aims upon doing not suffering. By His doing, properly this law is fullfilled. 8 Roms said to be spoken of sanctification not justification.

A: In the 1 verse "nae condemnation" is a part of justification and the reason must be suited to the asertion, and he saith "ther is now" at present when he was under all this conflict, though I am not perfectly sanctified yet perfectly justified. This reason .. ther is a holynesse in the nature of God that frees me from the law of sin and death, condemning the sin impliess the same, a judicial word, the intention is to comfort believers against



Mr. Goodwin: (continued) imperfect obedience because the law is fulfilled in us. This noe argument of comfort if meant of our imperfect righteousness [ ] the righteousness of the law in us.

A: It is said not by us but in us. When this justification comes to be applied it is "fulfilled" in me, and because the apo[stle] after all those parts of justification enumerated.

10 Rom<sup>(16)</sup> "end of the Law" .. It is spoken of the righteousness of because of that establishing of their owne righteousness. Now Christ is the end of this righteousness.

The "end" .. what the law could not doe and failed in, that Christ hath done and in doing it He is the Telos .. the perfection of the law. And that this is meant by doing appears in the next words that the man that doth these things. What law in the world doth justify a man, makes him righteous, but upon doing?

Dr. Hoyle: It was said that Christ having taken our nature must dy. God is debtor.. non nobis sed sibi. Christ layed down His life for us, [it is] said the innocency of Christ noe part of qualification to [but] is not innocency and spotlessnesse to the lamb a qualification?

Mr. Seaman: Give reasons why I doe believe the active and passive obedience are both imputed:

- 1) If they be both inseparable in their use to us, then if one, both imputed together. It is generally granted whatsoever Christ did or suffered is for us.
- 2) If Christ in suffering did obey the ceremoniall, judiciall, and

Mr. Seaman: (continued) morall law, in the substance of each of them, then this needs be imputed. Not only that speciall law given to Him as a mediator but all the lawes.

3) If the habituall righteousnesse of Christ must needs be imputed then much more must His active - the prooffe of the minor.

4) If the whole Christ be imputed to us then the obedience, He is wholly ours.

5) If all the justice of God could not be justified, satisfied without both kinds of obedience. Ther is two:

a) .. God's mandatory justice in commanding.

b) .. [ justice in threatening.

6) If the active obedience of Christ was not necessary for Himselfe above, then it must needs be imputed not necessary for Himselfe, because He was by the personality.

7) That which was done in our stead and for our good that must needs be imputed unto us. In our stead all was done under the notion of a surety and mediator not as a creature or person only.

8) If the suffering of Christ had no value but only as they ware the sufferings of a righteous person, then 1 Pet 1:<sup>19</sup> "Not redeemed with the bloud of Christ" as bloud but as the bloud of a lamb without spot .. .. 1 Pet 3:<sup>18</sup> [ ]

Some things given by way of answer not satisfactory ..

[ ]

"Made sin for us"<sup>(17)</sup> .. sin sacrifice if this be granted I see not how this be enervated. A sin sacrifice is not given as an exclusive sence, nor as necessary sence or the only sence. We are soe, the righteousnesse of God in Him, as He is made sin for us and contra.

Mr. Herle: That yesterday urged that which the law requires of us to and have not done, that Christ hath done for us. To the mater, it is answered not fully true, for it is required for us to repent.

A: the law doth not require repentance ..  $\int$   $\int$ ,  
it was answered that it was not altogether true because otherwise God should commend a contradiction.

A: to dy and live are not only contradictories it is rather impossibility than contradiction. We have involved ourselves in an impossibility though God did not lay it upon us. The law is not the measure of our ability but of our duty.

Three things were desired:

1) That it might appeare how this active obedience is a distinct ground of title to life. And how by scripture it doth appeare in that of "do this and live."<sup>(18)</sup>

2) How this active obedience might be imputed to  $\int$ righteousnesse or us $\int$ .

R: That place 8 Rom. 3 "what we did owe and could not doe, Christ came to doe for us". That this is imputed 2 Cor 5 "we are the righteous that is in Him". If this that is in Him came to be conveyed to us and in us, it can only be by imputation. Whatever is in Him and on us or to us must be imputed, but this righteousness is in Him and upon us.

1 Rom 22<sup>(19)</sup>: Difference betweene humane lives and God's. Lives of men are merely literall and if negative, bind only to the negative part and see justification .. in humane court requires but bare innocency. But in the court of God ther is an affirmative precept. Though at God's tribunall it appears that I have not fullfilled that.

Dr. Smith added from Dr. Burgess that he said was willing to give any satisfaction that he should be commanded to give to the Assembly by the House of Commons though it were upon his knees.

Dr. Burgess appeared being desired by the Assembly and with the approval of the Commons. I was here upon this day seven night upon the same errand that I am come to you now. If you would have been pleased to have heard me I would fully have submitted myself. That not pleasing the issue was my suspension, the suspension did not move me so much as the judgement of the House of Commons that I had aspersed the Assembly. I must yet be confident of my innocency, it was farre from my intention to wrong either. If admitted to be heard the aspersions would have been more easily removed. It is true that in the bitterness of my spirit I did draw up a petition but if you please to consider the suddenness of it, wherein anything hath lighted upon this Assembly I might say.

Yet though it were not all fault will light where it is layed. I find it is aspersed and without intention by me for which I am sorry.

I shall say as Judah "what shall I speake, the Lord hath found out the iniquity of thy servant."<sup>(20)</sup> This will never become me, though never see innocent, the wisdom of this Assembly will never account it to exasperate a disease that they may after cure it with a great deal of glory.

Resolved: The Assembly is well satisfied with Dr. Burgess his acknowledgment in the Assembly.

Mr. Seaman: As we have put no barre to his coming we shall be very glad to see him in his place againe.

Dr. Smith, Dr. Stanton, Mr. Hodges, Mr. Calamy, humbly to

testify the satisfaction of the Assembly and to desire the House of Commons to receive him to favour again and to restore him to his place in the Assembly againe.

FOOTNOTES -- SESSION 49

- (1) Dan. 9: <sup>24</sup>
- (2) Rom. 10: <sup>4</sup>
- (3) Phil. 2: <sup>6f</sup>
- (4) Phil. 2: <sup>6</sup>
- (5) P. M. Vermigli, The Common Places, 3 3-4, pp 79f
- (6) Rom. 5: <sup>11-18</sup>
- (7) Rom. 5: <sup>18</sup>
- (8) Rev. 7: <sup>17</sup>
- (9) Dr. Burgess was expelled because of his continued opposition to the signing of the Covenant, which culminated in his sending a private petition to the House of Commons. This had been expressly forbidden in the original ordinance establishing the Assembly.
- (10) Rom. 8: <sup>3</sup>
- (11) Rom. 10: <sup>4</sup>
- (12) Dan. 9: <sup>24</sup>
- (13) Rom. 3: <sup>31</sup>
- (14) Rom. 4: <sup>12, 22</sup>
- (15) Rom. 5: <sup>19</sup>
- (16) Rom. 10: <sup>4</sup>
- (17) 2 Cor. 5: <sup>21</sup>
- (18) Luke 10: <sup>28</sup>
- (19) Rom. 4: <sup>22</sup>
- (20) Jer. 25: <sup>12</sup>

September 11th. 1643. Munday Morning.

Mr. Gataker: Desires those that have not spoken may be admitted.

Mr. Woodcocke: I made bould to name a scruple. I am in some measure satisfied that the whole obedience, meaning this by imputation, that this in whole hath an influence on our justification. But for the manner of justification, I am altogether unsatisfied. If formerly imputed and transmitted upon me, I doe not see but great inconveniences follow upon. If soe then I may be looked upon as not at all having sinned, not soe much as in former time. Againe if this be formally transmitted upon me, I doe not see but when a merit is intrinsically included. I myselfe doe merit all that that right.  $\int$   $\int$ . Then surely God can see noe sin in His children, for as much as He lookes upon them invested with the same righteousnesse Christ is clothed withall.

Mr. Walker: These doubts answered already and very obvious. By the same reason Christ's passion then we meritoriously satisfy. This overthrowes as well imputation of passive as active. Manifest scriptures plainly shew that ther required a righteousnesse. Therefore not enough to take away sins.

Mr. Bathurst: These things objected against a formall imputation:

1) Then be held as never to have sinned, this will follow as being inherent righteousnesse - not imputed. Imputative righteousnesse implies imputed sin.

2) Therefore we want merit.

God sees noe sin, it is plaine that He did see sin, therefore cover

Mr. Bathurst: (continued) it and that which He sees, though not to  
[condemn].

Mr. Woodcocke: How can God looke upon me as having sinned when I  
have fullfilled the whole lawe?

Dr. Gouge: God doth not looke upon us as having fullfilled the whole  
lawe for ourselves but by our surety, and therefore it is said  
"accounted".

Mr. Walker: Consider the difference betwixt head and members. All  
the meritt is not imputed to every member, but to every member  
according to his necessity.

Mr. Case: Objection, if active obedience imputed then God lookes as  
not having sinned. Answer, God lookes on me as a sinner, may be  
taken:

- 1) in regard of the act.
- 2) in regard of the consequences and see God doth not looke for  
meritt. I see noe more reason why that should hold than the  
imputation of the divinity of Christ for His meritt.
- 3) God sees noe sin. Answer, in poynt of justification, God sees  
noe sin.

Mr. Gover: This word "formally" may have a proper signification in  
poynt of sanctification, but in justification another word is more  
proper relatively.

Mr. Vines: I suppose the businesse lyes in this, God's imputing may  
have a construction. Imputing, the act that I have done it, and  
the passive that I have suffered it. But I take it in regard of  
the use and fruite of it.



Mr. Hill: Take both together, they are soe farre imputed that I stand as noe sinner.

Mr. Herle: Distinguish betweene "formally" and "virtually".

Virtually, the obedience and sufferings are ours, but "formally" that word must needs imply an inhesion. For that, not [to] looke upon us as having been sinners. Four things in sin; culpa, consisting of an act or irregularity. The act is transient and God cannot but looke upon it. But the guilt that makes lyable to the justice of God, and that is that by which He cannot but punish sin. I doe not say that He is bound to it.

See that it is guilt that is taken away and then to the ey of God's justice we are nae more sinners.

There is an efficacy in the death of Christ, and for the last punishment of sin, that comes more to that of the Antinomians. It is true God doth never truely punish sin that is taken away in Christ.

Four. Wayes of correction; not properly punishment, an instruction. Witnesses not only a correction, but what is nearest to punishment - a revenge.

To those objections they are fully satisfied. Because obedience therefore the meritt. It will not follow, it is not a safe speech to say, the meritt of Christ is imputed to me, then I must meritt. The law did not require of me meritt but obedience, soe as that the obedience is mine the meritt is Christs.

Mr. Walker:

Mr. Rayner: I am loath to be any obstacle to the speedy passing of the Article. We all agree in the maine. If I were asked by what a sinner is justified, the answer would be, by the righteousness of Christ. If how it is made mine, answer, by divine imputation, but if further questioned from whence it did arise, I should answer, from the obedience of Christ unto death, and thus farre a generall consent and agreement.

Some thing said I am not fully satisfied.

Some make two parts in justification, one in remission of sin, the other in acceptation and so they divide the passive obedience for remission. These things I doe a littel sticke at. I doe not perceive sufficient warrant in scripture to divide those parts when all sin originall. When one taken away that man must needs be in God's account righteous. Whatsoever it be that taketh away all sin that doth constitute a mans righteous .. "for the righteousness of Christ."<sup>(1)</sup>

I doe not perceive this to be the language of the scriptures, that any righteousness be ascribed to Christ untill His death, but not that they have an influence on the death of Christ. Therefore when you come to the death of Christ, plaine texts for His righteousness.

The Article would have been well thus: "the righteousness of Christ's obedience even unto death being imputed by God the Father".

Many scriptures both old and new testament attest for the establishing of this truth.

Mr. Rayner: (continued) "I love and remember the brethren". (2)

Some of them are such that it is a riddle that  
righteousnesse should have been distilled from them. Divers  
things aledge for the proving of this. If it be not for the  
active obedience not to be imputed then had Christ been a fitt  
Saviour if offered in sacrifice as soone as borne. Answer, I doe  
not see any absurdity, but it had been then sufficient but then  
His life could not have been [

]. He could not have published  
the gospell, He could not have confirmed His doctrine by miracles,  
and soe have evidenced Himselfe to be the Messiah.

The will of Christ is of great moment for the world.  
Now Christ came to the use and exercise of His facultyes by degrees.

Objection, a double debt that man owes to God as a  
creature and as a sinner. Answer, I take it to be a truth that  
sin is called a debt, but it is an obedience that I owe.

A man owes noe debt unto God, that is to be answered only  
by way of justification but only sin. Grant that a man has all  
his sins forgiven him, origenall, actual, commission, omission,  
and imperfection, then doth a man owe no debt to be taken away by  
this way only sin. For that debt of obedience I confesse that is  
the debt indeed, he is bound to performe this debt. But this  
debt which is over and above that in remission of sins. That a  
Christian doth truely pay in sanctification, by the power of Christ  
sanctifying me and inabling me to obedience and remission of sins  
and soe the whole debt is payed.

Objection, if the active obedience of Christ be not a

Mr. Rayner: (continued) particular ground of sanctification, then what title hath a believer to heaven.

Answer, I heard not or did not heed any thing said to prove it. If you aske me how a believer comes to heaven I say the acquisition of heaven is a piece of Christ's purchase. An adjunct concomitant of justification, adoption. Justification, even this of remission of sins intitles a man to heaven. Called "justification to life"<sup>(3)</sup> at least it takes away all that hinders life.

Objection, what I should have done and did not, that Christ did for me, must be imputed to me.

Answer, the major proposition may be granted [ ] but if this be made up as a distinct part of justification, then I deny it.

Objection, 8 Romans 2, "the law of the Spirit of life" - habituall righteousness and holynesse in the passion and nature of Christ. And said that Beza<sup>(4)</sup> is of the same mind.

Answer, the law of the Spirit of life, the doctrine of the gospell hath made me free from the law of sin and death. It is yet something ambiguous to me whether to be meant of justification [ ] or [ ] of sanctification. The apostle makes an opposition betweene the law of the spirit of life and the law of God or of sin. A contradiction at last, I with my spirit see farre as I am unregenerate serve the law.

It may be objected if ther be any scripture, thou art in danger. Answer, noe, "ther is noe condemnation".<sup>(5)</sup> But how art thou free? The gospell hath freed me.

Mr. Rayner: (continued) Its called the "spirit of life". See the ministratation of the Spirit is called spirit, he doth not say that the law is "in Christ", but the "spirit of life" is "in Christ", for that Christ hath reference either to the spirit or life, not the law. If the words meant of sanctification then the argument falls.

Renew the former motion for the words to run.

Mr. Arrowsmith: Endeavour to build up in a few words what our brother laboured to pull downe, not reply to answers, but leave that to them that made them.

Two things that fell from him are very strange to me, one - that noe righteousnesse till his death. See it becomes us to fullfill righteousnesse for that debt of obedience, in sanctification. Yet can be noe discharge, we cannot pay one debt with another.

Three conclusions:

1) Justification includes both the taking away the guilt of sin and title to heaven; 3 Rom: 23,24. In 23 verse  $\sqrt{\text{we}}$  which have the firstfruits of the Spirit even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of the body $\sqrt{\text{}}$ , the apostle layes downe the two lawes of nature; guilt of sin, and deprivation of glory and but one salve for both these. Verse 24  $\sqrt{\text{we}}$  are saved by one hope $\sqrt{\text{}}$ .

The state of justification - two termes.

2) Justification receives both these. In Acts 26:<sup>10</sup> "receive by faith in me remission and inheritance."

3) The active obedience of Christ procures both these. 4 Gal.<sup>4</sup> (6)

Mr. Arrowsmith: (continued) Argument: whatsoever is a part of the price of our redemption is a part of the matter of our justification.

Mr. Coleman: Some passages observed to be accepted against, saw no place in scripture that holds out both these parts. I shall offer a scripture 53 Esa. 10<sup>(8)</sup>. This I must laye downe as a principle that Christ is the person intended in this scripture, "He shall see of the travaile", "by His knowledge". Two things set out: 1. Redemption. Two effects of it - justify many, beare the sins of many.

Two things to confirme active obedience of Christ, by scripture, as this now urged - all the difficulty, as in the word "knowledge". It either means a quality in Christ or in man, if in Christ the point is at an end, but for that in man, then interpretation is something hard. By the knowledge of man - this is seldome see. Then whether is this knowledge a righteousnesse in man or noe. [ ]. By Christ knowing and seeing the fruite of His death "shall my righteous servant convey righteousnesse to many".<sup>(9)</sup>

It is common in scripture to clothe God with such attributes as are suitable to the businesse in hand, therefore here called "righteous". Servant, as a servant obedient. "Justify many" or carry righteousnesse "to many", passive righteousnesse of Christ noe further than active.

Answer, that righteousnesse is conveyed to us which is beauty in Christ, 16 Ezek 14. But the active obedience of Christ is his beauty 53 Esa 2.

Mr. Gataker: One scripture alledged and one argument to prove active apart from passive. I thinke we need not stand upon any of those termes. The place is 53 Esa 11 .. "by the knowledge of him". I suppose that those who will bring scriptures for the prooffe of a poynt in controversy where they maintaine the affirmative, they must bring things that are cogent, they that hould the negative it is sufficient to say it may be soe.

If we turn over all the writers on this place not any of them expound it soe. Calvin<sup>(10)</sup> and Junius<sup>(11)</sup> they doe translate it cognitione sui, and the use of those inseparable particles is very obvious in scripture, as 5 Ps 7 .. "in thy feare", timor tui not tuis, soe here not cognitione sua but sui.

It is generally agreed upon that knowledge put here for faith, the antecedent for the consequent, to interpret it as before secures to offer force to the text. For that righteous servant seemes to be as littel to the purpose as the former. It was well known that Christ was to be a just person, "he suffered, the just for the unjust person"<sup>(12)</sup>. Christ is said to be that just one.

Answer, the reason is apparent saith Gomarus<sup>(13)</sup>, Athenasius upon those words<sup>(14)</sup> Christ did beare those infirmities that are naturall and generall.

[

] for the connexion of the two parts of the verse, the copulate is as ordinarily used for "for" by way of exegesis or casually, as in one place 64 Esa [5] "thou art angry with us for we have sinned" - because we have sinned.

"Justify them by bearing of their sins" ther was a great

Mr. Gataker: (continued) reason to say "my righteous servant"

because in the beginning of the chapter it said "we judged him a sinner". (15)

Argument of the beauty of Christ proved 16 Ezek 14 ,  
[thy renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty].

Answer, this place seemes to be much forced and farre fetched. See the words before and see how when it is spoken of those that from a meane condition are raised up to a faire goodly state; as the state of Israell. "My comlynesse" is that beauty God had put upon her not that that was inherently in her, but by God conferred upon her.

In the close of the last day some arguments delivered. Declaire my apprehensions and then speake noe more. It was objected to a brother that the question is not right stated (16).

One day debated as two distinct parts of justification and from this in the second day some falling off, joyning both together to bring out one [aphorism].

The right state of the question.

The termes, justification, righteousnesse, imputation and obedience.

1) Justification allwayes conceived it a judiciall term, an acquiting and assailing from guilt, and consequently temporarily to distinguish it from pardon. A reason why the Lord's prayer noe prayer for justification. That prayer was framed for justified persons to make, though a man doe not only stand justified before God in regard of his sins, yet he may still make that prayer as David (17), for ther is a daily pardon not in regard



Mr. Gataker: (continued) of the guilt of sin, but the offence of God and God's paternal indignation. We stand justified before [

].

2. Righteousnesse, we are still in a judiciary way, and it is a judiciary way consists into severall things; in the performance of the in specie which the law regards; in the recompense of that made to the law for want of performance. Not in both but either, where this may be pleaded - a man is pronounced guiltless and consequently a righteous man. To this purpose is that of the apostle, 5 Rom 10 [when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son"]].

Dicaionai - it is pressed by one righteous act.

Objected, noe example of that exposition in scripture.

I confesse that word is of divers and various use in scripture, therefore it is noe good argument. The word is found but ten times in all the New Testament, and at least five times in a various sense, save twice in the same sense.

1) for moral precepts, Luk 1:<sup>6</sup>, Rom 2:<sup>26</sup>, Rom 8:<sup>4</sup>.

2) for rites, ceremonial rites, Heb 9:<sup>1</sup>, 10.

3) for judgement Rom 1:<sup>32</sup>, Rev 15:<sup>4</sup>.

4) for inherent righteousnesse or justification Rev 19:<sup>8</sup>.

5) for justification Rom 5:<sup>16</sup>. But once in that sence. The word in that place is well expounded justa satisfactio. A full recompense made for the breach and want of justice. Thus it is used in Greeke authors.

A repaire of the breach of justice done by a wrong offered. At any barre that man that can plead full satisfaction

Mr. Gataker: (continued) done for wrong, that being made and accepted he shall be reputed righteous.

3) Imputation, it is well cleared to be said either when a man is reputed to have done that which he hath done, and this must not but  $\int$

$\int$  in this case as a man that can plead a full recompense shall justly be deemed, see if my surety have done it, this being imputed for the use and benefit of me, it shall make me to be guiltlesse. Guiltlesnesse and righteousnesse, one and the same thing.

4) Obedience, if noe more in the Article then obedience noe sticking at it, but the word whole. The question is if Christ's habituall holynesse, His obedience to the law naturall and morall, be cast into that price that was paid for the discharge of our guilt. It is a question named unto me by a professor at Bazill whether any place in scripture where Christ's active obedience called the price or ransome by which we are redeemed.

We conceive that all those servile sufferings that Christ indured from the beginning of life to end of death is the ransome or price wherby the guilt of our sins are discharged. That ther is an activity in those things it is not denyed but it is not the willingnesse in the payment of a ransome that goes into the price of it, but the money that is layed downe. The willingnesse comes ex pacto. As for the taking away, that argument, Christ  $\int$ is $\int$  Lord of law.

Answer, Christ is said to be "lord of Sabbath"<sup>(18)</sup> as the "son of man" was in heaven when He spake upon earth. John 3:<sup>13</sup>

Mr. Gataker: (continued) This for clearing our meaning:

1) United obedience.

Answer - an obedience that Christ did performe to God in regard of the lawe in generall, and another in respect of that of the mediatorschip, and that those are distinct none doe deny. Not safe to confound these, it will be hard to persuade a man that to love God and to suffer death for the sake of another, are one and the same.

2) Justification, redemption, remission are all one.

Answer - this is as farre from probability as the other, Those have severall notions as appears in severall deffinitions of them. But what will follow hence. But if those be all one, all those ascribed in scripture ascribed to Christ's sufferings as justification. Remission: Ephesians 1:<sup>7</sup>; Redemption: 1 Peter 1:<sup>19</sup>; Reconciliation: Romans 5:<sup>10</sup>.

3) Whatsoever Christ did for our good He did also in our stead.

Answer - I doubt the proposition of this argument. It is not true what Christ did for our good He did in our stead, as He taught, wrought miracles. A great difference betweene those, "to doe for our goode" and "in our stead", as "to watch for a man's good", as "to watch for a sich man in danger of a lethargy or after bloud letting." Christ did keep the preceptes of the law for our good, but if therefore in our stead, then it will follow that we are not bound to keep it.

That which another man performes in my stead that I am not bound to doe. It is answered in this reason by Gomarus<sup>(19)</sup>, obey in way of thankfulness unto Christ.

Mr. Gataker: (continued) Answer - those are noe sufficient answers to what aledged, for if true that Christ had freed me from obedience by keeping it in my stead then I doe not stand bound to it by virtue of the obligations of the creature. I desire an answer on this.

Said we are not bound to keepe the law to obtain life from it.

Answer - this is nothing to the purpose, it was said the sanction is noe part of the law, soe the promise of life is noe part of the law. That man that shall keep the law of God only in respect of regard that he may obtaine eternall life that is minus mandato, he is bound to serve God freely. I doe not deny that ther may be respect to the reward. I've said that man hath bound himself to a contradiction.

Answer - ther is noe contradiction, every man doth stand bound to God, even the doomed in hell bound to obey.

Objection - if we all stand bound to obey [we are condemned by the law for our disobedience].

Answer - what we faile in, Christ doth it for us.  
1 John 2:1-2.

Four arguments: Christ is wholly ours therefore all [ ]

Answer - whatsoever a husband hath is wholly his wives, it doth not follow thereon a husband's honesty for that.

"By water and bloud" and tipes in the Ould Testament, a cleansing by water. (20)

That of John aparent, as in the words of Beza (21), by

Mr. Cateker: (continued) water is ther implyed the grace of sanctification, and bloud - the grace of justification.

Ther is noe necessity of implying an imputation save a righteousnesse, in any of them. It is not an imputation of sanctification, but an imputing of it to us.

Redemption [is] the full confirmation of all of them at the last day. Active and passive inseparable.

Answer - though inseparable in regard to the benefit to us "in generall" but not in regard of particular ends and benefits. As the light and heat of the sun.

Obedient to all three lawes.

Answer - Christ did what He did out of love, therefore it comes into the price. I doe not see how it followes necessarily Christ as a suerty.

Answer - What a surety doth frees us from the doing of it. Sufferings of Christ as the sufferings of a righteous person. That ther is noe question of, for that of the high priest going into the sanctum sanctorum it is true, but it was not the robes that made the attonement, but the bloud that he carried in.

A motion to consider of the motion of my brother before, whether convenient to dissent from a great part of our brethren. Whether in an Article to be generally allowed, and soe say many learned men differing from it, to pitch upon that may exclude many that [ ] and keep them from exercising of their ministry. On the other I observe not this application of the obedience of Christ expressly mentioned

Mr. Gataker: (continued) as to justification, except one confession of the Helvetian Church<sup>(22)</sup>. In the Irish Articles<sup>(23)</sup> it is expressed but in the close, and provision that none should be compelled to subscribe unto them, as in our Article of 62<sup>(24)</sup>.

Dr. Gouge: I doe confesse as in the case of newes, I had rather heare more than declare what I conceive myself. The ground of this controversy not from the Article. The whole obedience, it makes noe distinction of active and passive.

A comparison, many here have seen the temples of which Mithridates<sup>(25)</sup> made all mixed together made an excellent cordiall. Soe I conceive concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, those things that Christ did for us, they are of such a composition that as that they are for all turnes, seeing it is expressed.

7 Heb 22<sup>(26)</sup>, certainly what He did for us as we stood in need of and was usefull to us. By way of comparison note what is said 3 Zach 4 .. take away those filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee; and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.

By the bloud of Christ, and death our filthynesse taken away, and not only soe but a clothing us, soe that our sanctification may be fit for that to which we are called. If they mean that sanctification while here we live, that is imperfect, if after death, perfect sanctification is not fit for purpose by which presented before God.

Respond - we have a glory abouve, that that Adam should have had, and the angells, that we might be a fit spouse for Jesus Christ, and His must be a transcendent righteousness.

Dr. Gouge: (continued) Said, what if He had sinned? His death could have been to noe purpose.

Answer - it's a supposition of an impossibility, impossible He should sin. As a surety He did [come] and soe not only nostro bono but nostro loco. We standing in need of it, done for others and for us. How soe ours but by imputation.

For that tipes. Some truths soe transcended as noe tipes can be given of it, especially not proper tipes. But yet besides other tipes mentioned that was to the purpose, gift as well as sacrifice. Add this of Melchisadec <sup>(27)</sup>. The place wher king of Salem, prince of peace, to shew that he is our prince, interprets the name "king of righteousnesse".

One thing noted in the conclusion, this doctrine is an ancient doctrine, and a constant and universall doctrine. Councils and synods of the Church of England, Church of Scotland, Ireland, Sinod of Phrance, Palatine, Bohemia. <sup>(28)</sup>

It hath been proved out of the scriptures Romans 5:<sup>19</sup>, 1 Corinthians 15:<sup>22</sup>.

In the second text an opposition paralleled Adam and Christ in one. Adam's transgression imputed to us and Christ's obedience imputed to us. In the other our sins and Christ's righteousnesse imputed to us.

Wher many samples come to an antidote every one hath their virtue to a speciall use, soe the particulars of the Lord Jesus Christ have their speciall use in us. 7 Hebrews wher Christ is named a suerty, it is set downe "holy, harmlesse" all this for our suerty.

Dr. Gouge: (continued) For that motion.

They that would have it changed are against active obedience, shall we then exclude it?

Mr. Ley: Desire to bring it to a vote.

Divers scriptures propounded to prove this: 1 Cor 1:<sup>30</sup>; 5 Rom: 15,19; 3 Rom: 23-24; 26 Acts: 18; 4 Gal: 4,5. These fully prove it.

Argument: what we should have done stands on his feet.

The Article saith this is a comfortable doctrine and it cannot be to me if this be wanting. Good company in this opinion, divers confessions and Calvin 3 Inst 11<sup>(29)</sup>.

Mr. Herle: Loth to leave this aspersion upon this opinion as it flavoures of Antinomianisme. .. Said obedience consists of two things and either will serve.

[

].

Said imputation of this obedience, upon this moved that the Article might be altered. It is yet a question whether the habituall righteousnesse be imputed to us.

The mediatory obedience of Christ.

Morall obedience done to our good but not in our stead. But how out of this the necessity of the Antinomian doctrine? It will easily follow that we are freed from the rigour, consider the difference of the Covenants, that of workes of the law, that was faulty.<sup>(30)</sup> Through the flesh not able to arrive to the scope of a Covenant to reconcile. Consider the offence [

]. In Christ



Mr. Herle: (continued) the valew and the virtue, the price and power of His satisfaction. That our workes should give us a title to heaven is a strange speach.

Col 2: <sup>10</sup>

A compleate place. What is required of us and we cannot doe, that must Christ doe for us, else not "compleat in Him".

It is answered either in specie or equivalent.

Answer - it is true that noe man that stands rectus in curia is soe bound, but we are born sinners.

┌

┐

Some objections:

1) Aspersed by the Antinomians. If Christ hath fullfilled the law man is not bound to fullfill the law. This doth not in any way favour them for His obedience is imputed only to penitent sinners.

Not bound to fullfill it to that end that He hath fullfilled it, but to other ends.

2) By the Papists. If Christ's righteousnesse then either whole or part. If the whole then one hath all another none. For then every one as righteous as Christ.

┌

┐ we are equally pronounced just

but not equally just.

3) By Arminians. If by the act of faith then not by the imputed righteousnesse of Christ. Neither active nor passive. An act of injustice to lay punishment of one upon another.

Mr. Herle: (continued) Answer - it is true it is an act of injustice to lay a penalty except he voluntarily accept it as a suerty. It is ours, Christ purchased it. Christ is given to us and we and Christ make one.

Mr. Goodwin: Three things in the speach of the constant brother:

1) Justification being a judiciary act therefore only in an acquiting of sin.

Answered - Justification of Adam and angells would not lie only in acquiting.

All the attributes of God are enemies to sin [

] His holynesse must

be made up somewhere, it is not in us. Though Christ did doe this in our stead and therefore that we should be freed from it, not freed from the uttermost that we can doe unto it. [

]

2 Cor [ 5: 21 ] Ther is a righteousnesse said to be in Christ, and that is said to be put on us. That that is in Him and on us must be imputed to us.

Dr. Featley: I have been passive these last two dayes in hearing soe much and soe acutely objected. I desire now to be a little alive. I am indebted to that learned brother that first made doubt of this.

Many texts for active aleadged.

Matthew 12: <sup>8</sup> : "the Son of Man"

Answer - If Christ not bound to fullfill the law for Himselfe then His fullfilling the law is to be imputed to us, but He is not bound, for He is the Lord of the law and the King of the church. Ther is emphasis that the "son of man" is Lord of the

Dr. Featley: (continued) Sabbath, if this be not true we are at a great losse, we lose all Christ's workes. Whatever is debitum is meritum.

Romans 5: 16-19.

If we were made righteous by obedience of Christ. The special obedience.

Answer - any one place where dicaionai is taken for passive obedience. St. Bernard in Epistle ad Templarios (31).

1 Cor 1: 30.

That which Christ is made unto us, He is made perfect, our inherent is not perfected.

Clemens in his Epistle to Corinthians (32) "wisdoms imputed to us".

2 Cor 5: 21

The true meaning of the word seems to be this, as Christ was accounted, soe we righteous.. - See Chrisostome (33), Austin (34), .. them from guilt, for if you take Adam in the first moment of creation, he was innocent but not righteous till he fullfilled the Law.

2) It is not requisite for the mediator to performe in specie; it is enough in lieu of it.

Reply - It is a rule in law that satisfaction may be refused if another thing be offered than. Why else is Christ called a suerty and a ransome? How else is the law said to be fullfilled and established if recompensed in sin some other kind. It is recompensed but not fullfilled except eadem specie. Though

Dr. Featley: (continued) the last act had an infinite worth in it yet therefore rightly blame that a drop of His blood did satisfy. God will have a soul for a soul, body for body, and observes the proportion even in specie. The passive obedience said to be an appending of the law "God spared not His owne Son" (35). Whatsoever is required of us, He required of Him.

3) The Antinomians, if Christ fulfilled the law we are not bound.

Answer - the same answer before, not to the same end, are we bound. He fulfilled it for justification, they say for punishment. God doth not affect to the same end.

The law doth bind the creature simply as a creature.

Answer - Christ having performed it for life doth but free us from the obligation as creatures. There are two things, obedience to the law, and obedience in way of life. The former is an eternal command by virtue of the relation as creatures now, but of the promise of life, this doth cut off the obligation as creatures.

Romans 8:2, the answer was given to it. Whether the holynesse of Christ's nature intended or whether justification intended.

1) That justification is intended is agreed upon all hands, that verse one is meant of justification. And all of justification is meant in the fourth verse. The conclusion, the intermediate, are an opposite reason. Why "noe condemnation"? and must therefore speake of justification.

2) "from the word hath freed" (36). Doth he speake this of justification or sanctification? Not of sanctification, for he

Dr. Featley: (continued) could not say "hath freed me" that he  
complains of chapter 7 [21]. In the last verse of former  
chapter "who shall deliver me" (37) not freed from all the releases  
of sin and therefore he would have complained at that. And "from  
the Law of sin and death" implies it too. "From the law of sin  
and death" all one with not condemning [

] if those words be  
meant of sanctification, yet it is first by a condemning of sin,  
by casting sin in its suite, by destroying the right that sin  
hath [

].

As justification is intended, see the habituall  
holynesse is that which is meant here. Here is a law opposed  
to a law. A law in Christ opposed to a law. In Paul a "law of  
Spirit" opposed to "law in the flesh".

How comes it that Christ condemns sin - by taking the  
likenesse of sinfull flesh. Dicaionai meant the precepts of the  
law. If the precepts of the law had been intended it would have  
been by us.

Mr. Vines: I hope now we draw towards a conclusion. As we began  
I hope now we may now end it. The difference of active and  
passive was not stated by us. This poynt mistaken. As if we  
deny the imputation of Christ like Socinus (38), whole Christ.

With all our souls. Whole for every use, wisdom, whole  
Christ, satisfaction whole Christ. But if you say "whole obedience"  
in this Article men will come to enquire in what respect.

[

Mr. Vines: (continued)

J.

Habitually righteousnesse, I cannot digest the imputation of it. We are not against the use or necessity of active righteousnesse in Christ, but the query is upon what it comes to be terminated when you say ther is an imputation of it.

We find eternal life in justification and adoption.

Take a man from his very birth, he comes to be justified by faith. Is this active obedience imputed soe that all his acts are made as perfect righteousnesse. If soe what room is left for sin.

Lord Say: I am not desirous to take you off but something to deliver you from both Houses. Satterday last a committy to meete with Lords and Commons, commissioners to receive what they should offer unto Parliament. When they had delivered to us they tould us that they had something to offer to this Assembly. Ther was some difference between this Assembly and theirs.

Desired a committy apoynted to receive such a thing as they had to offer from the General Assembly.

Both Houses agreed.

Order read.

Number -- as many as the Assembly pleaseeth.

Mr. White	)	
Mr. Nye	)	To be a committy, or any five of them.
Mr. Hill	)	To meete with the Scotch Commissioners and
Mr. Calamy	)	to receive such papers from them as shall be
Mr. Seaman	)	directed unto them by the Assembly.
Mr. Goodwin	)	To meete with the commissioners at Three
Dr. Temple	)	O'Clocke in Star Chamber.
Dr. Smith	)	
Dr. Hoyle	)	

Mr. Seaman: This is not of ordinary consequence, to put to the vote  
one by one.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 50

- (1) 1 Cor. 1: 30
- (2) 1 Pet. 3: 8
- (3) Rom. 5: 18
- (4) T. Beza, Annotationes (1594) Ad Romanum pp 89 f
- (5) Rom. 8: 1
- (6) Gal. 4: 5
- (7) Rom. 8: 15
- (8) Isa. 53: 11
- (9) Isa. 53
- (10) J. Calvin, Commentarii in Isaiam Prophetam, pp 435-441
- (11) F. Junius, Opera Theologica, I (sv) Sacrum parallelorum libri tres, quorum postremus iustum et methodicum commentarium exhibit in Epistolam Hebraeos. p 1435
- (12) 1 Pet. 3: 18
- (13) F. Gomarus, Opera Theologica Omnia, I p 233
- (14) St. Athenasius, Contra Arianos Oratio II, 16 P.G. 26 p 179
- (15) Rom. 2: 12
- (16) Ms. Minutes Session 45
- (17) Ps. 51
- (18) Mark 2: 28
- (19) F. Gomarus, Opera Theologica Omnia, I pp 233 f
- (20) Lev. 8: 6, 14: 52
- (21) T. Beza, Annotationes I In Evangelium p 140
- (22) Confessio Helvetica Posterior, 1566, Cap XV in Schaff, III pp 266 f
- (23) Irish Articles of Religion, 1615. 34 f Of Justification and Faith, in Schaff III pp 532 f
- (24) Thirty nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England, Article XI in Schaff III p 494



- (25) Probably "Mithraeum" or temple of Mithras. The cult was widespread throughout the Roman Empire. It was an artificial cave, oblong with naves and aisles. Mithraea have been found in Syria, Asia Minor, Spain, and one in London.
- (26) Heb. 7:<sup>21</sup>
- (27) Heb. 5:<sup>6,10</sup>
- (28) Synod of France was probably the National Synod of the French Protestant Church held at Gap in 1603, where Piscator's doctrine of Justification was condemned. (Quick, I pp 226 f: Camero pp 197 f)
- Synod of Palatine, was probably the General Synod of ministers of the Palatinate held at Heidelberg 1562, which approved with revisions the catechism prepared by Olevianus and Ursinus (Schaff I pp 531 f)
- Synod of Bohemia, probably refers to the council of non-catholic Bohemians who presented a statement to Maximilian II in 1575. This statement was prepared by Pressius and Krippen and became known as the Second Bohemian Confession. (Schaff I pp 579 f)
- (29) J. Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, III 2 pp 36 f.
- (30) Covenant Theology is that form of theological articulation of the doctrine of salvation which sees the relation between God and man existing first as a divine order, then as a compact between God and man. Then came the Covenant of Works, under which developed the first step in sin, followed by the proclamation of the Covenant of Grace. Though faith then replaced works, faith was not seen as a new law, nor Christ simply as lawgiver. The Covenant of Grace developed into a testament. (N.I.D.C.C. 267 Clouse)
- (31) St. Bernard, Ad Milites Templi de laude novae Militiae Liber, XI 23, P.L 183 p 935
- (32) St. Clement of Rome, Epistola I ad Corinthios, XXXII P.G I p 152
- (33) St. Chrysostome, Monitum ad homiliam in illud, P.G 51 p 371
- (34) St. Augustine, Enarrationes Psalmos, Psalmum XXI P.L 36 p 172
- (35) Rom. 8:<sup>32</sup>
- (36) Rom. 6:<sup>20</sup>
- (37) Rom. 7:<sup>24</sup>
- (38) Ref: Session 48, Footnote 3

September 11th. 1643. Afternoon.

Mr. Hodges: A motion concerning the Assessor absent.

Mr. Gataker: An argument pressed that justification doth discharge us of all guilt of sin, as well omitted, as committed. Against this excepted, difference betwixt God's law and man's law.

A: In this kind ther is noe difference betwixt God's law and man's law. Save man's law doth not require the contrary duty.

A: This doth not come home to that intended. It is true that the decalogue is the summary of God's law, but not God's law at large. In the prophets are covenants, and ther is the affirmative command as well as the negative. And the like is in humane laws, and the reason is, the like in either in the humane lawes as well, affirmative lawes, as negative lawes. As in case of treason not only the offering of any violence to the king, but the concealing those things, bring in compasses of law, as well as others. Now when a man is arraigned for treason, if he can prove that he is not guilty, he is to stand rectus in curia, and to be accounted a legall and righteous man.

Justification is in commonsense, an assayling of a man from the guilt of sin. Against this objecta, the example of Adam, he could not be justified in this manner because Adam was created innocent but not just.

A: I cannot find a medium betwixt those two, to say Adam was not made just, but innocent, is directly against scripture, "created in righteousness and true holynesse". [Ephesians 4: 24]

Ther is noe use of justification but wher ther is crimination.

I sayed, righteousness consists in performance in specie

or in awful recompence.

Mr. White: You sent us in the name of the Assembly to the commissioners come out of Scotland.

Letter read.

They will prepare a copy of their commission. Desire a copy of the order of this Assembly be sent to them and a signification from this house of the consent to the Covenant.

Mr. Seaman: Desires a copy of the order of Parliament. He also sent that sae further provision may be made as to the wisdom of the houses shall seeme good. Necessary of thanks be given to them and gae them notice when we desire to meete with them againe.

Mr. Nye: Whether we should not againe be sent to them to see whether they have any more papers to communicate, and designe a time for this meeting. Consider whether it be not fit to waite upon them to expect what they have to propose to us about the Covenant.

Dr. Temple: We had noe thing to do with the [ ] .

Mr. Nye: They come as a Commissioner from the Generall Assembly and see most of their business is from us.

Dr. Gouge: The Comitty be intrusted to take the coppies and shew them and to render hearty thanks for the testification of their love.

Mr. Seaman: Necessary to give answers to them in writing by way of thankfulnesse.

Dr. Smith: It is not in our power to answer any thing in writing, we can gae noe further than our order.

Ordered to read the letter againe tomorrow morning.

Ordered that the same comitty meete with the commissioners againe tomorrow morning, and in the name of the Assembly to give them hearty

thanks for the affectionate letter, and to desire if they have any more papers, to communicate them to this committy, who are to impart them to this Assembly.

September 12th. 1643      Tuesday Morning

The letter from the Assembly of Scotland read againe. <sup>(1)</sup>

Dr. Stanton: A humble motion, that this committy like to be a committy of more than ordinary service, therefore strengthening of the committy. Three to be added more, Dr. Gouge, Mr. Vines, Mr. Palmer.

Dr. Gouge: Let the committy stand.

Mr. White: Desires the letter be sent to the House of Commons.

Mr. Nye: Seconds it and the rather because of that clause in the letter concerning the papers sent to our Assembly.

Mr. Seaman: To present the letter speedily.

Mr. De la Mare: I doe consider this letter that notonly this Assembly but the Parliament had intimated such a businesse in calling them.

I conceive as they should joyne with us to oppose the enemy in this warre, see also with us in a spirituall way to fight against our enemyes.

Mr. Gataker: That cause let the House doe what they shall see good to doe.

Mr. Calamy: They are not sent as members but desire liberty to come amongst us and heare our debates.

Mr. Seaman: Ther is a difference to be put betwixt those individuall persons now come, and those that are apoynted to joyne with them.

Mr. Nye: It will not be fit for us to put them upon a way which may put them upon a denyall.

Ordered ... That Mr. Solicetor be desired to present this letter to the House of Commons.

Mr. Solicitour: A message, a treaty concerning the Covenant.

Their desire that four or five may joyne with the House of Commons to tret with them about the Covenant.

Mr. Nye )  
Mr. Calamy ) To be a committy to joyne with the committy  
Mr. Seaman ) of the House of Lords and Commons to treat  
Mr. Hill ) with the Scotch commissioners about the Covenant.  
And they are to meet in the Afternoon.

Mr. Prolocutor: I desire to show how I have profited by this dispute. Two things in which I was not satisfied:

- 1) in reason it brought man to that position wherin Adam was before the fall.
- 2) the hypostaticall union.

Christ is called the "son of man", and that particular nature I doe not say obliged under this notion.

Whether for Christ's obedience to the death we get this "kingdome of heaven" for a ground, noe cause why difference in opinion should trouble us, because all concurre in this.

Piscator <sup>(2)</sup> "if heaven be gained by Christ's suffering upon the crosse then proved". 10 Heb 19, 20 liberty to enter by the bloud of Christ and the same proved out of Gal 3:4 <sup>(3)</sup>  
Whether bestowed on us for the bloud of Christ or His obedience.

Prolocutor: (continued) A gracious life is the fruite of the "bloud of Christ" 2 Tit 14 [Titus 2: 14] "he gave himselfe for us to redeeme us" and Romans<sup>(4)</sup> "by his bloud he hath redeemed us" and he "works those workes in us for Christ's sake".

Hence that "Love of Christ that constraines us to every good worke"<sup>(5)</sup>, "the love of Christ that in fullfilling the law"<sup>(6)</sup> marke what follows, "who dyed for us". Now I am to seeke whor the like dutyes are improved upon this ground, His fullfilling the law for us. The consequents, if all grace bestowed with reference to the crosse of Christ, then the glory too, because this is the consequents of grace, it is expressly mentioned in 2 Heb 10.

We acknowledge Christ to be mediator. Upon what ground? Why He is "the propitiation for our sins".<sup>(7)</sup> We pray for grace and glory and conclude, "through Jesus Christ", whether upon this my thoughts ware set, upon Christ's fullfilling of the law, I doe not find [ ] ].

Then the active obedience of Christ should have a principall part in all the honour and glory wherin to Christ is advanced with His sufferings. But this latter is expressed as the only ground of all that honour that is cast upon Christ. Reason of all this arising from the due comparison of the active and passive obedience.<sup>(8)</sup>

We may mistake, to the best of God's children the law is irksome, but noe obedience could be irksome to Him; it is natural to Him, noe burden to Him at all; it was meate and drinke to Him.

Prolocutor: (continued) Obedience to the law ceremoniall is not considerable, hypocrites may doe it; the manner belongs to the morall law, ire in jussum, He was but passive in that. His conformity to the law morall, not the least motion could be wrought in Him to swerve from the law, noe not though tempted by Satan. 53 Esa<sup>(9)</sup>. Consider the effects of Christ's passion, the great shall be His portion.

Dr. Hoyle: Some things seemed strange in the discourses yesterday.

It was confessed that we owe a double debt, yet one said the one part is payed by our sanctification. Is not this to confound justification with sanctification, to make sanctification half a saviour? How can we say our debt is "full", "satisfied" while we are in the world.

Strange to say that justification takes away not the guilt but the punishment. Punishment shall not be taken away in this life, are we not therefore justified in this life?

For the considering the willingnesse. God doth not say it matters not whether the person be willing.

1 John 2<sup>(10)</sup> .. "if any man sin"

It is neither a weake nor poore objection. To what end is it brought in? If it be any purpose, to the purpose in hand.

For that whole Christ take Him as the Bible gives Him. Not whole Christ in His passive obedience only. If active imputed, then not bound to keepe the law from our birth.

Said wher can we be said by pardon of sin to have any title to heaven. Ther is not the like reason. We are accepted for Christ's death. I but whether for His death only, if His



Dr. Hoyle: (continued) death, we must be forced to go to a syneck  
doche.

3 Acts 14: .. "the holy one and just."

4 Acts  $\int_{27}^7$ : "of a truth, against the holy child Jesus."

1 Peter<sup>(11)</sup>  $\int_{1}^7$  19,20:

I wish we doe not admitt a falacy of division. That  
in Hebrew is perfected through sufferings, not sufferings only;  
the sufferings of Christ were named 7 Heb<sup>(12)</sup> "end holy  
harmlessnesse".

I doe not stand to divide them, take both together for  
both.

Mr. Hearle: Desire though unfited to say something to that debate.  
Some places of Scripture.

10 Heb 19, that is a kind of speach answering to the law  
and legall sacrifices. The priest was not to enter without bloud,  
but yet legallly cleane.

3 Gal 14<sup>(13)</sup>. Thence infered heaven. Grace given for  
the passing obedience and therefore glory.

A: Inasmuch as by the death of Christ all is taken away  
that hinders, all sin, and if all sin, all wants, as want of  
originall justice, then it followes that we have that originall  
justice.

A: It is true it takes away all want consequenter and  
infallibly, but not formaliter. As suppose my ignorance be a  
privation of learning, it must needs follow consequently that I  
must be learned, but before I can be soe ther must be some positive  
quality. Consequently it doth, because it brings with it a

Mr. Hearle: (continued) necessity. These two never goe asunder, but that it doth not formally constitute the person and make him possessor of that which should intitle him to heaven. Pressed, all grace is given to us for Christ's sake, nae man deny's it, but because grace, therefore glory. That of "redeeming us from vain conversation"<sup>(14)</sup> hath reference to sanctification.

2 Cor 5: 15; this still reference to sanctification and it inferes but this, that in the death of Christ ther is power to sanctify us.

It is true that to holynesse ther is a more moving cause, the death of Christ.

2 Heb 10; "perfect through suffering": it is free perfectum est sui et nihil deest. On the crosse ther was the consumation. 1 John 2: 2<sup>(15)</sup> "propitiation for our sin". In our prayers we doe only in the mediation in Christ. We have speciall reference to His death, for Christ did dy that He might purchase. But still this hath reference to sanctification; but when we come to sanctification, did not Christ meritt in being "borne of a woman"<sup>(16)</sup> this merit must be lost. If it be ours, the thing ended as said, if they be joynd, the active should have equall share in the glory etc.

This was the last and next step to His glory. The last sand in the glasse doth formally empty it but every [

].

A man shut in a room [

].

The death of Christ did unbare heaven for us, drew away the boul't, yet many things must concurre to it.

Mr. Hearle: (continued) It was said Christ's obedience was naturall and see He might actually obey and yet be obliged to it too. I doe not well see how this obligent can stand with the dignity of His nature, though the human nature of Christ be a creature yet it is not a person. The obligation is a personall thing, the terminus of this obligation must be the person of the Son. If ther ware any obligation that He did not merit for, that must be a debitum. Noe man will say but that Christ did meritt for all those.

For that 53 Is <sup>(17)</sup>, "by his knowledge" not He the subject of it but the object, knowledge of Him. I suppose this contains faith in Him, and except this be made appeare [ death itselife without an active concurence of the will had been but a slaughter.

Mr. Price: Many excellent places reckoned up, but whether those places be exclusive of the active obedience. Many places to prove that the active obedience of Christ hath a share in this as well as the other.

2 Phil <sup>(18)</sup> "obedient to the death of the crosse", not only in dying, it may be taken for the duration of His obedience.

Mr. Seaman: About the notion of justification out of scripture.

Often said as opposed to crimination. Two kinds of crimination:

- 1) in reference to the negative part of the law;
- 2) in reference to the affirmative part of the law.

Be justified see the crimination in both may be taken away.

Condemnation two ways:

1) imply negative not justifying

2) [ ]

Mr. Seaman: (continued) Two things in justification to answer:

- 1) not only condemning;
- 2) but also an initiating to life.

As cleare in scripture, we are said to be made righteous, and see not only to be made lyable unto death, but by Christ to have a title to life.

These four things goe together to justification:

R: 1) Because justification by Christ must be as large and beneficiall as justification by workes, but by workes all those four would have been brought in.

2) They that are justified by Christ are spirituallly blessed by their justification but to true spirituall blessednesse all those must concurre.

3) He that is justified by Christ shall by virtue of it raigne in life .. Rom 5:17.

4) He that is justified, may by virtue of his justification, "rejoyce under the hope of glory". (19)

We doe frequently read of a righteousnesse made unto us of God, and given of God wherof God is the author.

10 Rom 3, 6, 10, and 14 Rom 17, 3 Phil 9. See not only righteous by being, but made righteous.

If this be the justification then the active must needs be imputed to bring in.

1) If the active obedience of Christ doe merit, then it must needs be imputed. If Christ might plead His owne active obedience as a ground of glory either to Himselfe or to us. John (20)

2) If the sufferings of Christ in death might exclude His active

Mr. Seaman: (continued) obedience, then the sufferings of His life too. As Christ may be said to be bound to dy see bound to suffer, "that the rich for our sakes becomes poore"<sup>(21)</sup> this relates to life of Christ.

3) If Christ had redeemed by His active obedience as well as His passive, four ways of Redemption:

- a) by serving in another's stead;
- b) by price;
- c) by conquest with a high hand;
- d) by intreaty and desire.

In those things that are co-ordained it is a weak argument to reason from the one to the exclusion of the other, All that will be questioned is whether redeemed by serving

It is plaine in 4 Gal.<sup>(22)</sup> "made under the law" and many places where mention of Christ giving His life a ransome and then it seemes to be in a way of ministry. These two gee together: 1 Tim 2:<sup>6</sup>, nothing that restraines it to His death, looke how He gave Himselfe a "ransome".

If Christ, and all that He did and suffered, make but substitution and [ransome]. If the obedience of Christ must needs be retained from the first act of it, to the last, then the question is, what is the first act? "He tooke upon him the form of a servant and began to obey."<sup>(23)</sup>

Mr. Gibson: I cannot consent to the restraining of obedience unto His death. Of justification, of remission of sins. More required than remission of sins from baptisme, "put on Christ".

The question was put, three or four only dissenting.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 52

- (1) Session 50, September 11th.
- (2) J. Piscator, Analysis Logica sex epistolarum Pauli, Ad Galatas, pp 2 f, 8 f.
- (3) Gal. 1: 3-4
- (4) Rom. 3: 24
- (5) 2 Cor. 5: 14
- (6) Gal. 2: 20
- (7) 1 John 2: 2
- (8) Rom. 5: 6
- (9) Isa. 53: 12
- (10) 1 John 2: 1
- (11) 1 Pet. 1: 19-20
- (12) Heb. 7: 26
- (13) Gal. 1: 3-4
- (14) 1 Pet. 1: 18
- (15) 1 John 2: 2
- (16) Matt. 11: 11
- (17) Isa. 53: 11
- (18) Phil. 2: 8
- (19) Rom. 5: 2
- (20) John 17: 4-5
- (21) 2 Cor. 8: 9
- (22) Gal. 4: 5
- (23) Phil. 2: 4

September 12th. 1643 Tuesday Afternoon

Mr. Sedgwick: A motion to put; not White.

Resolved upon the question that Mr. White be added to the former committy.

"And by faith alone layed hold on."

Mr. Wilkinson: Desire it may be said "layed hold on and applyed", reason, because it is the peculiar privilege of faith to [ ]  
[ ]

Notitia scienta et fiducia, in the last of which the soul of man doth quiet itself; now "layed hold on" or "apprehended" will serve the turne for "notia" and assensus. But that without which it will not prove effectually in the application of it to our owne conscience. Thus the difference betweene the faith of a Christian and the faith of a divell, the divell knowes it, but we comfort ourselves in the application of this one to [ ] our individuall conscience [ ]

Justifying faith is therefore effectually because it brings Jesus Christ crucified to the conscience. Why doth it see? Because it hath an effect, essentially in relation with Christ crucified, which "alone by faith" doth apply to a believer.

How doth the blood of Christ come to the conscience, but by faith as a hand taking the blood of Christ and laying it upon the conscience, and this is application. It is said [ ] fides [ ] ad salutem. How is that? Because the heart of man layes hold upon that Christ crucified that doth save him. It is not the "notia" and the "scienta" but the belief, the fiducia, that brings

Mr. Wilkinson: (continued)

it home.

Desire the word of application may be put in.

Application is the thing that doth the deed and application is the worke of faith.

Obiection: then faith will be not only in the understanding but in the will.

A: Is not the will and understanding the facultyes of one and the same soule.

Mr. Bayly: It will conduce much to the clearing the doctrine of justification, that something be added touching the nature of justifying faith about which ther are many mistakes.

To say nothing of miraculous faith.

- 1) the severall kinds of faith, what they be;
- 2) poynt out the precise difference;
- 3) the mutuall agreement;
- 4) resolve two questions.

To say nothing of miraculous faith, ceased long ago.

Three sorts of faith; generall assenting, speciall resting, and particular applying faith.

The first is called [

].

Second called faith of adherence.

Third commonly called saving and justifying. Therin lyes the error.

Generall assenting faith wherby we believe all things to be true and that upon God's testimony because He is the author of them, example Paul. Acts 24: <sup>14</sup>.

Speciall resting, wherby we put our trust and confidence



Mr. Bayly: (continued) in Christ for the benefit of His mediation.

The act is usually called a believing in or on, "ye believe in God, believe also in Me"<sup>(1)</sup>. Simply to believe, an act of credence. To believe in, an act of confidence. All we lost in Adam, see we recover all by Christ, Who "is made unto us God's wisdom"<sup>(2)</sup> etc. This we have by speciall resting faith, it unto Christ makes up a marriage.

Particular applying faith wherby we appropriate the promises of Christ and make them our owne. Gal. 1:20 In which words he mentions the two former.

Differences of these three.

Two ways: 1) by their objects; 2) subjects.

- 1) Objects. The object of assenting faith word of God.
- 2) Christ closed with His benefits.

Of third; the promises of the word drawne into personall propositions, by Christ the object of speciall resting. I meane the mediate, otherwise the ultimate is God.

1 Pet. 1:21.

The agreement of these three.

The first is the cause of two. The second the ground of the third. The third presupposeth the first and second.

General assenting faith if cleare and brought downe into the practical understanding as it doth only in God's elect, is the cause of speciall resting faith. Reason, because the will which is the seate of the speciall resting faith, doth always follow the last dictate and reason of the practical understanding.

The second is the ground of the third, not the cause, for

Mr. Bayly: (continued) whosoever believes in Christ may apply unto himselfe all the promises of the gospell; he hath the warrant to doe it, if he doe it not.

I did distinguish the objects but not subjects. Take it now.

Subject or seate of generall assenting faith [is] the understanding, speciall resting faith, the will; and particular applying faith the conscience.

1) It is the office of the understanding to assent to the word of God.

2) The will, the nature of this stands in affiance and that is a rationall affection.

3) Conscience, he that doth appropriate any promise must doe it in a [ ] conscience, nothing else but the soul of man reflecting on itselfe.

4) Two questions of moment:

By which of those three is a man saved?

A: By the second and second only.

We are saved by faith, but not by generall assenting nor particular applying thereof. If generall assenting, then devells would go to heaven as well as we. Yet we must not slight this, see though we are not saved by it, yet we cannot be saved without it.

Not by particular applying, the use of that is not to save us, but to assure us of salvation. Which is a cleare truth that if men cling to Christ by a speciall resting faith they shall be sure to be saved, though not a particular applying faith. This particular applying faith is the most comfortable of all other.

Mr. Bayly: (continued) By which of these three is a man justified?

A: By the second, it is a branch of speciall resting faith and differs from it only as the part differs from the whole that contains it. Speciall resting, we have believed in Christ that we might be justified, an affiance in Christ for the benefit of justification, the genus affiance, the specificall difference partly of object, Christ, if ends justification. They are deceived who think that God's speciall mercy in pardoning of sins is the object of justification, because justifying faith goes before justification.

I cannot believe that sins are forgiven until they are forgiven.

The act of justifying faith is not simply to believe, but to believe in. Rom.3:25.

Motion: That something be added to declare the nature of justifying faith. By faith we understand only justifying faith, which is a resting upon Christ for justification and remission of sins. Reasons, because many upright Christians whilst they lose their assurance or never had it, they fall into grievous temptation.

Mr. Gataker: Take my hint from the conclusion of my reverend brother, concerning the putting in the word "applied"; 'tis ambiguous and I doubt it may prove something dangerous. The word "apprehended" was on the same ground refused in the regard of the ambiguity of it.

Shew by what steps and degrees we proceed to that act of faith, that is, the justifying faith to the particular persuasion.

1) Ther is nothing necessary "notice" and "apprehension" of something to be believed, and "rested upon" and this is sse essentiall

Mr. Gataker: (continued) to justifying faith as that sometimes it seemes to be put for faith, and thus farre an atheist may goe, have heard of the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments and believe not a word to be true.

2) creditio scientia an assent unto or assurance of the truth of it; this in our common English is belief and this is essentiall to justifying faith; John 6:<sup>69</sup> "we know and believe thee to be the son of God" thus farre the devills may go but not the atheists.

3) an application, a conditional application wherby a man doth believe that this doctrine of the gospell may be saving to him if he doe performe the condition required. This is not sufficient to bring a man in to the state of grace.

Balaam, Numb. 23:<sup>10</sup>, by the death of the righteous man he did believe that if he took that course the people of God did, he might come to a good end, thus farre a reprobate may go, but also necessary "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved".<sup>(3)</sup>

Here is an application but this will not.

4) A speciall resting or fiducia a resting upon Christ. I have demanded wher I shall looke for the speciall. I was answered in Rom. 10:<sup>9</sup> "If you believe Christ". It must be found ther wher the thing ex professio is treated and insisted upon. John 3:<sup>18</sup> "believe on him" and wher the apostle doth state the question Rom. 3:<sup>25</sup> "a propitiation through faith in his blood".

It hath been objected that believing "in" and "about" are the same and that this is a mere quirke.

A: not soe. It is usuall with the Greeke fathers, we may believe of man, but only in God.

Mr. Gataker: (continued) It is said Jonah 3:<sup>5</sup> the men of Ninivey believed "in" God, not in a God of threatening, for we cannot believe [ ] trust but for some good. [ ] and this I take to be the justifying act of faith. The will is inclined to goe out of itselfe and to cast itselfe wholly upon Christ.

5) Another apprehension. An apprehension of my faith. I must know that I doe believe that I have trusted.

6) The speciall application or particular persuasion that doe believe "that you may know that you have life eternal"<sup>(4)</sup>. This comes two steps after the justifying act of faith soe cannot be the justifying act of faith, see Augustine.<sup>(5)</sup> If you put in the word application, as it is ambiguous, soe it may prove dangerous.

Mr. Carter: This phrase imports the act of faith only, whereas it may be done by the habit of faith also, for though wher ther is the act it implyes a habit, yet in some persons as infants the habit may dominate. Between habit and act ther is only a graduall difference and therefore he that hath the habit, when by an individuall necessity he cannot act, he is a true believer. In the first act a man is merely passive, yet at that very instant of time that [ ] though action doth in order of nature proceed over justification, yet in time both one.

Actus and actu esse in two things, at the same instant a man actually justified in the sight of God, the habit of faith.

3) By working, the habit of faith in the soul, ther is a union

Mr. Carter: (continued) as well by the act. As in natural abstractions

actus agendo ne batillum.

4) The habit of faith may be the condition of the new Covenant though faith be not the condition of any act in God, that is the condition of our enjoyment of the benefit of those.  $\int$

- substantial part of text missing -

7.

Case of great sins as Peter, the act of faith was gone only the habit remained. Therefore some phrase that may be meant as well of the habit as the act and exercise of faith. That of "receiving" because it is the scripture phrase.

Mr. Vines: I conceive we are not justified by the habit of faith.

It is an assertion that hath a tendency to the justification of us by faith as a quality.

Let the man looke upon the habit as a habit.

Ther must be something to answer imputation, and must be an act.

Those words "apprehended" and "received by faith" in me 26 Act<sup>(6)</sup>.

Acts 10:<sup>43</sup> "Received remission of sin".

A reception ther is, but a passive reception. I understand not. Such a reception as a woman receives a man in marriage.

John 3:<sup>16</sup> "Whosoever believes on him shall not perish".

An act, looking up unto this serpent<sup>(7)</sup>. John 3:<sup>15</sup> Ther is potentia in the habit but by the power of faith receiving, that is not that wherby I receive Christ. For that of infants their faith, a query upon that of habituall faith in him.

For the Covenant, ther is a reciprocally betwixt Christ

Mr. Vines: (continued) and us. Those bonds on part of Christ may be the Spirit and the union ther may be "but then I in you and you in me"  $\int$

7

For that then ther may be an intercession of. Suppose a pardon offered and I receive it, am not I pardoned? Though not allways after pardoning.

Soe married once though not allways marrying. We are not simply justified by a habbit.

Mr. Walker: I desier to expresse my opinion, our brethren have expressed divers. Briefly, what I conceive true saving faith. Difference is not that in respect of any act or object that it reacheth unto for saving faith. The same acts that a temporall belief hath, ther is an assent, and this not merely in the understanding but in the will. Ther is some operation of the will as we doe believe the things received. Soe ther is a resting upon this word of God and applying it to oneself.

Then he comes to applying divers particulars that are in Christ. But justifying, is the believing that we shall have in Christ remission of sins and  $\int$  be  $\int$  constituted righteous before God.

It is called justifying faith when it reacheth properly to those things that concerne our justification.

A reprobate may never have part of Christ; he may believe and give assent. True saving justification is that which comes from the Spirit of God. The first saving act by which we come to have part in Christ, it is God's act.

FOOTNOTES -- SESSION 53

- (1) John 14:<sup>1</sup>
- (2) 1 Cor. 1:<sup>24</sup>
- (3) Acts 16:<sup>31</sup>
- (4) 1 John 5:<sup>13</sup>
- (5) St. Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmum, CIII P.L.36, pp 1335 f
- (6) Acts 18:<sup>18</sup>
- (7) John 3:<sup>15</sup>



September 13th. 1643 Wednesday Morning

Mr. Palmer: A motion concerning Dr. Burgess, that some way may be found how he may be restored to us againe.

Dr. Temple: Seconded him.

Mr. Clayton: If they can give us assurance that he joynes with us in that great service, it will be more considerable.

Mr. Vines: It is not within our power to call him with that account.

Dr. Temple: His crime is not dissenting, that every man's right, but in petitioning.

Dr. Smith: Petition to them to call him to a speedy account that he give satisfaction, if possibly it can be, and upon his satisfaction we restore to his place within the Assembly.

Mr. Palmer: )  
                  ) To draw a forme of what is fit  
Dr. Temple: )  
                  ) to present to the House on behalf  
Mr. Vines: )  
                  ) of Dr. Burgess.

"And by faith alone layed hold on."

Dr. Hoyle: Concerning faith ther are four things, and the last comes to our consideration, the word "hold".

Is 27:<sup>4</sup> "who shall lay hold upon my strength."

1 Tim 6:<sup>12,19</sup>

Heb. 3:<sup>6,14</sup>

Heb. 4:<sup>14</sup> and 6:<sup>8</sup>

The "sirach"<sup>(1)</sup>, the language that Christ spoke upon earth, an Hebrew scribalists upon the Greek testament.

In the epistle to the Hebrews we had, - Heb. 3:<sup>6</sup> "to lay strong and fast hold" "we stand or make to stand"

For the matter consider faith as a hand;

three parts:

- 1) Knowledge with the assent of the understanding, it is notitia.
- 2) Act of the will, to accept or to take, "as many as too him" "as many as believed".
- 3) Fiducia.

A question whether this same fiducia be an ingredient to the definition, or to come in as an essentiall thing as rationall.

Scientiale est constituens not consequence. St. Austin in his 150 Epistle<sup>(2)</sup> what is it to believe "credulo Deo adorare credeude in deum ire".

"By workes" was added because of that of Stapelton<sup>(3)</sup> who saith that we are justified not for faith but by workes.

It is no contradiction to say by faith only and by grace only. One thing of forgiveness of sins before committed, till sin be pardonable how can it be pardoned.

Ordered to consider better of the petition concerning Dr. Burgess tomorrow morning.

Mr. Palmer: Desirre to offer few words a littell to state our holinesse. Yesterday divers learned and judicious debates.

- 1) It was argued to add the word applyed. Answered to be ambiguous.
- 2) It was moved that the speciall act of speciall resting faith hath for this object the person of Christ.
- 3) Something concerning the habit of faith, to expresse something in this Article concerning that.
- 4) How distinguish justifying faith from that carnall presumption that drunkards etc. have.

Whether the mention of the Spirit of God be sufficient to make that distinction.

- 5) Whether you will not thinke it necessary to expresse as actually justified whilst believers.
- 6) And not whilst impenitent.

Instead of "by faith alone" "layed hold on", "when He by His spirit workes true repentance and faith in us by which faith alone we lay holde on Christ as our onely saviour".

Dr. Gouge: Dangerous to place repentance before faith.

Mr. Vines: This faith is called dogmaticall by some because it rest

[ object is indeffinitely the whole of God. This is not justifying faith the subject and seats of it is the intellect.

[

- substantial part of text missing in Ms. ]

Mr. Vines: (continued) the act is common to those that are not in Christ, not men, to angells and devells. It doth not bring the immediate effects, it doth not argue or suppose a man that hath it, to be a sinner. It doth not spring out of that calling that is according to purpose for justifying faith supposeth effect of all calling.

[ - substantial part of text

missing in Ms. - ]

It seemse to me that ther may be a cleare conviction and yet not that faith that we seeke.

"They believed in his name". Yet Christ did not trust them.

Calvin<sup>(4)</sup> saith this was not simulata fide, it might be vera Fides. Fides may be vera in suo genere yet is not [

] Fides temporaria

Seemes to me to adde to the former notion of historicall faith, something of affection and seemes to be taken from him that receiveth "the seed in strong ground", he "receives with joy" and falls off againe, but to make this a species distinct, I understand not, because drawn only a duratiome, not ab intrinseca natura rei

I cannot know if it be temporary till I have lost it. Therefore Christ saith hath "no roots" in Himselfe.

This hath for its object the gospell of Christ, this believing is, he percieves, the gospell, believes the tidings of the gospell, and then starts to a sudden pleasure and joy. This is rather a believing in the being of Christ than in Christ. The maradge is not to the state, wealth and honour of the person but

Mr. Vines: (continued) the man. As a woman may have joy in the wealth etc., but yet afterwards upon the terms deny the man.

Justifying faith.

This faith for the habit, many sundry acts not. Faith is an instrument apprehending and laying holde on and [

] The speciall object of this act, more generall the gospell, more speciall Christ Jesus for righteousnesse, or that which accounted to be for righteousnesse. This believing is not properly the believing the truth of an actione or proposition [ with him the union is. Now the applying of myself to Christ for righteousnesse, "faith is unto righteousnesse", and this must precedently in nature goe before, shall I say, fiducia. But put the case ther be a trepidation, how can I call that a resting?

A going out to Christ, a receiving or laying hold on Christ. The seat of it is the heart, which is in Scripture taken very largely. Bishop Davenant<sup>(5)</sup>; "faith is in the whole soul, laying on and making out against all discouragements" and this was called in the case of the woman [ ] great faith.

How a man may be said to believe upon a stone. But in this sence trusting and relying. Therefore trust soe often in the oulde testament. The [trust] doth not alwayes imply a certainty and evidence of the thing in being, but an assurance of the power, wisdom, and goodnesse of God. Rom. 4:<sup>21</sup>

Generall faith it is not temporary faith; it is not, neither is it certitude which we call an evident knowledge. That I am justified and some call a reflex act of faith. That definition

Mr. Vines: (continued) of a particular assurance was faith in opposition to papists. This followes on justification for I cannot believe or know that I am justified till I am, see known and believe, further believe.

Applying of the seale of Jesus Christ the promises that Christ Himselfe for righteousnesse.

Mr. Price: For justifying faith.

- 1) Object. First promise
- 2) Christ in the promise

The magne Charta wherin Christ is contained is in the new testament and oulde.

- 2) The nature of it, a fiduciall assent. The generall nature an assent, the characteristicall fiduciall assent. I throw myself upon Christ, it is not only to believe that Christ came to save believers.

- 3) Acts of justifying faith in either reflex or direct reflexe assurance. A man may be justified by Christ and yet still want, it is a steele backe unto a bow that may be put on and taken off.

Direct acts, either as a receiver and worker. Receiver, receive Christ for justification, sanctification, sustentation. Worker, inwards purifyes the heart, outward it works by love.

Dr. Temple: I only speake to the poynts in hand. Three acts of faith:

- 1) Generall assent
- 2) Fiducia, resting and relying.
- 3) Assurance, the first is not properly the act of justifying faith, it comes short of it. The last goes as much beyond and therefore it must be that which lies between the two, fiducia.

Desire something to cut off the papists and the

Dr. Temple: (continued) Antinomians.

Poor weak Christians who have been formerly taught that faith is an assurance. Thus "layed hould on by faith" wherby the soule believing the truthe or promises of the gospell doth withall cast itself and rest on Christ only or wholly for salvation, yelding obedience to His Lawes.

Mr. Goodwin: Speake to the words of the Article. Here is in the Article an object of faith and an act of faith. The question is about the properest expression to expresse the object and the act.

For the object of faith to say "the promise" or "Christ's righteousnesse", or "the whole obedience of Christ". I would not have it run soe. It is "Christ hath His righteousnesse," and the person alone, but Christ invested with obedience sutable to a sinner.

For the act of faith.

I lay this for a ground, you can expresse noe act, for the matter of it that can distinguish it from the faith of temporaryes, and it must ly in the spiritualnesse of the act which we need not stand to set downe but expresse it in scripture phrases. The act is  $\int$   $\int$ .  
The act of the will towards Christ with His righteousnesse and the reason is because it is that which doth distinguish a man from angels. An act which is proper to the will, that is peculiar to man, and that is either to lay hould upon Christ for salvation, trusting and relying upon Him.

Those that speake of general faith all the places they

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) bring have an act of the will in application.

Rom 10:<sup>9</sup> "if you confesse...." It is plaine he speaks of justification, but mark what follows "with heart believe" and "believe on him", and therefore not a bare act of understanding but will also.

1 John 5:<sup>10</sup> "on the son of God" and for that act the scripture have many expressions, the scripture hath a "coming to Christ", "receiving Christ".

This "Christ with his righteousnesse being apprehended and rested on for salvation"<sup>(6)</sup>, "trusted in only by faith for salvation".<sup>(7)</sup>

Dr. Smith: The object of faith: I take it to be voted already.

That which is imputed by God must by faith be apprehended by us.

The word imputation is a word taen from accountants as that which give an account of thy stewardship.

Soe Rom 8:<sup>18</sup> "I account the afflictions of this life" as if he were making up an account, and who could do it better than Paul, who had a multitude of afflictions, and he had been raped up into the third heavens and knew much of the glory thereof. In this poynt what have we to make up our reckoning and account but the whole obedience of Christ which is layed hoyld on by faith.

An expresion in the book of 25 Ecclesiastes 12<sup>(8)</sup> "the feare of the Lord is the beginning of the love of him and faith is the beginning of our [ with God."

Mr. Chambers: I assent to this, to take in the Lord Christ as the object. Christ is nott the finall terminated object for He is to be looked on as a mediator. 1 Peter 1:<sup>21</sup> in the definition



Mr. Chambers: (continued) ther should be made mention of the  
mercy of God.

Mr. Hericke: If another word added and "stayed" and "rested upon",  
because the scripture useth both those "trust" and "stay" upon  
his God.

Mr. Wilkenon (Sen): I desire to be added one word. I have  
conceived Christ's blood applyed to the conscience to be a  
sovereigne medicine against all the diseases of the soule. All  
definitions that I find, take in the word application, I thinke  
it more significant than any other I can think withall.

Prolocutor: I am against this opinion that our relying upon Christ  
doth goe before our justification, it rather followes after.

Reason: Consider whether this relying in Christ be fit to be  
represented by a hand, and whether it were fit to take it as a  
hand receiving. And in this sence it is taken, relatively free  
mercies offered.

Whether this relying be a worke of grace or not, if  
soe God's Love was towards us.

Sanctification comes after justification, this being  
a grace God did not bestow it upon us as an enemy but as a friend.

Which was Paul's faith wherby justified? - Gal. 2:<sup>20</sup>  
Melancthon 2 tom 279p.<sup>(9)</sup>

It is the receiving of remission of sins.

Belarium,<sup>(10)</sup> confessed by Camier,<sup>(11)</sup> yet he speaks

22lib docent fidem justificare Camier 22lib 11 Chap 17 sect  
Cap 12:2 sect.

I never heard it questioned that justification was  
before sanctification.

Prolocutor: (continued) In Calvin,<sup>(12)</sup> fiducia is a consequent to faith for that of weake Christians, it may be this disturbance may arise from the melancholique humours, till they be lifted.

To rely upon Christ is it a worke of flesh and bloud, or of grace? If a worke of grace, did God bestow it as an enemy or a friend?

How can I call God by the name of Father when I am not persuaded that he is my father?

Mr. Walker: I think the fullest word is the word of application.

Dr. Stanton: Desires God's free grace is the principall object of justification, may be taken into the description.

Mr. Palmer: It is love we are said to believe through Christ in God. But I know not where the mercy of God is said to believe it.

- (1) Syriac
- (2) St. Augustine, Epistolarum Classis III, Epistola CL, P.L 33 p 645
- (3) T. Stapleton, De Universa justificationis doctrina hodie contraversa, Lib 12 pp 407 f
- (4) J. Calvin, In Evangelium secundum Iohannem, p 3
- (5) J. Davenant, Determinationes quaestionum quarundam theologiarum, XXXVII Fides justificans est fiducia in Christum Mediatorem, pp 163 f
- (6) Phil. 3:12-13
- (7) 1 Pet. 1:9
- (8) Deut. 6:2,3
- (9) P. Melancthon, Opera Omnium excedebant haeredes, Tom 2 p 279
- (10) Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) Jesuit cardinal and theologian. Taught at the New Roman College where he produced the standard theological statement of the Tridentine theology, Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus Iniquos temporis haereticos, Igolstadt 1586-88-93. He later became personal theologian to the Pope, and entered into a controversy with James I of England. (N.C.E 2 pp 959 f Friske)
- (11) D. Chemier, Pentratiae Catholicae sive contraveriarum de religione adversus pontificios corpus III 22 Sola Fide iustificante  
 (11) De Remotione causarum, propter quas sola fides iustificat 17 p 958; (12) De modo iustificatione per fidem 2 p 959
- (12) J. Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 3, 24, 17 pp 257 f

September 14th. Thursday morning

Mr. Palmer: A motion concerning the expressing of something concerning repentance against the damnable opinion of the Antinomians.

Dr. Gouge: A motion that it be not put into the Article but rather reserved to the aspersions.

Mr. Bayly: Second the motion. By a short marginal note, God justifies no sinners but such as doe repent.

Another marginal note be put, "by faith", in this place we understand only justifying faith which is a resting upon Christ for righteousness and remission of sins. Reason, because the obscure nature of faith doth much perplex ordinary Christians, who presuming that noe faith doth it by applying.

And it would be a means to correct the catichismes that doe pervert the people.

Mr. Rouse: A messedge of  $\int$  7

Mr. Vines: Desire that it be not referred to a subcommitty and that it may be solidly confuted.

Dr. Gouge: A just occasion to despatch the matter in hand.

Mr. Palmer: To begin in the Assembly will not be the readiest way and it may be the exactest way. The bookes will of necessity send you to a committy. Whether a select committy.

Mr. Rouse: The ministers of London are best verst in it having been vexed with it, therefore you may joyne some more with them.

Mr. Gataker: That work doth require expedition, when diseases are desparate noe delay of phisicker, this as desperate, as sprung up in late days. We cannot do better than do it and in full Assembly.

Mr. Goodwin: A few doth prepare it for the Assembly and gather up the debates to present them to the house.

That ther be a committy or any five to compare the opinions of the Antinomians now presented to the House by Mr. Rouse. And to compare the opinions of the Antinomians with the word of God and with the Articles of Religion. And to examine the bookes of the Antinomians and make report to this Assembly.

Mr. Galamy, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Gataker, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Herle, Dr. Featly, Dr. Temple, to meete at 2 a clock in the afternoon in the deans house.

Dr. Gouge: An aspersion was layed upon a very worthy and learned man as contradicting himself. I desire the words may be considered.

Dr. Hoyle: Mr. Peirson told me "full assurance" was too much.

Mr. Bayly: It was far from my intent to asperse the name of Mr. Perkins. He doth in his catechism<sup>(1)</sup> define faith by assurance, as by a genus. But three pages after moves this question [

7.

Mr. Palmer: A motion received again concerning repentance to be expressed in the Article.

Mr. Goodwin: I suppose you would not enter into this question whether repentance be before faith or noe. Its in opposition to Austin who excludes repentance from that faith.<sup>(2)</sup>

Mr. Gataker: Ther is some distinction to be made both of repentance and of remission. For the priority of these I cannot conceive any distinction in regard of time, nor to speake properly in regard of the nature of them. Both are branches or effects or

Mr. Gataker: (continued) what we might derive them from regeneration.

When not only is the mind enlightened by the will healed, which is done by satisfaction. The will is enabled to fit to work according to any object represented to it and any duty God requires of it. These goe together.

Matthew 21:<sup>31/32</sup> .. "repent that you might believe". Repent of your former disobedience and standing out. These two, the one of them may to our appearance sooner offer themselves as we say thunder and lightening, they are together in time but apprehended one before the other, it is not because the example is a quicker sense. Soe we are more prone to apprehend their repentance than their belief. But ther is a distinction to be made when we speake of repentance in order to remission of sins in a justifiable condition, freed from the power of the law to condemn. But if we speake of justification in regard of the act of it, a man may be actually justified afterwards yet [that?] he is in a justifiable condition.

[There is then a blank page before the next session.]

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 55

- (1) W. Perkins, Works, 1 The fountain of Christian Religion gathered into five principles, pp 1 f
- (2) St. Augustine, De Spiritu et Littera liber unus: Cap XXX 52-58, P.L 44. p 233 f

September 15th. Fryday Morning

Prolocutor: Right Hon. and you reverend divines of our brethren in Scotland, right dearly beloved.

We have not learnt the Lord Jesus Christ see ill that the speciall time to trust in the Lord and "as light and darknesse are both alike to God".<sup>(1)</sup> See light and darknesse [

] "Who art thou that thou shouldst feare".<sup>(2)</sup>

"Surely the Lord removes the bitterness of that cup of fury put into our hands,"<sup>(3)</sup> how few to guide the Church of England - of all the sons she hath brought up.

Blessed be you of the Lord that are come in such a seasonable time. This leads us to remember Nehemiah<sup>(4)</sup> - he fasted, mourned, wept and prayed. Job - fare more comfort from every one of you than he found from all his [comforters]. He found they were phistians of noe valew - they did speak eloquently [but did not provide any words of comfort].

By reason of the acustomed hatred betweene borderers, yet the bond of Religion is of fare greater union, and he hath been a way to remove all blockes. We do remember the letters lately received from you, with great joy, Could an angel from heaven expresse himselfe in better oratory. We trust we shall forsake Babylon in doctrine, in worship, in discipline.

Dr. Hoyle: Though after so singular a speach ther [remains little for me to add]. I rejoyce to see the day of the union of the church of God. The worst concurrences of our worst brethren you know. Those churches that have come through the suite of popery



Dr. Hoyle: (continued) are the fairest churches. Those that have received the most purity according to the Word of God have prospered the best.

We remember Calvin's words<sup>(5)</sup> "hold this way and never enemy shall have power over you". We have found this in our brethren of Scotland. Had we done as our brethren about us, we had not had this occasion. Did they because bishops were bad, take in good, noe they cast out all.

∫ Germany was even about to revolt from them because of their bad lawes. ∫

∫ to these our reverend and worthy brethren, all our hearts and tongues are to give you publique thanks. We need not say "come over to Macedonian and help us",<sup>(6)</sup> you are come.

We may say in the words of David "you are come to us to help us, our hearts knit to yours."<sup>(7)</sup> It is noe strange thing to have helpe, the Romans had it, Athens and Lacedemonia by Solon and Licurgus,<sup>(8)</sup> Sicily and Siracuse by the helpe of Plato. Therefore seeing we are thus joynd together under one king in one island, speake one language and which is the greatest, by one Christ Jesus.

We have more need to have them that are ours in heart to helpe us, seeing many of our owne have little better than betrayed us. We desire to be thankful first to God. We beseech the Lord to reward you, beseech you to go along with us and herein we doe not more but desire to requite the same.

Mr. Case: I hope it will not be thought presumption in me. It was the sad complaint of the prophet - refuge from Edome. [

] Blessed be God that He hath taken from our lips occasion of soe sad a complaint this day. [ of whom we may truly say, "their kindnesse hath been more in the latter dayes, than in the beginning."<sup>(9)</sup>

How hath God worked that nation unto "bowells of compassion"<sup>(10)</sup> Such an hyperboly of sympathy and affection have they expressed without a figure but not without a wonder [

] This speakes to me a new argument that God doth not intend [to allow the flame of His gospell to be extinguished within the Church of England], that firekindled is but the ministry of the burning bush. The wind you heare. It is not the whirlwind, it is as the Baptist speakes. "Wherefore let us arise and build and let our hands be strengthened to this work"<sup>(11)</sup> [With] Levys fidelity, Phineas zeal [set as examples to us]. The Lord fulfill upon this Assembly. "He shall sit as a refiner upon the sons of Levi"<sup>(12)</sup>. The good Lord facilitate the counsellis of both nations and the Land of our Parlement and the Commissioners of Scotland.

Mr. Henderson: We are surprised with soe solemne a gratulatory acceptation that we have nothing to answer only this. We may from our present sence say as we did blesse God before our coming here for that we heard of this reverend Assembly, soe now we much more blesse God for that which we see and heare this day.

As the consul of Rome did not despaire of the republic [ when we looke to men we have small ground for

Mr. Henderson: (continued) hope, but when we looke to God, and remember the dayes of olde, we cannot but be confident.

We know how difficult it was - the returning. The learning, policy and power of the world was against them yet the Lorde by His owne power and wisdom hath done it to us. We may promise in the name of the church and kingdome of Scotland hearby, affection to this worke.

Their hearby prayers for you. In times past our church and kingdome have not been negligent. They did such a supplication to his majesty. It pleased his majesty to deny, it pleased God to dispose of things.

Though some have controverted the lawfulnessse of call of this convention. (13) No sooner were they met together but plots and discord, as if God had called them to that purpose, your commmissioners came soe oppertunely as was to admiration.

They did resolve upon a covenant. It is the desire and shall be the joy of our hearts to see it concluded for we are confident by our experience. We only wish that both you and we strive to have hearts elevated according to the nature of the worke, that we would strive for self denyall. Two grounds: (1) an earnest disire of the deliverance of the church and kingdome. (2) our owne preservation and the safety of our king and his kingdome.

Mr. White: The word inserted - "against the common enemy".

Mr. Gataker: That clause we excepted against formerly, and now ther is noe ground of scruple.

Mr. Goodwin: I always thought that this put in in order for religion [ ]

Mr. Nye: It is not ordinary to make mention of some sister church without some reverent respect.

Mr. Gataker: (14) The scope of the apostell is not to define justification. Remission of sins and justification are things of several motion and nature. Pardon indeed is the freedome of man from the penalty of everlasting condemnation, and is that that doth necessarily follow upon the justification of a sinner. Pardon of sin is an act of God's free mercy. For the apostell argument I conceive it to run thus, reasoning not from a breach of justification but from a necessary connexion and a necessary consequent even of effectual justification. The argument is taken from that that doth necessarily accompany the justification of a sinner. His scope is to show that Abraham had noe cause wherof to rejoyce in themselves.

That man whose blessednesse doth consist in the remission of sins, covering and not imputing his sin, is not justified by his workes.

He that is justified by his workes has that wherin he may glory, but noe man, not David or Abraham have anything wherin they may glory in themselves. That man to whom not working but believing, faith is imputed to him for righteousnesse, not working but believing. What he had said out of Moses concerning Abraham, he confirms further out of David. That man to whom God imputes righteousnesse without workes is not justified by his workes nor has that wherin he may glory. The assumption is proved that man who [has] happynesse doth consist in this, that his sins are not imputed.

Mr. Gataker: (continued) This is sufficient from the plea, that that man was a happy man whose sins are remitted and he whose are soe, he is justified without workes.

[ Large gap in text of half page ]

Mr. Burgess: Sir you know the occasion of that unhappy interruption that hath been. (15) It hath pleased the House of Commons to give me soe much liberty that I come in to speake for myselfe. The sume of what I said is this. Howsoever it was my great unhappynesse to stumble at some expressions contained in the covenant as first propounded. Yet I find by report of divers members of this Assembly that ther hath been a review, and that those things that principally stumbled me were removed, as for instance the explication on the body, and the "five articles" is altered to give satisfaction. In that I rest fully satisfied. In that they were prepared to accept of as satisfaction from me and have restored me.

[ Textual gap of one page ]

Mr. Seaman: I see noe reason why [ ] should be removed in respect of treating of justification. The apostell sets out all that appertains to glorification in the 5<sup>(16)</sup> sanctification.

Mr. Herle: The word freely is left out in this place and we must specially insist upon that because in the Article and against the Papists.

Mr. Goodwin: That it is meant properly of justification. Notwithstanding that objection that being justified it belongs not to the receiving but the shedding of the Holy Ghost.

Mr. Vines: The words immediately relating to regeneration, it is  
directly one and the same.

Mr. Bathurst: Referre to the words "saviour Christ" ...

[Textual gap]

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 56

- (1) Ps. 139: <sup>12</sup>
- (2) Paraphrase of Neh. 6: <sup>11</sup>
- (3) Jer. 25: <sup>15</sup>
- (4) Neh. 1: <sup>4</sup>
- (5) Letter CGXXIX "To the Protector Somerset" in Letters of John Calvin Vol. II p 172
- (6) Acts 16: <sup>9</sup>
- (7) 1 Chron. 12: <sup>17</sup>
- (8) Solon and Licurgus were classical lawgivers in Athens and Sparta
- (9) Ruth 3: <sup>10</sup>
- (10) 1 John 3: <sup>17</sup>
- (11) Ps. 90: <sup>17</sup>
- (12) Mal. 3: <sup>3</sup>
- (13) King Charles had refused to sign an order convening any Assembly of Divines and had then condemned any Divines who attended the Assembly convened by order of Parliament.
- (14) He is returning to a debate on the nature of justification using Psalm 32 and Romans 3 as the basis of his discussion.
- (15) Dr. Burgess was returning to the Assembly after being disciplined by Parliament for submitting a private objection to the Covenant.
- (16) Rom. 5

September 18th. 1643. Monday Morning

"His whole obedience and satisfaction".

Dr. Featly: In the question ther is a supposition and a proposition.

Mr. Walker: This text proves the whole proposition. Righteousnesse implies that Christ did performe whatsoever was required to satisfaction. That is imputed to us which was imputed to Abraham. Now God [is] our reward - but in Christ.

Mr. Raynor: The 4 Rom<sup>(1)</sup> proves the righteousnesse is imputed. Other places must be to show whence it comes.

Dr. Hoyle: Obedience and righteousnesse are synonymous.

Dr. Burgess: It is not unknown to you that this 4th Chapter is challenged as a very strong argument to prove faith to be that righteousnesse to be imputed. I doubt not but [that] a great deal of care to look into this text. Desire the committy that brought it would open their deliberations to us.

Dr. Hoyle: Why is faith imputed but because it hath relation to the righteousnesse of Christ. We must not confound it with workes.

Mr. Palmer: The order of the proofes is something improper. Begin with that of obedience.

Dr. Smith: The first place proves a righteousnesse imparted. If you aske what it is, it is the active and passive obedience.

Dr. Hoyle: I owe the 5 Phil<sup>(2)</sup> with it takes away all the doubt.

Mr. Calamy: This chapter<sup>(3)</sup> proves ther is righteousnesse imputed.

"It was imputed" cannot be meant of faith in a proper sence.

Arg: (1) Then justified by an inherent righteousnesse. Election out.

(2) Then justified by that that needed justification - that



Mr. Calamy: (continued) was imperfect.

If those arguments prove this then the righteousness of Christ that was imputed.

Dr. Smith: This is not soe pertinent though exceeding well spoken because that part is now produced.

Mr. Goodwin: Desire to begin with 5 Rom. 18, 19.

Mr. Palmer: Desire that the ninth verse be added.

Mr. Goodwin: Desire the 17th to be added. Interpreters doe make a dwelling upon the same thing. I thinke it is a comparison made with Adam's sin and Christ's obedience. With a dissimilitude of a transcendency.

- 1) It abounds simply in the merit and efficacy of it; v 15. We say causae bonorum must needs be efficacious than causae malorum.
- 2) Adam conveyed but one sin, but we are freed from many offences. He doth not only save many men, but from many offences.

Dr. Smith: Not fitt for us to start that question againe. Keeps to the order. If places produced be sufficient, we need noe more. The addition of those places 15, 16, not soe proper. This 15 speakes rather of an abundance of grace, and these I take to be the acts of God the Father.

Mr. Gataker: Crave leave to except something against those places. I stand bound by conscience in that oath taken for the former place. The word dicaiousia - I show that word may be taken in other wayes. And the word obedience, that it comprehends Christ's whole obedience. In severall places:  
Phil<sup>(4)</sup>, Heb. 5:7 - They speake of His obedience to death and sufferings, and is plaine in Heb<sup>(5)</sup> and I see noe reason why this

Mr. Gataker: (continued) third place should be extended to any further. And that desired to be adjoined<sup>(6)</sup> makes much to the purpose if "justified by His blood" then "made just by His blood". Noe reason why one ground of justification in verse 9 and another ground in the verses following. The 3 Chapter<sup>(7)</sup> - all is ascribed to His blood. It is not enough to say obedience may be taken for his whole obedience, but they must see, it must be taken see.

Mr. Walker: A sufficient cogent argument in the chapter<sup>(8)</sup> by the obedience of one shall many be constituted righteous.

Dr. Featley: The word dikaioussay never taken for intercompensation in the scripture. Aristotle is noe good interpreter of Scripture.

Dr. Hoyle: Ther is noe restriction in the obedience to the death.

Mr. Bathurst: The generall rule of exposition, - wher the native proper sence of the word obedience. See for the word of righteousnesse, [the] proper sence is conformity of act to law, therefore unlesse it can be proved thatthis is inconsistent with the place which He must doe, we have obtained it.

Mr. Goodwin: That those places still referre to suffering. That Phil<sup>(9)</sup> is untill death. 5Heb: 8 will be much helpe to our sence. Here he names the obedience of his whole life, not his last sufferings, but that he suffered all his life long and his active obedience was in some sence a suffering, and active obedience simply, if not a suffering way, would never have remitted. See it's the obedience of His whole life as Jeremiah saith "to beare a yoke from his youth fittes a man for greater suffering" - see for Christ.

[Another] thing out of the text. It is an active kind

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) of obedience that God did aime at, which He should learne by suffering, suffering the medium to this end. It was chiefly the active part in His suffering death, but both active being intended and passive too. In these words observe the conclusion "and being made perfect He was made a perfect saviour." He was a son and being a son had the right of a son, yet He subjected Himselfe not only to suffering but dying.

Dr. Burgess: Two things objected from these verses, one clearly answered already, but one thing not yet answered - if blood be sufficient to justify, what needs any more. The text doth fully cleare this, though in 9v<sup>(10)</sup> it is attributed to His blood but not exclusively, "and not only soe", we have not only attonement by the blood, and therefore layes in the scale the active obedience of Christ, and soe the benefit of that.

Mr. Vines: Obedience answering to a Covenant is a doing. This cannot be meant of the imputed righteousnesse of Christ only, because he speakes of a visible glory in the church after the ruin of Antichrist, when Christ shall reign. Christ learned to dy by the things He suffered.

Mr. Palmer: "By His blood" must be taken as a synechdoche. If said "unto death" - that will not doe, for it must be the death of the crosse. So the simple mention of one, in one place, must be noe argument that the other allsoe is not imputed.

Mr. Goodwin: That in Hebrews<sup>(11)</sup> an instance offering up an active obedience, "prayers and cryes and supplications". He learned this part of obedience to pray the more earnestly by His sufferings. Ther was a more intense acting of obedience by all those crosse

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) passages of providence that befell Him.

Mr. Gataker: For the synecdoche it is true, there may be some, but as the Papists in the words of institution there is a trothe, yet this trothe or that trothe is not the whole or complete truth some this.

Mr. Wilson: 40 Psalm<sup>(12)</sup> when Christ speaks of His willingnesse to dye - "my ear hath thou heard". But in Heb<sup>(13)</sup> its "a body hast thou prepared". Obedience began in hearing but the Apostle saith a body, - and a body for suffering. All obedience begins in the care we receive it by.

That in Heb<sup>(14)</sup> it is not said he learned obedience in His death - it was long before. It is cleare that even when "strong cryes and tears"<sup>(15)</sup> it hath reference to that "thy will be done"<sup>(16)</sup> and that as active as well as passive. In Phil<sup>(17)</sup> "till death" it must needs be before death - obedience preceeds it. If passive, it was active, for He was as servant, a servant not only suffers but in doing. "My father loves me because I lay downe my life"<sup>(18)</sup> therefore loves me because I keepe the commandments." For 15 Rom<sup>(19)</sup> Adam's whole disobedience was imputed to us.

Mr. Gataker: The ransome is Christ's blood, noe place can be produced where the obedience of Christ called by the name of a price or a ransome. The Apostle having dispatched the argument of justification than was spoken of before. The former ground being sufficient to averre God's righteousnesse.

Mr. Walker: These things some often objected and I have answered them, I am able to satisfy any reasonable man.

Dr. Hoyle: Suppose that in Rom<sup>(20)</sup> be for passive that, we bring in all to prove active and passive, if the active be in the 5 it is sufficient.

Mr. Bathurst: The epistoll was originally one whole context though since distinguished in chapters.

Mr. Vines: If this phrase were looked into we might find something, "faith imputed unto us as righteousness". He was accounted righteous by believing. Consider the phrase in other places. Rom. 2:<sup>26</sup> "Be counted as circumcision", "imputed to circumcision", "accounted as circumcised". Rom. 9:<sup>8</sup> "Imputed to the seed", "accounted for the seed." 2 Cor. 12:<sup>6</sup> What is this but a phrase of speech. "He was accounted righteous by believing."<sup>(21)</sup> But still the question will ly what righteousness that is. I holde to the imputing of Christ's righteousness to me for justification and not faith. That which God hath received for the atonement is that that must be imputed.

Mr. Hearle: Adde 53 Esi<sup>(22)</sup> for satisfaction.

Mr. Gataker: 2 Cor. 5:<sup>25</sup> This place seems to be directly against it. A sacrifice for sin, has to say sinner in the proper sense, that by making of him a sin sacrifice we might be justified.

Mr. Case: This place doth hold out easily more than a sin sacrifice. "Sin for us, who knew noe sin"<sup>(23)</sup> Sin in the same sense that He is said not to know it. He did not know it by the committing of it but He was accounted a sinner in our stead. He was soe made sin as we're made righteousness.

Mr. Walker: It is true He was made a sacrifice for sin.

Mr. Seaman: Beza gives indeed such an interpretation but after

Mr. Seaman: (continued) rejects it. <sup>(24)</sup> Christ is soe made sin  
for us as we are made righteousse.

Mr. Wilkinson: Austin interprets the scripture in this manner <sup>(25)</sup>  
He was made sin and we righteousse.

Dr. Hoyle: Sin - a sin offering, soe in many fathers, but grant it  
then here comes in imputation, for how could he be a sin offering  
except God had [laid it upon Him].

Ordered that Mr. Palmer have Liberty to speake concerning  
that addition formerly tendered to the 11th. Article.

Mr. Seaman: Something need to be inserted or in an Article distinct  
concerning the nature of justifying faith.

Acts 26: <sup>18</sup> excepted against as refering rather to  
sanctification.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 57

- (1) Rom. 4:<sup>5</sup>
- (2) Phil. 3:<sup>9</sup>
- (3) Rom. 5
- (4) Phil. 2:<sup>8</sup>
- (5) Heb. 5:<sup>8</sup>
- (6) Rom. 5
- (7) Rom. 3:<sup>25</sup>
- (8) Rom. 5:<sup>19</sup>
- (9) Phil. 2:<sup>8</sup>
- (10) Rom. 5:<sup>9</sup>
- (11) Heb. 5:<sup>8</sup>
- (12) Ps. 40:<sup>6</sup>
- (13) Heb. 10:<sup>8</sup>
- (14) Heb. 5:<sup>8</sup>
- (15) Jer. 13:<sup>17</sup>
- (16) Matt. 6:<sup>10</sup>
- (17) Phil. 2:<sup>8</sup>
- (18) John 10:<sup>17</sup>
- (19) Rom. 5:<sup>15</sup>
- (20) Rom. 5:<sup>15</sup>
- (21) Rom. 4:<sup>3</sup>
- (22) Isa. 53:<sup>11</sup>
- (23) 2 Cor. 5:<sup>21</sup>
- (24) Beza. T. Annotationes - Ad Corinthos II p 204.
- (25) St. Augustine, De Spiritu et Littera liber Unus XVIII 31  
P.L 44 p 219

September 19th. 1643

Tuesday Morning

Ordered that the 2 Assessors in the absence of the  
Prolocutor doe supply the place by turnes.

Mr. Hearle: To consider what the word "wholesome" doth impart.

Mr. Gataker: The truth is, not to speake properly that doctrine that  
brings health to another but that doctrine that is found in itselife  
true.

Mr. Wilson: These epithetes are but to the Word of God to show not  
only the nature but the effect of the word.

Mr. Palmer: It may be taken here effective. It ware a poore  
commendation to say only they are true. I desire that it may be  
taken into consideration that not only in this Article but in all  
the rest ther is noe mention made of the things that the apostells  
makes one of the main things in their preaching. We that preach  
remission of sins, unlesse a fitter place may be found, may lay  
downe clearly that repentance is necessary to remission of sins.

Mr. Case: We are now dealing with the nature of justification. A  
motion yesterday for a new Article and then we may take this in.

Dr. Temple: Repentance necessary to be taken into some of the  
Articles.

Mr. Herricke: Doctrine of repentance is handled in other Articles;  
repentance being a work of sanctification, improper to be put  
into the Article on justification.

Dr. Gouge: Provided the resolve made doe stand, if anything offered,  
thought fit, can be added.



Mr. Gataker: The opening of the nature of justifying faith, the fittest place will be in the next Article. It is true repentance of itselfe simply hath simply no influence unto justification. I doe not find ther anywhere joyned together.

Mr. Coleman: Desires a committy to draw up a new Article may expresse this of repentance and the time of our justification.

Mr. Case: Desire the same.

Dr. Gouge: This is out of our power; the order is for nine Articles and for us to bring in ten <sup>is</sup> not allowed.

Mr. Wilkenson: Let two or three goe aside and prepare it.

Dr. Smith: Something may be added at the end of the conclusion of the Article full of comfort to the penitent. But I feare some may say here wants yet another thing the testimony of the Spirit that may as fitly be brought in.

Mr. Vines: It is not the purpose of any to bring in all the designations, but to adde this as a boundary that noe ungodly person may lay hands upon it.

Mr. Tuckney: In a person justified, ther is repentance but that not allwayes necessary to have the witnessse of the Spirit.

A committy to adde something concerning the nature of faith and repentance and to see if anything in the Homilyes. Mr. Palmer, Mr. Gamer, Mr. Vines.

Mr. Goodwin: The danger is lest you put a suspension of remission of sins till the act of repentance. In the matter of faith and justification you ought to expresse the greatest varynesse that can be. Those that ware our inovations of doctrine that did goe about to spy wherin they might come hearer to popery, they excluded

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) the work as merit. But faith and repentance are the condition that you could suppose it that he that believes if he doe not repent, it should do him noe good at all.

Mr. Gataker: I cannot conceive how in a regenerate soule ther should be a want of repentance. Wher ther is an act of faith he cannot but have an apprehension of his sins and see a remorse for sin.

Mr. Goodwin: For exception against these words, if a man's justification is suspended till he hath repented. As well as faith I could say that the Article /

7.

Dr. Hoyle: Desire to know what repentance goes before faith.

Mr. Palmer: Two expressions: 34 Exodus 6-7; Nahum 1:<sup>3</sup>

There must be something wherby he must not continew in that course of wickednesse - Scolomon, 18 Ezek.

That man that goes on in the course of sins whilst they are see, goe on, may have noe advantage to say they are saved by Christ.

Dr. Hoyle: Ther are indeed legall terrors but can that be a true grace.

Mr. Vines: The suspending of justification till I repent - I am not of that opinion but in immediate justification upon believing.

Mr. Palmer: Two motions made: (1) This addition be received.  
(2) A new Article be framed for this besides.

It is not any weyes necessary, we may adde what we will.

Mr. Palmer: (continued) For that of suspended God's act. All that sticks with me but that one thing. If we can find another word that may but signify that a man that lives as Herod, in incest cannot believe or be justified till he repent. For the phrase of evangelicall repentance. In one sence all repentance is evangelicall. If we consider the law a covenant of workes then noe repentance. Yet this, if I offend the law it is supposed I should be sorry for things done amisse and for that other part, the nature of the law doth still require amendment. But if by legall repentance we understand that which ariseth only from considerations of our danger or anything below the grace of Christ. But a man must see his sinfull course wherin he lived is a damnable course, be sorry for it and for breaking the law.

Mr. Herricke: That repentance must go before remission of sins is not only heretical but dangerous.

Report of the 12 and 13 Articles.

12 Article read.

13 Article - an alteration in 2 words pleasing more proper, answering to the Latin gratia.

Dr. Stanton: I desire to interpose one word.

Mr. Valentine: I assent to the addition.

Mr. Vines: Let us not because we can intreate a question with other questions upon the by, be weary of the poynt we have in hand, [ I looke at a world of prophane, wicked and ignorant persons that have a pretense of a rude faith doe think that they may be justified. This is not only against the Antinomians [ ]

Mr. Hearle: The Antinomians will except against this [

] these words have passed a long time in the homily [

]. In confession of faith we cannot be too faithful  
or too short.

Dr. Burgess: A short view of this long and learned debate - the  
words propounded have begotten a double difficulty. [

]. The course of God Himselfe in Scripture  
when He propounds anything of extraordinary comfort, He doth add  
some caution. 50 Psa. [And] because men openly prophane, may  
possibly abuse this doctrine to their destruction.

[ Large gap in text ]

Mr. Case: Committed to conceive an Article, it may be in this new  
Article that all this work may be done.

Mr. Goodwin: The words are not the words of the homily.

A Committee to draw up a form.

R. Twelfth Article.

September 20th. 1643. Wednesday Morning.

Report of the 16th. Article read.

Mr. Gataker: A motion because the two first committyes have made report of their Articles and have noe more worke. That the two last Articles may be referred and committed the one unto one, and the other unto the other.

Ordered that 18th. Article be committed to the first committy to prove it by scripture and to make report unto the Assembly and they are to meete in the afternoon at 2 a,clocke. 19th. Article be committed to the second committy to prove it by the scriptures and to make report unto the Assembly and they are to meete at 2 a,clocke in the Deanes lodgings.

It was decided that something might be prepared to expresse the nature of faith and repentance which may be represented to the Assembly and then they may consider whether fit to annexe it to any Article, or a new one. And they are to meete tomorrow in the afternoone, 2 of the clocke.

Debate upon the 12th. Article.

Mr. Hericke: Faith cannot be a fountaine of good workes, because it is a good worke itselife.

Mr. Wilkinson: Faith is one bond of our union with Christ. That which doth join me to Christ seems to me to be a principle of good workes in me.

A worke is so farre good as agreeable to the word of God. The first acte of conformity is by faith besides the bloud of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Wilkinson (continued) Faith being the first bond of union there is an influence of all grace from Christ. Faith doth not only apprehend but apply Christ crucified and rests in him.

Mr. Seaman: Good workes sometimes taken for internall acts of obedience sometimes for external faith. But when faith and workes are distinguished we understand it of external workes. And its cleare that by that place in the Gal<sup>(1)</sup> workes are taken in that sense. Good workes are commonly taken as the fruits of faith.

Mr. Vines: Because faith workes with our workes - actes and wordes, whereby they doe act in an evangellicall gospell and gracious manner. Faith doth actuate or act those very graces that are in us.

Mr. Walker: It is true that all habits and good acts come from the Spirit of God.

Mr. Bathurst: That those words do reflect with some derogation from the Spirit of God.

Mr. Herricke: It is a generall opinion that faith is the roote of all grace that is unsound.

Mr. Herle: There is a worke of God - a worke God calls you to doe.

Mr. Gataker: It is not soe fitt to say they accompany faith, in the former Article it was true. Faith the roote is not in this Article; noe such thing in this Article.

As faith is a holy habit soe it is a spring. Heb<sup>(2)</sup> throughout doth show it. By Faith they are the effects or fruits of faith.

Dr. Featley: Mediate or immediate.

[

Large gap in text.

]

Dr. Burgess: Faith is a distinct thing from regeneration and sanctification, properly soe called. Faith and repentance, two evangellicall graces which doe qualify and prepare the soul. Faith draws virtue from Christ. Though faith is the first which makes us maove to God, yet faith is that which makes love to act. Faith workes by love, and God workes by faith.

Mr. Gataker: Faith is a branch of sanctification, it is an observation. The graces in man before the fall consisted partly in a conformity to God and dependance upon God, and faith is this.

Mr. Herle: All lesse principle efficient causes are instrumentall. "By faith" doth imply the instrument rather than the efficient.

Mr. Hall: Faith may proceed instrumentally. 2 Pet<sup>(3)</sup> Tim<sup>(4)</sup>. The end of the commandment "Love and faith unfeigned."

The report of the Antinomian committy read.

Dr. Temple: Consider whether not fitt for the Assembly to doe something more on this businesse to adde some considerations to the House of Commons. The danger likely to accrue to the land. God's people humbling themselves may be termed the repairers of the breach. Those apostates open a gap to all manner of licentiousnesse and strike at the very power of godlynesse.

How easy it is for men to deliver themselves. If a child of God I am bound to keepe noe Lawe. I need not aske pardon for sin, God sees noe sin in me - I need not fast, pray, etc. Those doctrines do strike at the very obedience to the civill magistrate. The scandal they bring on the doctrines of free grace. To preach noveltyts that carry such a face of liberty. The endangering of themselves in God's displeasure. If we have these

Dr. Temple: (continued) If we have these things committed to us, do not do something to vindicate God's honour - it objected this is not a reason. Whether we should neglect anything that is our duty.

Ordered: The former committee shall consider of those reasons delivered by Dr. Temple or by any other, and drawe them up into a form to be presented to the Assembly.



(1) Gal. 2:<sup>16</sup>

(2) Heb. 11

(3) 2 Pet. 1:<sup>3</sup>

(4) 1 Tim. 1:<sup>5</sup>

SESSION 60

September 21st. 1643. Thursday Morning.

Mr. Maynard by order of the Lords and Commons  
was admitted as a member of the Assembly in  
the room of Mr. Nye of Sussex and took the  
protestation.

SESSION 61

September 21st. 1643. Thursday Afternoon.

The text of this Manuscript is missing.

September 22Fryday Morning

Report of the Reasons against Antinomians brought in and read.

Mr. Selden: You have received an order and according to that you have  
 [ I think the very particulars are there and  
 here determined. The Commons doe comprehend the necessaria  
 imposed. The common books have that. [ ]  
 upon those considerations you represent the opinions to be very  
 erroneous and dangerous. But give me leave to tell you what was  
 the end of the House. Not only to make some lawe and declaration  
 against the opinions, to proceed against the persons.

For soe much as concerns the Articles you give them  
 faire way by the lawes of the kingdome, how to proceed as by the  
 act that doth establish if any person preach anything, deprive of  
 ecclesiastical promotion. You do not give them enough how to  
 proceed, what if they be against scripture? - that are not much  
 consequence to lawe. Two ways of proceeding in this kingdome upon  
 any ground of lawe:

Upon the act of breach

that against heresy. Unlesse you doe let the House of Commons  
 that ther be of those things that are direct heresyes then they  
 can know how to proceed against them that have already disturbed  
 you.

Dr. Burgess: We are bounded by the order how farre to proceed, and  
 that commands 2 things, to compare and to return their judgments  
 upon them. I fearre that it will not be safe for us to term  
 anything a heresy in the language of an Assembly.

Mr. Selden: I commend the leudcrusses<sup>(1)</sup> in looking to your order, but I think you shall not outgoe your error. Admitt something they held out which you could not but have extracted that way. To doe that is idolatry.

Mr. Herle: Before we can give our judgements of those for heresy we had [ doctrina humano suesa capta pertinaciter contra fundamentum fidei<sup>(2)</sup>, we doe not say that the Galatians were heretics, ther must be a conviction. Besides they may properly be called scisme cut of from the body, from the head, about the foundation, as the ubiqutaries.<sup>(3)</sup> Against the foundation they must flatly oppose or deny some way or other the efficincy of Christ's death. Therefore our divines doe say that the Church of Rome that deny the foundation. For these opinions they deny the law, sin in a child of God - humiliation and fasting.

Dr. Temple: As we cannot doe too much in a right way putting us in such a way as may put the House, I see not that it may be agreeable with this order. That that strikes directly at the new Covenant must be a heresy.

Mr. Gataker: This will take up more time than the necessity of the straights. Consider what is made heresy by the word, what by human laws. I find noe place in the new testament wher the word doth signify anything but sect or faction. Acts 24:<sup>5</sup> it is translated sect of the [Nazareneg] and afterwards translated heresy. The way which they call - "I heare ther are scismes" - ther must be heresy, now it would be easy to prove them factious. But what is heresy by the lawe of the land? When legal way called in question, then great dispute. Some did affirme that ther was

Mr. Gataker: (continued) noe lawe to determine heresy or burne a heretique. Form that definition given, if we goe to take deffinitions we shall find a great discrepency in them. For that of denying the Covenant of the gospell this doth not come within the compasse of these Articles.

Dr. Hoyle: The 6th. generall<sup>(4)</sup> counsell doth condemne the Antinomians, Simonians,<sup>(5)</sup> Nicolatians.<sup>(6)</sup>

Mr. Calamy: A man may hold an error and yet not be an heritique.

Mr. Goodwin: I was one of this committy and when as the condemning of them was finished that question was propounded. To speake in such a case needs apology because grosse [ I say that I hate them as much as any, that liberty to vent those things I am against it. Consider whether not beyond commision to goe on in order to have them punished.

If Parliament proceed to any criminall sentence because they have asseyed to allay the grossnesse of the opinions. In order not only to their conviction but to justify the proceedings. Persons should first be dealt with soe as to be convinced, allwayes taken to this end.

Magistrates are to deale with persons in matters ecclesiasticall, as a church in spirituall. If you had powers of excommunication you would first convince then admonish them. Thus I thinke that you ought to deale with them. The Parliament intent is not that we should give judgement in order to punish them.

Mr. Palmer: I conceive that we are yet in our right way about to doe. Remember where our businesse springs, the Articles represented to us.

Mr. Palmer: (continued) Upon the 7th Article we could not but take notice of those opinions. It was offered to them to proceed in another way.

Mr. Walker: To prove them heretiques or blasphemers is as easy as to stande up or to sit downe.

Mr. Seaman: To acquaint what was said in the country for his satisfaction. We were to proceed according to the tenour of the order.

For those propositions we were to take them as we find them. [ for that is urged. That the magistrate is so to deale with offenders as the church and soe it will follow what Parliament must doe.

I looke upon this as a very strange thing.

The Parliament must suspend their judicial proceedings for second admonition.

Mr. Goodwin: That the magistrate should deale by way of admonition is farre from my owne intention. But if they aske the advice of the church [ ]

Mr. Arrowsmith: Those pretentions make error more erroneous. I cannot judge the exhibiting of those considerations either necessary or convenient [ ], by writing or by conference [ ] if we handle them roughly. [ ]

[ ] it may be free from crime proceeding this way but shall we be free from blame. Their opinions are leaven, they score man's mind a littel with prejudice. But let us doe as the Jewes, three degrees, inquisitio, extermination, execration.

Mr. Arrowsmith: (continued) [ these  
are but a fifth of what is to be found in their bookes. ]

] My motion is  
that these considerations may either be layed aside or not exhibited  
yet till the bookes be examined, the persons dealt with in a faire  
ministeriall way.

Dr. Burgess: This great mistake that we are not to punish persons,  
I know nothing of any man present of this order.

Mr. Herricke: These considerations I desire more words added to them.  
Distinguish of error and facts in things infamous. But in things  
betweene man and man ]

].

Mr. Seaman: Direction of our Saviour, spirit of meeknesse. The  
church is not type to proceed in all cases as an offended brother.  
Difference betweene private and scandalous offence.

Mr. Goodwin: [ that of Paul to Titus<sup>(7)</sup> admonish  
once or twice, it was a church proceeding.

Resolved: To tender to the House of Commons those considerat-  
ions of the Assembly on those Antinomian errors, apoynted to draw up  
this answer and the considerations sent unto them by order of the  
House of Commons.

Ordered: That the committy doe present the answer of the  
Assembly with the considerations in writing to the honourable House of  
Commons tomorrow morning and that the delivery of them that House be  
acquainted with all convenient speed that this Assembly will examine  
the Antinomian bookes according to their order.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 62

- (1) Probably "ludicrousness".
- (2) This definition is Thomist in origin; see St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, 2(ii) Question XI "of heresy" p 150
- (3) Lutheran doctrine that asserts that Christ is present in His human nature at all times, and everywhere (N.I.D.C.C.)
- (4) Council of Chalcedon 451 A.D.
- (5) Those who allow the deliberate conferment or acquisition of anything spiritual or sacred for remuneration, monetary or otherwise. (N.I.D.C.C. p 906, De Jong)
- (6) These were followers of one Nicolaus; they formed a sect in the early church which was condemned in Rev. 2: 6,15. They appear to have been an heretical group who retained the pagan practices of idolatry and immorality, which were contrary to Christian thought and conduct. (N.I.D.C.C. p 710, Mills)
- (7) Titus 2: <sup>2</sup>-10



September 25th. 1643. Munday Morning.

Order read.

Ordered that:    Mr. White begin with prayer.

                  Mr. Nye speake some words of exhortation.

                  Dr. Gouge conclude after all with a prayer.

                  Accordingly the Assembly meet in St. Margaret's with the  
House of Commons.    Mr. White began with prayer.

September 28th. 1643. Thursday Morning.

Assembly went to congratulate his exelencyes safe returne.

Mr. White: Moved a motion of congratulation.

Dr. Gouge: A motion to bind ourselves to promise or order the reason of absense.

Mr. Gataker: Desire in regard of his my weaknesse some other may be taken in my roome. Not that I am willing but doubtful of my owne inability.

Mr. Soleway: Let those who come late be accounted as not at all and soe taken by the Scribes.

Mr. Seaman: Necessary that the Assembly be supplied that the worke may be carried on more easily. For the writer, if the houses will give leave, come at 9 or 10 a, clocke and sit until 2 in the afternoon. Mundayes, Wensdays and Frydayes in Assembly and Tuesdayes and Thursdayes for committyes.

Dr. Burges: One of our great businesses, how to set forward businesse. Many are engaged in preaching, yet hope noe man will take upon him any engagement that shall disable him from attendance of this service.

Dr. Temple: Move the Parliament      

Dr. Gouge: That in his absense he may be excused and that he comes as much as he can.

Ordered: for Mr. Gataker and Mr. Wilkinson, that in their absence they be excused.

Mr. Palmer: Renew the motion for a promise not to be absent without cause and to be ready to give an account of it. If any man be

Mr. Palmer: (continued) absent from the Assembly or committy he shall give an account both of his absence and late coming when he shall be called unto it.

Mr. Herle: Every day that we meete let the scribes call each of them by name and at the weekes end, or fortnights end, transmitt those to the houses of Parliament.

Directed by the Assembly.

Mr. Seaman: The Assembly sits too seldome.

Committyes may be lesse. Four mae doe it as well as twenty-four.

Mr. Goodwin: Good to consider to inable ourselves to be diligent.

Apoynt a moderate houre to suite all men's occasions.

Motion to have Assembly to sit but certaine dayes.

As in all counsels they have but their sessions, it will dispatch the businesse more surely. Our debates would be lesse if we studdyed more. Be as strict as you will for meetings and apoynt a fewer number for committyes.

Resolved/Ordered, to meete in the Assembly at 10 a'clocke, the uttermost houre. Those that appeare not at that houre shall give an account of their absence or late coming.

A motion made about the committy.

Ordered: That noe minister shall be approved of by certificate to the "Committy for Plundered Ministers", but his name shall be first propounded, in the Assembly, the day before he to be examined and then any five of the Assembly, wherof Mr. Sey to be one, may examine him. Who are to make report of his sufficiency to the Assembly before the certificate be made to the House of Commons. The

time of the examining to be 9 of the clocke in the morning.

6 nominated to be a committy to set downe some orders for the more orderly proceedings in the Assembly and to consider order for those that come late and going away.

A committy of 6, Dr. Temple, Dr. Hoyle, 2 Assessors, Dr. Gouge, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Gataker, Mr. Herle, or any five of them, in the Deanes lodgings 2 a'clocke.

An order read for a declaration that that committy apoynted receive papers to treat with the Scotch Commissioners shall be a committy to draw up the declaration required by this order, and Mr. Palmer be added to the same committy. They are to meete in the Deanes lodgings in the afternoon at 2 of the clocke.

Mr. Sey informed - Mr. Francis Warham commended to the benefice of Hendon in the county of Middlesex. He is to be examined tomorrow.

Dr. Temple made report of the answer of the Assembly.

Mr. Carter of London subscribed the Covenant having taken it the day before with the Lord Maior.

September 29th. 1643.

Some members of the Assembly have had occasion to be absent at the taking of the Covenant, desired to take it, and they were admitted to it.

Mr. Sedgwicke read it in the name of the rest, and after the reading of it, they held up their hands and subscribed the Covenant. Dr. Smith, Mr. Sedgwicke, Mr. Bridge.

Mr. Jackson having before subscribed the Covenant, but not being present at the reading of the Covenant, he was desired, and accordingly did testify his assent by holding up his hand.

Ordered that Mr. Herle and Mr. Young be added to the former comitty for the drawing of the petition to Parliament against the Antinomians.

Mr. Sey - Mr. Gilbert Coxw for Epping in Essex.

Mr. Walker for Berstead in the County of Kent.

Adjourned to Hierusalem Chamber; Sunday morning ten o'clocke.

October 2nd.      Munday Morning

Mr. Bridge: (1) The reason is given by Job himself in the 3 v.

"Because of man's injustice". (2)

Mr. Walker: Job cleare that he did not justify himself, by his owne  
righteousnesse, he shoves that it is not his owne righteousnesse.

Dr. Hoyle: In 23rd. of Job 6, "will he contend with me with the  
strength of his force." Job [ ] ]

Mr. Seaman: Something seems considerable out of the 22, 23 vs. To  
understand the scope of the chapter he gives the sum of his  
arguments, why afraid to enter into judgement with God. Because  
God afflicts [ ] ]  
this is the course of God's providence towards His owne children  
and therefore I am afraid to stand in His presence. And "if I  
were a righteous man yet" etc.

Arg: If God destroys, in Job's phrase "the perphect and laugh  
at the tryall of the innocent" then it is not the worth the while  
an innocent man entering into the contest with him. Such is His  
wisdome and power and sovereignty as that God makes nothing of  
afflicting [ ] ] and this is  
that God saith he spoke right of God, but his friends had not,  
this is not refered to the last judgement.

Mr. Coleman: He does not mean his owne righteousnesse as appears in  
the 12 and 13.

Mr. Calamy: Whether this be the meaning the acceptation of Christ  
makes our workes perfect or that God for His meritts doth accept  
of them receiving imperfect.

Mr. Herle: /

]

Mr. Calamy: Whether the meritts of Christ doe make good workes perfect. Dr. Taylor<sup>(3)</sup> ther is a booke come out againste him, a quarter of that booke spent againste him. In this a derogation to God's justice to thinke that any worke imperfect may be accepted.

Mr. Wilkenson: Desire an addition of two scriptures in the Old Testament. Genesis 8:<sup>20,21</sup> Hebrews 11:<sup>5</sup>.

They ware waved.

Mr. Calamy: Moved for the addition. Good workes in themselves cannot indure the severity of God. But when tendered by Christ they remaine soe imperfect they cannot indure the scrutiny of God.

Mr. Case: Desire the motion to go on because the question /  
] they did affirm that our good workes though imperfect /are accepted by God/. If soe then ther is a two-fold justification. Ther cannot be a greater derogation to the righteousnesse of Christ than to piece it up.

Mr. Walker: Is it any derogation to say that Christ makes our persons and derogations right?

Dr. Hoyle: Ther is /a question as to/ whether the perfection of Christ's righteousnesse be imputed to /imperfect works to make them acceptable/ or our workes perfect.

Mr. Herle: This that our workes are justified by Christ may be spared. The Antinomians doe say God doth know our sins to be sins but He sees them not. Now to say that our workes are not only knowne sins but just actions overthrowes that. Before not endure the severity of God's judgement for if our workes be justified they may.

Mr. Gataker: How anything that flows from God's spirit out see fare  
forth should be pleasing and acceptable to Him.

Mr. Herricke: The Spirit of God in the producing of the acts of  
those habbits workes with us and see ther is a mixture.

Mr. Walker: Our workes performed by faith are pleasing to God.

Mr. Woodcote: What meant by our workes compleat in Christ?  
Whether by forgiving the imperfections of them or by adding a  
perfection to them.

Mr. Bridge: [ because they are imperfect,  
yet [ ]

Mr. Gataker:

Mr. Walker:

Mr. Herricke: I cannot yet conceive that this anything but popery.

Dr. Gouge: I conceive the Antinomians may be satisfied if the workes  
cannot endure the severity of God's judgement, then they are  
imperfect.

Mr. Herle: The former branch doth not sufficiently oppose their tenet,  
they doe acknowledge that the good workes in themselves cannot  
[ ] if our workes be justified then  
we may plead our workes.

Mr. Seaman: If our workes be justified and two-fould justification  
in one, what need the other.

Mr. Goodwin: "Speake" to what may be put in opposition to  
Antinomianisme. "One perfect" will not reach it.  
Though God sees them to be imperfect.

Mr. Bridge: Consider whether that not necessary to be considered  
better.



Mr. Herle: Faith is the instrument. To say that faith flows from an instrument is [ ]

Mr. Goodwin: Though faith be an instrument in respect of justification, why not a root in respect of sanctification.

15 John<sup>(4)</sup>. Our "abiding in Christ" properly implies faith, that is the grace [ ]

] and the consequence is, "he brings forth much fruit."

Mr. Herle: Said we abide in Christ by faith and that makes it clearer. Workes cannot be said to spring from that wherby we abide in Christ. Our abiding by faith doth imply that Christ is the roote, it will therefore imply that faith is the roote of good workes.

Mr. Arrowsmith: Faith may be called the root as the apostle the foundation of the church - secondary. Without that we can doe nothing, without faith we have nothing to doe with Christ.

Mr. Carter: If we grante Christ to be the roote, we may say also faith is the rocke.

Dr. Hoyle: The apostle speakes of "rooting in faith and rooting in love"<sup>(5)</sup> see what objection made against one will hould against the other. Metaphors are not to be stretched.

Dr. Burges: This is a good sound and cleare expression. All the workes accepted of God through Jesus Christ, they doe flow from faith.

Mr. Calamy: The committy doth prove that. But that they spring necessarily. That every faith hath good workes.

Mr. Gataker: This is only the meaning that faith is a working grace.

1 John 2:<sup>4</sup>, 119 Psalm 10.

Mr. Herle: This proves not that necessary stirring [

] .

Mr. Price: The 2 Corinthians <sup>(6)</sup> comes up to the necessity.

Mr. Herricke: Whether Balam and Judas <sup>(7)</sup> may not say the same thing.

Mr. Goodwin: That it is meant of true faith is undeniable but the scope of neither is not soe much to shoue how His speaking did flow from faith by way of causality, but he having uttered very confident speeches he gives an account why he did speake them.

Soe in Cor. the apostle gives this reason why he had with soe much confidence uttered these speeches in the former verses.

Mr. Woodcocke: By knowledge, here is meant an acquaintance with God before have fellowship with Him [

] good workes by way of interpretation [

] by way of motive.

Mr. Seaman: God takes them to be an evidence, men takes them to be an evidence.

Mr. Goodwin: God knowes both roote and fruite too, which man does not.

Mr. Walker: Abraham in offering up his son Isake did give such an evidence as that. Though none take notice of it, it is an evidence.

Mr. Price: It something to be of the right faith, another to be a believer.

Mr. Arrowsmith: "By workes made perfect" <sup>(8)</sup> - knowne to be perfect bye workes.

Mr. Bridges:

Mr. Gibson: It is easier to knowe who hath not faith than who hath faith.

Mr. Woodcocke: I question the truth of the proposition itself.

Dr. Burges: He that questions that [may] next question that of our saviour, "by their fruites you shall knowe them". (9)

Mr. Woodcocke: Christ speakes only of prophets -- "you shall know them by their fruites".

Dr. Burges: The scope in that place is true. But that it will have force in other things. If a prophet -- by his doctrine; if a good man by his good workes. That is a general maxim though ther brought only for doctrine.

Mr. Palmer: 12 Matth. 33,34. Ther the same cannot be meant of doctrine.

Mr. Seaman: Desire they should speake to the proposition whether it be true or not.

Mr. Goodwin: This intended against those that hold that you cannot have assurance by signs but put it in as evidencing it to a man's selfe and then those places will never hold out.

Mr. Philips: Whether we may knowe our faith by workes. In an ordinary way this being supposed that I knowe the worke I doe is a good worke [and] proceeds from faith. To good ends then it is an evidence. But then I am privy to my faith but many times we doe not see our faith or sincerity in doing of a good worke. In some cases when a man hath no knowledge of his justification what doth his good workes prove?

Turmonicus hath two great disputes taking upon him to confute Beza out of Calvin (10). Noe fruite can difference not allwayes between a temporary faith but only the Spirit of adoption.

Dr. Burgess: The words of the Article do not necessarily acquire us to say what kind of confidence.

Mr. Herle: Consider what this word evidence doth impart - certainty and appearance. It will not easily prove the certainty, say apparently instead of evidently.

Mr. Seaman: There is a case wherein a man may fall into when he cannot evidence his faith by his workes. This is granted on all sides.

Therefore this only intends ordinary [ ]

Mr. Bridge: Leave out "as evidently known".

Dr. Smith: The Article pursues a metaphor and see the scope is only of the evidence of one to another not that we can as certainly but in an ordinary sence.

Mr. Seaman: The first as is put in upon a supposition supporting them to be such as are before expressed.

Mr. Sey: Mr. Sprat to the Greenwich.

Mr. James for Edmonton in Middlesex.

Mr. Blackwell in Suffolk.

Ordered Mr. Ashe and Mr. Marshall take and subscribe the Covenant.

FOOTNOTES -- SESSION 66

- (1) The first page of the Ms. is blank so the debate begins at page two.
- (2) Job 9: <sup>14-15</sup>
- (3) Dr. Thomas Taylor, (1576-1633) (D.N.B. 55, p 465)
- (4) John 15: <sup>4-8</sup>
- (5) Eph. 3: <sup>17</sup>
- (6) 2 Cor. 3: <sup>5</sup>
- (7) Jas. 2: <sup>22</sup>
- (8) Matt. 7: <sup>16</sup>
- (9) Matt. 7: <sup>16</sup>
- (10) Tileman Hesshusen (1527-1588) Lutheran Theologian and Bishop of Samland. He attacked Beza and Calvin maintaining that Christ was omnipotent in His humanity, on the basis of His two natures. Beza answered the two books: Vere et sacrae Confessionis de praesentia corporis Christi pia defensio (1583), and Bekentnis von der personlichen vereinigung beider naturen (1586). (N.S.H.E.R.K. 5, pp 255 f)

October 3rd. 1643      Tuesday Morning

Mr. Ley informed that he had received an order for Mr. Harison for Kinsworth of Hertford.

Mr. Cox examined.

Mr. Lightfoote: Motion concerning women entering the Covenant, desire ther may be uniformity in it.

Dr. Gouge: This is beyond our power the Parliament must apoynt. An ill consequence upon this Covenant. Many signify unto us that we must stand against all things that are brought in by the bishops.

Dr. Smith: That doctor I doubt gave them full satisfaction that made that scruple and we may all doe it. Nothing taken away but only government.

Dr. Burges: A good motion, the ministers in the order of the House of Commons are apoynted to expound the Covenant.

You may give some order.

Mr. Seaman: Ther is a clause in the first branch of the Covenant. This tyes us to making more haste than we are forward to. Not one day to pass but some time in the Assembly.

Dr. Smith: For that in last clause in the Covenant if we were all of one mind in our severall cures we might for the time keepe one waye.

Mr. Palmer: The words in the order from the House of Commons the reasons and grounds. I know not how to expresse the reasons and grounds except I may express the particulars [ - substantial part of text missing - ] .

Dr. Hoyle: We see not how ther can be a confirmation without an  
explanation. ∟ ]

Mr. Hericke: Whilst we sweare against episcopacy, it being  
established by law ∟

]

Resolved to ajurne the Assembly tomorrow morning 9 a clocke.

October 4th. 1643 Wednesday Morning.

Mr. Channell and Mr. Sterry tooke the Covenant and subscribed their hands.

Dr. Burges being desired made report of the rules for the regulating of the Assembly and it was read.

Dr. Stanton made report of the 19th. Article. Mr. Coleman made report of the 12th. Article recommitted.

Mr. Bridge: "remain" was left out because it was a transient act

[

- 1) That workes are imperfect in themselves.
- 2) When God accepts them he looks upon them as imperfect.
- 3) Though he looks upon them as in themselves imperfect, yet in Christ he doth accept them, for that they call all, dunge and drosse, soe may our good workes. In that sence the Apostle soe speakes, be soe called in respect of justification.

Dr. Smith: The word "remain" is not necessary to be put in. Because they are workes they are good workes and imperfect and at that time is needlesse to put in.

Mr. Herle: By putting in "remain" we shall fall upon a greater difficulty; Four things in every sin; reatus, culpa, pena, macula. Now it is the opinion of many divines that the macula is taken away. Those phrases of justifying our workes and Christ's righteousnesse imputed to our workes, unsound speaches. Our workes are not accepted because of their worth.

Mr. Walker: I desire not lay an aspersion on glorious lights. As workes of sanctification imperfect, but as accepted in Christ



Mr. Walker: (continued) perfect. God accounts them soe and His judgement is according to Christ.

Dr. Hoyle: Our workes justified, they are Calvin's<sup>(1)</sup> wordes. To be evangellically justified is to stand with pardon.

Mr. Arrowsmith: 4 Col. <sup>(2)</sup>

Mr. Seaman: Desire one littell word put in for the preventing of the opinions of the Socinians.

Mr. Wilson: 28 Exodus: they hath reference to the persons and not to their workes.

Dr. Burges: 8 Rom.<sup>3,4</sup>. For the prooffe of the former - that ascending before God is their acceptance.

Mr. Coleman: This place omitted in the committie because noe mention of the imperfection of them.

Dr. Burges: The imperfection is manifest because they must be weighed innocence with a better thing.

Mr. Price: 2 Cron 30:<sup>8,9</sup> (3)

Mr. Gataker: Divers grave writers they doe not expound that of Christ but Constantine.

Mr. Goodwin: 8 Rom. 3 if it should be meant of Christ yet it will hould out that we are accepted, for Christ with us. It may be cleare to be meant of Christ and of acceptation of imperfect prayers. Of Christ because of a manifest allusion to the High Priest going into the holy of holies which he did with innocence once a year and he caused a cloude to appeare and peculiar to a day of fasting and prayer.

This is the proper type of the priesthood of Jesus Christ. Also of the prayers of saints on earth are accepted in and for Christ - presenting the prayers that were that day made.

Dr. Gouge: We are to prove a principle that we should and see may be content with consequences, but we have to do with an adversary.

Now since there is no mention of imperfections [

].

Mr. Seaman: 1 Pet. 2:<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Price: Offered 2 Cron 30: 19,20. (4)

Mr. Seaman: Pardon here is only the remitting of punishment "soe often pardoned saith Moses, I have pardoned saith God." (5)

Mr. Price: We seldome find in the New Testament Christ healing any and not pardoning their sins, ther is never a branch of this.

Mr. Herricke: This place speaks only of a ceremonial neglect.

Dr. Hoyle: The sence of the prayer lyes in Heseekiah's prayer and God's audience. (6)

Mr. Lightfoote: It is not pardon in the original but expiate.

Dr. Gouge: That because healed and therefore pardoned, and instance where Christ healed none but pardoned - 10 lepers. (7)

Mr. Seaman: Pardon the iniquities of the people and it follows that all the earth shall [ ] 8 Rom.26:<sup>27</sup> offered.

Mr. Herle: I cannot joyne in same expression. Ground of that prayer divers. Came to joyne with them in that performance of that solemn sacrifice. Then to be prepared they had some kind of legal uncleannesse or by disuse. They were not careful.

Heseekiah becomes a suitor for them, to those of them that come with a sincere heart that God would receive them to favour and mercy and accept of what they did.

Ther is noe specification or intimation of any temporall judgement of desire to be freed from any.

Mr. Herle: (continued) God is said to heal them when He passeth by what is faulty in them as Esay 5: 7 (8) towards end see "I will heal your backslidings".

Rev. 8: 3-4, againe by Mr. Wilkinson; the most pertinent place.

Mr. Palmer: That 2 Cron 30: 18,19,20.

Mr. Goodwin: The place from Exod is a mere type, the place from Rev is a type applyed. Noe Angell meant of Christ, desire those places Rev. 6 (9) I will give power to my two witnesses. 1 ch. (10) "I was dead and am alive."

For the alter is Christ too. Christ is His owne preist, is His owne altar, and His sacrifice. Incece given Him, this noe absurdity. That it should be meant of imperfect prayers [

] entering into the holy place on that great prayer day. Compare it with 9 Heb: 8. In Exodus he speakes of taking away guilt.

Mr. Gibson: In this text ther can be noe allusion to the High Priest.

1) Because the golden altar did not stand in the Holy of Holyes but the Holy place.

2) [

]

Dr. Hoyle: The angell is not meant by Christ Himselfe and yet the argument stands strong by.

Dr. Smith: That in Rev. would serve exceedingly well if that in 8 Rom. may be joynd with it. That they were accepted it is considerable. That ther was a silence in heaven for half a hower, a silence of His prayes till He heard those prayers.

Mr. Goodwin: I retract that freely concerning the Holy of Holyes for  
the argument brought I cannot answer.

Mr. Tuckney: I thinke it may be reference to the day of expiation  
for on that day it was offered in that place.

Ordered that the rules presented by the committy apoynted for  
that purpose shall first be considered in the Assembly tomorrow  
morning.

Lay the businesse of the 19th. Article aside for a day or two,  
to see what may be sent unto us.

This motion sleepe until tomorrow.

Mr. Sey: Roger Edwards to Hospitale of St. Thomas Southwarke  
Thomas Thomas to Cashier in Suffolke  
Mr. Loft to Chisellhurst in Kent.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 68

- (1) J. Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 3, 18 1-4,  
10 pp 98-101 112
- (2) Col. 4: 12
- (3) 2 Chron. 30: 8-9
- (4) 2 Chron. 30: 19-20
- (5) 2 Chron. 30: 19-20
- (6) 2 Chron. 30: 19-20
- (7) Luke 17: 12
- (8) Isa. 5: 7
- (9) Rev. 10: 5-6
- (10) Rev. 1: 18

October 5th. 1643      Thursday Morning

Mr. Sey given a certificate to Mr. Blackwell, and to Mr. Harrison, to Mr. Walker.

Order for Mr. Tho[m]as Kentish for Linoch, Joseph Peeye, Hornden.

Dr. Burgis to rule, one argument at one time.

Mr. Ny: There is this liberty in the House of Commons wherby they resolve themselves into a committy. There is an aspersion in this order that not only the Prolocutor but the assessors when he is [not] present [should limit discussion on any subject].

Dr. Burgis: The assessors do not desire to show in this worke.

For that of resolving into a committy in the House of Commons [way], it is in case of businesse not prepared before by any committy, but then it is out for a certain time.

If any knotty poynt doe occure, you may put into a committy.

Mr. Bridge: The Parliament hath given us an order for our proceedings, and that is one prolocutor remayne silent.

I desire we may be found in the way of an ordinance of God.

15 Acts, when ther was a great question it is found ther was much disputation had, if you take away [then you deny the Biblical example]. In former counsellis I doe not find that they were stunted to two times.

Whether for the honour of the Assembly it will be said it was not a free Assembly this is in all other meetings the reason enjoyns silence.

Dr. Hoyle: I assent to the course of all counsells no wayes hinder the end, the end is to discusse the truth. I desire in speech some care had that not too much prolixity.

Dr. Burges: For the practise of the churches ther is noe man denyes but that men should have spoken and it is fit they should have a liberty, but that ther may be an end and an order that the Assembly judge of that and give leave. Every man will find in this Assembly soe much candor and ingenuity as upon desire to have leave to speake.

Dr. Temple: This stunting of it will hardly effect the end. We believe that for then they willlengthen out their speeches to too great a length and many will be cut off from what they might say.

Mr. Goodwin: Our way of debates is in a continued way without interruption every day and the whole day taken up in debates and committyes, soe that what is spoken is spoken in an extempore way. Neither have we time to adequately prepare. It is thought much that we should speake long. Lay those two things together, I knowe noe relief. In other Assemblyes intermitting times, we have none. In matters wherin we agree as in things of doctrine we doe and therin you may doe what you please. Ther are matters of moment and consequence to us when ther is any difference. For that we are an Assembly of divines not of scooles ther is one end wherin we may agree with scooles, - to beate out the truth and that in things of great moment. According to our protestation noe man ought to be restrained from speaking than that is in his conscience. For that of asking leave; a rule will prevent him from asking leave - it will soe to me. If any man speake impatiently it is

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) at his owne perill.

There is in matters of discipline differing judgements amongst us, we may agree in the end and concluding. The only way of debating is to bring us to a unity when men that pretend to know something have been silent in conscience.

Because hoped to be fully heard without destruction to the people, now for those to be restrained especially when one part may be few, the other more [

7.

Dr. Burges: Desire not apprehend any thought or purpose to stop any man from a full hearing, but the poynt is, What is a full hearing?

Mr. Wilson: I purpose not to trespasse against this order if it be made an order. But that protestation stickes upon my conscience. The gravity of this Assembly is such that we shall not need to make an order against impertinency in speaking. I preferre truth before time.

Utterance is not equally given to all.

Mr. Herle: Consider the capacity in which we are not only an Assembly of Divines but chosen by the Parliament. If a rule against impertinency, it would reflect upon the Assembly, and upon those that chose us to it, as if impertinency in our proceedings, that occasioned this rule. Many watch for our fallings.

Mr. Sey: We must not suppose ourselves men without errors and impertinency. Is not such a thing that we should stand with, it will free us from all guilt.

Mr. Sterry: Two ends of this rule.

1) Publique liberty may not take away particular liberty, a



Mr. Sterry: (continued) restraint on men in speaking for which noe more than a liberty.

2) That noe losse of time, I see not how a freedome of speaking left to man. Soe long as this Assembly takes this liberty to call to [ when the poynt sufficient- ly discussed, soe judged by them.

That of the Apostle not spoken too.

Dr. Burgis: Ther is one thing not yet spoken too; the necessity of expedition.

Mr. Burroughes: We doe see by this debate what need ther is for liberty of speach.

Mr. Young: The question is concerning the regulating of an [ for that freedome.

Two things produced; example concerning disputation in Acts (1) noe man will deny freedome of disputation.. But the question when shall the end be, - either in the judgement of him who speakes, or Prolocutor and Assembly. For example produced in the 1 of Nice (2) was not certaine men deputed that they should reason with the Arrians, witness Macarius (3) and others, men assigned by the orthadox thus to speake. And one being a holy man but not learned man, he had a desire to speake but they being conscious of his weaknesse did labour to keep him off from speaking yet carried on [

].

When a man hath spoken againe and againe and againe, if not fully a reply may give him occasion to answer againe. Then leave may be asked and that will satisfy any person here present.

Mr. Palmer: A debate concerning this order and whether this order should be limited. Three reasons principally alledged why noe limitation:

- 1) That of the Apostle, that doth not debare. A limitation in the words is not properly disputing but inquisition, and that may be by the multitude of persons as well.
- 2) For that of antiquity. Ther may be this reason in those counsellis. The businesse were few and ther was noe great need of haste, but never soe many things in debate. If inlardge ourselves to the uttermost it will be too late for us to apply a remedy when the disease is grown incurable.
- 3) For the number of times. The nature of this rule, if three times, then to one argument or scripture, and that in one session. If more then nothing will be determined in divers sessions.

If any man not satisfied he may bring in reasons. If when in any prick one were chosen out to maintaine the argument, very good.

Sir John Clotworthy: House of Commons apoynted a committy -- a common hall tomorrow in the afternoon at 2 a clocke. To apoynt some of the members of the Assembly to be there tomorrow to speake in it.

The Scotch treaty refering as much to the religion as the safety of the kingdome. (4)

Some designed to speake to the common hall publiquesly, and others desired to be ther to give countenance to it. The desire of businesse not very waigthy.

The Assembly adjourned tomorrow to attend this businesse.

Dr. Burgess: Not the Assembly to go as an Assembly, but a competent number that it may appear as an Assembly.

Mr. Prolocutor

Mr. Ny

Mr. Sedgewicke

Mr. Calamy

Mr. Burroughes

Mr. Ny: The dispersing of us advantageous to this businesse.

Spirits very busy in the city.

Mr. Burroughes: If say anything in the name of the Assembly.

Ordered that the whole Assembly excepting those that are of the committy for the declaration shall attend the promoting of the Scots businesse tomorrow.

Ordered to proceed upon the 13th. Article on Munday morning.

To adjourne to Munday.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 69

- (1) Acts 6:<sup>9-10</sup>
- (2) Council of Nicea 325 (N.S.H.E.R.K. 8 pp 156-8)
- (3) Should probably read "Marcellus", Bishop of Ancyra.  
(Helene, Histoire des Conciles, 1(i) pp 503 f)
- (4) Solemn League and Covenant.

Munday Morning.

Mr. New appeared and tooke the protestation.

Mr. Palmer: Informed that Mr. Simpson by name incouraged the Antinomians and confessed that we ought not to confesse our sins.

Dr. Temple: Fit for us to renew our petition because nothing done.

Mr. Gallaway: One cheape reason for that is Mr. Rouse, his sickness.

Dr. Burgess: The parish may doe well themselves to petition.

Mr. Gallaway: I will give you an account of this tomoxrow morning.

Mr. Sey: Mr. Thomas Gilbert to Hemstead.

Mr. Thomas preached and hath a certificate.

Debate upon the 18 Article

They are sinful.

Mr. Palmer: Whether enough to say they are sinfull.

Mr. Bridge: That some addition may be made to this Article. They doe not fully reach either the Papists or Arminians. Neither doe they prepare, dispose, or make men mette to receive grace.

Dr. Hoyle: Scotus (1) / - Large gap in Ms. - /  
Proposition - before the grade of Christ, altered thus before justification.

Dr. Smith:

Mr. Hearle: This alteration will meete the Antinomians. A reprobate may goe so farre as to be inquisitive.

Mr. Bathurst: Ther is some danger in putting in those words. Because in generall apprehension, faith goes before justification, and then it will follow. Rather put in regeneration.

Mr. Goodwin: Justification doth follow upon believing which is the act of faith. Now perhaps it may be found that habitually sanctification doth goe before either faith or justification. Those works are not acceptable or workes after, because God first accepts the persons then the worke, and the person is acceptable on believing.

Mr. Palmer: If you leave out justification you will have reason to alter it in the title.

Mr. Price: I desire the words in the Article stand or run thus, before justifying and sanctifying, - grace of Christ.

Mr. Goodwin: Nae workes are accepted in order to eternall life till a man believes but in order to working faith that be granted and yeilded as preparatory workes.

Mr. Walker: The first saving worke is regeneration.

Mr. Seaman: Two Articles concerning good workes. It ware good that we doe compare them. The twelfth saith that they do spring out of a lively faith, This is the affirmative and this is the negative.

Dr. Temple: Put in "before the saving grace of Christ".

Mr. Goodwin: The good workes in this Article are things of another kind.

The first Article speakes of goode workes that follow after faith and the second of good workes that are preparatory.

Dr. Gouge: The words in the Article may well stand.

Mr. Price: The words in the Article here the same.

Mr. Lightfoote: Inspiration not used in scripture.

Mr. Palmer: It cannot in any propriety of phrase say that faith is a worke before justification.

Mr. Hearle: This hath many reasons to give it a passage. Faith  
in time doth not goe before justification.

Mr. Goodwin: Some divines hold the preparatory workes of humiliation.  
They have an acceptation before God. [ if  
you will speake to the sence of the Arminians.

We will passe it. That ther may be some workes before  
faith that may be preparatory, this cannot be admitted as a plaine  
truth.

It is Aquinas<sup>(2)</sup> his censure.

To merit grace though of congruity is harsher phrase  
than to say merit glory.

His reason is preparatory workes then the last of these  
preparatory workes is the proximate forgoing cause of that that  
followes, and then it will necessarily follow. Ther is nothing  
in them more than the workings of any man in the world only  
drawings neare. Noe preparatory worke any waye acceptable.

Dr. Gouge: I am of opinion of my brother that last spoke because noe  
workes acceptable but only in Christ.

Dr. Smith: Philosophy is not a casting away of theology but an  
ascent up higher, all those previous dispositions are such as that  
the papists affirme, the last disposition doth propose. [

].

Mr. Goodwin: I shall not stand disputing this poynt because I see  
it will take up time. Arminians make all preparations beforehand  
of degrees. That these preparations should have an influence into  
faith I thinke not. Whether ther be an acceptation of these workes,  
though not in order to eternall life but to that worke of faith

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) which is to come.

Only do not shake off all sorts of preparation and  
acceptation.

Mr. Wilson: Three things: vocation, justification and sanctification.

Vocation before justification and sanctification. Some sort  
followes after justification. Vocation is an agregation of men  
that they may be united to Christ. Justification comes from  
communion.

Mr. Seaman: That ther are some workes that goe before justification  
and regeneration and faith in order to conversion. Conversion  
considerable as the worke of God or of man. Those addresses  
unto God [ I have ever held.

Mr. Gibson: Distinguished between the actions and persons. All  
things commanded by God the actions must be accepted, they have  
a morality and goodnesse in them.

Mr. Herle: Ther is a double preparation, a proximate and a  
participle. [ MS. illegible ]

Mr. Seaman: For that distinction of accepting person and worke.  
Workes considered abstractly or concrete, we understand it of  
workes in the person. A person accepted to eternall life.  
Another acceptance, as in that of Cain, <sup>(3)</sup> if you doe well, shall  
you not be accepted, even Cain himselve? An unregenerate man  
may doe many things that are degrees to his conversion. A sinner,  
as a sinner, may doe some things. The question of what quality  
this is, of what acceptance [it has] with God. That God has  
not bound Himself to anything. He must lay Himself downe at the  
feete of God's mercy. It is not in him that wills or that runs.  
God is not tyed to any gracious acceptation.



Dr. Howle: Concerning preparatory workes - for that of Cain it is supposed of a man not converted.

Prolocutor: The best preparation to grace is this, to know how much we stand in need of Christ.

How we are brought to this. By the law. The better we understand it we shall find our desparate estate and thus the lawe works the spirit of bondage.

Now here is the only preparation to grace. Then after we may receive the spirit of adoption. In all this we are merely passive.

The uttermost the Law extend unto is taking a man to such a state as that the Lord hath not mercy on him then he will perish.

Dr. Temple: It is agreed on most hands that workes before justification are not pleasing in order to salvation.

Dr. Burgess: It is true when sometimes a businesse of this nature comes you doe not committ it, but in a businesse of consequence you usually doe. Our longest debates have been upon acceptation of workes before justification, whether in order to salvation or any other. In order to salvation hath a great deal of latitude, if any acceptance at all in a degree it must looke that way.

Some things requisite to make a man passively capable. Natural morall persuasion. As for a man to be made acquainted with the lawe and the condition in which he lyes.

Motion to recomit this.

Mr. Sey: In order to doe this [ ] 7.  
God acknowledged the integrity of his heart. Genesis 20: 6

Mr. Whitaker: A good motion. This Article is of great consequence and falls in many poynts of our ministry.

That ther are common workes, that acceptance in order to life will laye us open too. They say grace, glory, increase of grace, of a man and his fall and final perseverance. Those five fall under merit.

Austin <sup>(4)</sup> saying that grace is never called mercy.

Mr. Seaman: For the double acceptation I ground upon the truth.

A two-fold love of God.

Mr. Wilkenson (Sen): A motion of recomitting this Article. We have done the best we can in it. We shall not be able to present better thing than already presented.

Mr. Newcomen: These workes in order intended by God, in order accepted according to His intention. But this in the Article doe meddle with these words.

Mr. Gibson: Leave out those words "pleasing to God."

Mr. Sterry: Two workes now in hand, one principall and subordinate.

Perhaps ther may be found a way to cleare the Article. [

].

Those preparations do not flow from nature but from the principall of regeneration to three works.

1) Acceptation that distinction. Acceptation of workes abstractly taken and of the workes in that person. Person and work concertly. Acceptation of the person is either absolute and simple, or limited with respect to some particular.

[ - Large gaps and indecipherable Ms. - ]

Mr. Sterry: (continued)

2) Preparations that distinction of approximations and participations. The first though explained may have a good sence if they

[ ] though they do not amount  
[ ]

3) Precedency of faith and justification. This a question that because it is cleare as seems to make all devinity very darke, noe work more profitable to fall upon.

It is granted that they are final tempore. Perhaps they may be final natura.

Ther is a three-fold poynt of justification; in the heart of God, In the person of Christ; [ ]

Two poynt of conversion.

The application of the fathers applying of Christ to such a person at such a time. A difference betweene union with Christ and communion. True in a morall sence and lardge sence, but in strict sence union and communion can be separated.

Two Arg. The worke of God upon us. God soe workes upon us that we worke together with Him, and it is one individuall worke in which God and saints concurre.

[ ] - Gap of over half a page - [ ]

Mr. Sterry being desired to explain himself.

Mr. Sterry: I have been sweetly but heavily and loosely pressed upon by some of our learned and wise brethren.

All that came from me was againe by many an interposition expressed not to be my peremptory judgement but to admitt it soe farre as you thought fitte. I did expresse myselfe soe as

Mr. Sterry: (continued): by noe meanes to exclude faith. If any expressions mentioned I should have given them account. [

] As doubting thoughts [

] that see manadged as if anything for which I be called to account.

Dr. Temple: Much of this discussion intrenches upon those opinions now abroad in the city.

Prolocutor: The argument seems strange to me -- seen only in the close, the confounding of justification and sanctification.

Mr. Seaman: The reason that made noe move to bring in his [my] animadversus upon the Article upon justification, that we might doe neither him nor ourselves any injury.

Mr. Sterry: I think myself ingaged in those that expresse. Entreat the liberty of the Assembly that I not be called to an account for everything I propound for consideration.

Resolved to referre it to the last committee.

Mr. Sey: Mr. Tandy for the church of littell Gainford in Essex.

Ordered - noe certificate to be given from this Assembly to any person without a certificate concerning his conversation and the testimoniall published in this Assembly.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 70

- (1) Duns Scotus, John (1266-1308) Scholastic Theologian of Oxford, Paris and Cologne. He argued that faith was a matter of will, and could not be supported by logical proofs, thereby positing a division between theology and philosophy. (N.I.D.C.C. p 315 Clouse)
- (2) Probably St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, 2 (1) Questions I-XLIII pp 1 f
- (3) Heb. 11:<sup>4</sup>
- (4) St. Augustine, De Gratia et libero Arbitrio liber unus, 15-21, P.L 44 pp 899 f; 23, p 910

October 10th. 1643      Tuesday Morning

A paper against Mr. Simpson<sup>(1)</sup> brought in and read.

Mr. Palmer: The whole of this businesse [

] By our owne covenant we are bound. This above all other opinions leading to prophanenesse. We are above all to be leaders of it by petition or otherwise to move the House to resume the businesse. If you please to take into consideration the Covenant.

Dr. Burgis: To apoynt a committy to prepare [a report against the Antinomians].

Mr. Palmer, Dr. Burgis, Mr. Gataker, Dr. Temple. To be a committee to prepare something to be presented to the Assembly fit to represent to the House of Commons, for their proceedings against the Antinomians and about the particulars in the petition formerly presented to the House of Commons.

They are hastily to withdraw and prepare their report to this Assembly.

Moving of them [the House of Commons] to put an end to their proceedings against the Antinomians in respect of their dayly mischiefe that doth arise. More [harm] done by reason of the not finishing thereof and for the receiving of the former petition presented to both Houses of Parliament for reformation of sundry abuses still continuing to the further drawing downe of vengeance upon the kingdome.

Mr. New, Mr. Pickering took the Covenant.

Dr. Gouge: This text <sup>(2)</sup> is pertinent because it speaks of unbelievers.

Mr. Tuckney: The apostle here speaks against the Cretans <sup>(3)</sup> who were the worst of sinners.

Dr. Smith: Though they were such vile sinners yet not such that ther be not some good workes done bye them, "that they may be sound in the faith", the question whether they were not believers.

Dr. Hoyle: The words are generall of Jew and Gentile.

Mr. Bridge: He saith nothing is pure, their mind or their conscience. Those things that they make conscience of, he saith they know God, then teacher teaching things yet they know not, [v. 16] seemes to be the best prooffe.

Mr. Simpson: Their minds and consciences are refered by some to them that against them, and are godly, amongst them that thought this mal[ice].

It suites with that 14 Rom <sup>(4)</sup> "to him that thinks it uncleane it is uncleane". A good man may have his conscience. They are as Beza <sup>(5)</sup> [said] the worst of men, of whom ther is noe hope that ever they will be brought to any good.

Mr. Gibson: 1 Tim <sup>(6)</sup>

They deny the faith being worse than infidells.

Mr. Price: This place is soe apt for this reason, reprobate to every good word. Averse from everything materially good, noe man will say that such works are accepted.

Dr. Gouge: Ther is a generall proposition that compriseth all other.

Mr. Whitaker: The Jesuits upon that ground do jeer [ ]  
two sorts of men [ ] a double assertion  
[ ] .

Mr. Lightfoote: The place seems to speake of male malice and Jewish leaders. Since the Article speakes of those on the verge of the church, to apply a text concerning Jews, and those that ware false teachers, and reprov'd as being false teachers seems inappropriate.

Mr. Bathurst: The word shows that it is spoken of the people, A command given to them not to give heed to Jewish teachers. For the Jesuits cavil he speakes of pure and impure but withall he determines who are impure and pure.

Mr. Goodwin: That he speakes here of those that keeps up the Jewish ceremonies. It appears by the v<sup>10</sup> they of the circumcision thought they ware good men and did conscientiously practise the Jewish ceremonies soe that it is not an impurity. In respect of their opinions, they were wrong and guilty but not of unbelief.

14 Rom <sup>(7)</sup> "he that regards a day regards it to the Lord". He speakes of the Jewishe dayes now though they differ yet in regards of the generall ends it is done unto the Lord. But here he found it in the impurity of their state of mind and conscience, which is the best thing that any unregenerate man has. Their light. To them it is impure, since they are growne to more wickednesse.

Mr. Wilkenson: Noe place soe pertinent; ther is an evangellicall uncleannesse, viz: infidelity and unbelief, till we be in Christ nothing cleane.

Faith is the true seasoning of all actions of the Christian man, if I pray and pray not in faith, if I keepe a sabbath and not persuaded that I keepe a right day. Soe the



Mr. Wilkenson: (continued) best actions that any unbeliever can doe they are not approved in the sight of the Lord.

21 Pro. 27<sup>(8)</sup> offered for further confirmation.

Mr. Sey: Mr. Lavender to High Ongar, Mr. Anderson of [ ]  
in Hertfordshire.

Mr. Goodwin: When he comes in a praying way offers

Mr. Seaman: In a wicked man in that is not meant a man naturall, but a man debayst, in opposition to a righteous man.

Mr. Goodwin: In the 21 Pro it is not spoken of man grosse and wicked, but the best of wicked men as is cleare by the opposition of that 15:<sup>8</sup> a separate man.

Dr. Hoyle: Wicked signifyes any out of Christ.

Mr. Lightfoote: The way of the wicked is his notorious course.

Mr. Gibson: His way is his course. See taken in the end of the last verse in first Psalm.

Mr. Seaman: The word "wicked" and "righteous" in Proverbs taken in a morall not a spiritual sence, as from the scope.

Two Propositions: Hebrews 11 vs 5,6.

Mr. Goodwin: The chapter and verse taken in the lardge sense not of faith in Christ but of faith in generall whereby we believe spiritual objects.

Dr. Smith: I conceive this place is very fit, the fathers make a great use of it, and Austin<sup>(9)</sup> see expounds it of faith in Christ. It is not only said he must believe that "God is and a rewarder of them", and wherein is he a rewarder but in Christ.

Mr. Bridge: Ther is noe coming to God but by Christ. The other faith that hath no relation to Christ cannot please God.

Dr. Gouge:

Report of the Comitty set out by way of a message.

Mr. Bridge: I desire to be tender in this. [

] til we have resolved [ ]

to have been satisfied.

Mr. Goodwin: I am as sensible of the dangers as any man, the only thing I desired in a way of justice. You would see how these opinions are alayed. They should be dealt withall to convince them. That private brethren have done it is not ground enough for the Assembly to refrain from so doing.

Mr. Gataker: If the opinion be of themselves so odious is it not high time to see them supressed. Shall we stay til they have been talked with.

Mr. Seaman: It is objected that we are bound in conscience before we petition against any man to see first if we can convince the man, that according to the Word of God.

Resolved to send another messadge to the House of Commons.

Ordered that the petition mentioned in the messedge shall also be sent to the House of Commons together with it presently, by the same committy that drew it up.

FOOTNOTES - SESSION 71

- (1) Sidrach Simpson 1600-1655
- (2) Titus 1:15-16
- (3) This was a term of abuse implying defective behaviour, normally a liar. Cf. N. E. D. p 1168
- (4) Rom. 14:<sup>23</sup>
- (5) T. Beza, Iesu Christi D. N. Novum Testamentum, sive novum foedus. Cuius Graeco contextui respondent interpretatione duae; una, vetus; altera, nova T. Bezae, diligenter ab eo recognita. Eiusdem Th. Bezae annotationes, quas itidem hae tertiae editiones recognovit & accessione non parva locupletavit. Ad Titum p 377
- (6) 1 Tim. 5:<sup>8</sup>
- (7) Rom. 14:<sup>6</sup>
- (8) Prov. 21:<sup>27</sup>
- (9) St. Augustine, De Nuptiis et concupiscentia libri II, P.L 44 1.9 p 419

October 11th 1643      Wednesday Morning

Dr. Burgis made report of the answer from the House of Commons. <sup>(2)</sup>

2 Proposition 4 Hebrews 2

Mr. Carter: That place will not prove it <sup>(3)</sup>. The apostle speaks of the Heathen rest. They did not enter, and it was through their unbelief. Here is not mention of works being accepted or not accepted.

Dr. Hoyle: The same faith is meant, that spoken of in the 11th. <sup>(4)</sup> to the believers.

Mr. Taylor: The place may make well for the purpose aledged.

Mr. Palmer: The apostle scope is that spoken of form erly. The argument is good if the word doth not profit being that.

Then not these works that come from the word.

Mr. Gataker: This is not spoken of concerning acceptance of workes but benefit by the ordinance. Their not believing the word of God concerning the bringing them into the land did make them to set lightly it.

116 Psa. Im <sup>(5)</sup> I believed.

That promise made unto him by Samuell that he should succeed Saul. This word did faile of some use to David at some time, by reason of his distrustfull thoughts concerning it.

Dr. Gouge: The maine scope is to bring those Hebs to imbrace Christ and believe in Him. The means by faith, and he showed how many of them did fall for want of faith and therefore exhorts us to believe. It is aplyed here to Christians and he brings in this

Dr. Gouge: (continued) instance that the word, the gospell, could doe them noe good because they had not faith. Here was a great work, the hearing of the gospell, yet it profited not for want of faith.

Dr. Smith: This Article is intended against the Papist concerning preparatory works and one of them is hearing of the word, and therefore very apt to this businesse.

Mr. Wilson: That hearing will not profit without faith is true, but His hearers were passive. He speakes rather of the worke of their preachers, that was not profitable unto them. It intimates not that their own work of hearing is unprofitable.

Mr. Hearle: This place very unfit. In the Article three things considerable:

- 1) Subject, an unregenerate man.
- 2) The spring those good workes.
- 3) Effect pleasing. Heare the word is profitable, it speakes of all those that fall in the wilderness.

"For faith" it is not meant of faith in the Article with us, of justifying faith. This is temporary, laying hold upon a temporary promise and soe referes only in type.

3 not pleasing here nor profitable. That a regenerate man may not profit by the word and may misse of some degree of the promise -- Jer: 23:<sup>32</sup> Here is a not profiting and yet we may not say, this was a judgement upon the prophets.

Mr. Carter: Said the apostle doth indeavour to persuade them to believe in Christ as supposing them to be believers. Now that is not soe, he supposing them to be a church. Church <sup>is</sup> mentioned

Mr. Carter: (continued) in<sup>7</sup> last chapter, and of their ministering to the saints. See that of selling their birthright and that in part is here mentioned in this place and rest not that in Christ, the sabbath day's rest.

Mr. Goodwin: The Article is of workes before faith, not pleasing because they want faith; but the unbelief which here is mentioned is not merely a negation but joynd with a positive refusall; see the scope in the former chapter "harden not your hearts" (6). This is a positive unbelieve with an obstinacy.

The Article said "pleasing" the word here is "profitable". That of workes wrought by them, this of word preached to them. Paul supposeth them to be unbelievers, there ware many amongst them who may fall short such as God swears agaynst - they shall never enter into His rest.

Regenerate men in the Old Testament may in some sence be tipe of unregenerate men under the gospell, as Ismael, (7) though in other cases a tipe of reprobate. Yet in case he was saved, as some think in answer to that prayer of Abraham<sup>7</sup>.

Mr. Bathurst: The place playnly speakes of unregenerate for the word passive. This can be noe exception, the gospell was preached therefore they must be hearers, but they have not faith to the word.

Mr. Porter: Though we translate it - "the word preached" - yet the word is the word of hearing, therefore not only passive.

Mr. Seaman: Compare it with   <sup>7</sup> if faith be necessary to make the ordinance profitable, then to make our workes acceptable. If to make the learning of the word acceptable, then other workes acceptable.

Mr. Carter: The hearing of the word considerable either as a command duty or a means of grace to the hearer. It is only spoken of the letter not as a reason why the worke of hearing was not accepted, but only a reason why it did not worke grace in the hearer.

Mr. De la march: In this place the apostle hath regard to a temporall blessing. Ther was another rest, that should continev to be a tipe.

Mr. Bridge: This cannot be concluded but by a double consequence, it profits not, therefore not pleasing, if not pleasing, because not mingled with faith, then whatsoever workes have not faith mixed are displeasing.

Galatians 5:<sup>6</sup>

Dr. Temple: This place improper as the former. The maine scope to consider what it is that doth render a man acceptable to God. The Jewes, they thought that circumcision did it and the apostle falls upon that, opposeth three generall considerations that may availe rather [ than ] circumcision:

- 1) Under this, all the privillages of the Jewes [ ] .
- 2) Uncircumcision which the Gentile rely on under this all dignities, excelencies and titles of the Gentilles as Romans and Grecians.
- 3) Faith the Christians looke upon, it is not the two former but faith, this only renders a man acceptable to God.

Dr. Gouge: Faith is a roote; that from it springs love. Seeing faith is it, noe workes can be acceptable but that springes from faith.

Mr. Goodwin: It is true that he speakes of the prerogatives both of Jewes and Gentill. That under the notion of circumcision he doth by a synechdoche emply that all the workes the Jewes stand upon for their salvation [are unavailing]. 4 v. "whosoever are justified by the law", by the law, is not. But "faith working by love" - that doth.

Mr. Gataker: I doubt something concerning the validity of this place to prove. I do not conceive that by circumcision is meant the workes of the law. It is only the mere right of circumcision - as the apostle [says]. The apostle's words are: "nothing availes ought". It is a matter of noe moment whether circumcised or uncircumcised, soe he believes it in noe way hinders his interest in Christ.

Dr. Hoyle: This text seemes a most plaine text. Faith workes by love as the first and prime originall of all good workes.

Mr. Seaman: According to the principalls you rejected the former. This will not serve because of many deductions. In another place "but a new creture".

- 1) What meant by circumcision and uncircumcision, all the priviledges and prerogatives of the Jews and the Gentill.
- 2) "Availe nothing", and neither one or other can have any priviledge by those things wherin they thinke to have the greatest priviledge.
- 3) "In Christ Jesus", whether it relates to justification or sanctification.

Luther<sup>(8)</sup> carryes it justification, Calvin<sup>(9)</sup> sanctification. But it is clearly relating to justification, "in Christ



Mr. Seaman: (continued) Jesus." In the businesse of justification he must only by faith in Christ Jesus. If by sanctification, then the meaning is not holy by externall workes but by his being received.

Mr. Hearle: Our Article is of workes before justification, and the workes that must bring us unto Christ, but the apostle speakes of those that are "in Christ", as he doth of himself in Phil. 3.<sup>(10)</sup> Soe in the following words "ye did run well" we speake of such workes as qualify by way of congruity to acceptation, but this speakes rather by waye of qualification of the person than the worke.

Mr. Price: This is not at all the sence of the place, for by rules of opposition it may be a working faith opposed to a working circumcision and working uncleannesse, in those though they worke to the uttermost.

Dr. Burgis: This pertinent to the purpose that it is alledged for. As this spoken of "man in Christ" be "in Christ Jesus". This is noe more but  $\int$  - Ms. illegible -  $\int$  as by circumcision and uncircumcision is meant the priviledges of the Jewes and that liberty that the Gentills gloryed in, that were not subject to those rites.

Two questions:

- 1) Concerning justification.
- 2) Concerning Christian liberty.

$\int$

is opposed to circumcision.

$\int$  faith

Mr. Hericke: This place makes full to the profe. A contention in the church of Galatia betweene "Christian Jewes" and "Christian Proselytes". The apostle steppes in "you that are all Christian and professe Christ" etc.

Mr. Rayner: The workes the Article speakes of are externall workes. "Faith workes love", and "love the fountayne of all obedience" and good workes and therefore noe act pleasing unto God.

Mr. Gibbon: A place is pertinent when you can make the proposition the conclusion of the syllogisme.

Mr. Bridge: "In Jesus Christ" some interpreters say the meaning is in regno Christi, others understand it of sanctification because all one with that in the next chapter. A new creature in Jesus Christ. "A new creature" in the next chapter. Are not all one? In the former he treats of justification, in the latter of sanctification. For circumcision and uncircumcision omnia illud in quo vel Judei vel gentes gloriari potuerunt.<sup>(11)</sup> The apostle speakes before of the whole law and then falls upon those particulars. All priviledges or performances amongst Jewes or Gentills.

Dr. Hoyle: Love /

7.

Mr. Palmer: The text is of justification, those workes have noe ingrediency to justification but adds, this faith is an /operative/ faith. That in the 15 of 6 give light to it. In this he expresseth rather the person that is accepted, if we compare this with another place 1 Cor 7: 19 what kind of keeping the commandment? That that comes from a new creater, and what new creter? If I lay those three places it will follow that noe man is accepted but a believer.

Mr. Bathurst: "In Christ Jesus" - under the profession of Christ  
Jesus. Availles, expressed in 18 Acts 2.

Mr. Sey: A certificate concerning Mr. Edwards under the hands.

Dr. Burgis: A motion. We have been long upon these Articles.  
I desire that we see husband our time by making all the haste  
we can through the scriptures propounded.

Mr. Palmer: The sentence in the Article "a prophet etc" doe suit  
well.

Mr. Woodcocke: Their workes are not rejected because unregenerate,  
but see feared and notorious, their "hands full of bloud."

Prolocutor: Piscator<sup>(12)</sup> doth understand that "hands full of bloud"  
only of the sin of oppression not of murder.

Mr. Seaman: This place proves it, but by consequence; the Jewes  
were the greater part unregenerate.

Mr. Young: It is pertinent. The two last propositions to be put  
under one debate. Esa 66:<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Goodwin: He doth oppose "a broken and contrite heart". He that  
wants those is as if he killed a man, and for that it is most  
penitent.

Ordered: To proceed upon the report of the 15th. Article  
tomorrow morning.

Dr. Burgis: A motion concerning Mr. Sterry in regard of Antinomians.  
Desire him to receive and give satisfaction in this businesse when  
he be enable and have opportunity to returne backe againe.

To expresse himselfe more clearly and distinctly in the  
doctrine of justification in reference to particulars declared by  
himselfe in the Assembly, the last time he was in the Assembly.

FOOTNOTES -- SESSION 72

- (1) Should read Session 72. The previous debate is dated Tuesday, October 10th., and is Session 71.
- (2) This was a reply given to the proposals made to the House of Commons on the subject of the Antinomians.
- (3) Article.
- (4) Heb. 11
- (5) Psa. 116:<sup>5</sup>
- (6) Heb. 4:<sup>7</sup>
- (7) Gen. 17:<sup>18</sup>
- (8) M. Luther, Lectures on Romans, 3:<sup>4</sup>, p 26; 3:<sup>21</sup>, p 30; 4:<sup>7</sup>, p 37.
- (9) J. Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 3, 6 pp 1 f
- (10) Phil. 3:<sup>4</sup>
- (11) "all gloried in that they were either Jews or Gentiles".
- (12) J. Piscator, In prophetam Ezechielem commentarius, sub Ez 23:<sup>37</sup>  
Herborn 1614.

I have been unable to check this reference but it is given in  
B.M.C.P.B. 190 p 607 (3166 bb. 48(1) )

Thursday morning.

Ordered that noe members of the Assembly shall withdraw themselves out of the Assembly to any certificate to any minister except ther be a full Assembly without them.

Mr. Sey: A testimoniall for Mr. Tandy read. Mr. Spratt, a testimoniall for him by various members of the Assembly. Those have certificates, Mr. Wilkenson to Epping, Mr. Sheffield to Tunbridge.

Report upon the 15th. Article debated and ordered.

Report of the 16th. Article debated.

Two alterations [ over half a page of the Ms.

is blank - ]

Mr. Coleman: Question is whether infused habbits may be augmented or increased. Things may be increased per modum or per modum meriti. Whether God doth punish. [

] Job and David 51 Psalm. God

may justly suffer an abatement.

Mr. Goodwin: To answer objections.

Grace being a quality, it is capable of diminution as well as augmentation. Consider by what means it comes to passe that grace is either increased or decreased. If according to the naturall lawe of qualities, the sinne will expel grace. It must therefore depend upon the will of God per modum meriti. This argument that God doth not see, because I know noe threatening that he will doe see. If all a man's former workes he looseth not the reward of, but they all stand still before God to be

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) rewarded, then not with the losse of reward of any of his habituall graces. The one is the roote, the other the branches. Why the branch should contain and the roote not. Made mee by habituall grace, and prepared for glory by the same.

Suppose a man at the end of his life should have a great decline. According to this principle he shall lose all his acquired grace and bring himself to noe more than he had at first. He repents, and yet recovers not.

Why should all those places as 1 John 2: <sup>15,16,17</sup> not the person, but the principles to the lust in the world. See the lawe written in the heart; every degree of grace is a new writting of the law. One argument against falling away - the law written argues an eternity. If all the new acessions of grace be a new writting of the law they will stand as perpetuall as the last. That that is gained is infused for it is by creation, it is not in a naturall way but it is a "new creature", from first to last. It being a heavenly, it should partake of the state of heaven, it is called a glory. The heavenly bodies doe not, the sun is only eclipsed. The seed of God abides an immortal seed, will you interpret it of the Holy Ghost.

1 Peter 1: <sup>[24]</sup>

When doth the word of God abide forever in men's hearts? <sup>[</sup> and therefore he doth oppose the regenerated man to "grasse and the flowers of grasse". Two things: it abides forever, both roote and branche. Why should all the grasse a man hath gotten goe with him into heaven.

Mr. Hill: The gifts of God are without repentance. If the degrees of grace are the gifts of God, why not without repentance? Grace is the image. How howrable is this to have any of the image of God lost. Anything of the divine nature lost. It may be clouded but nae abatement of the degrees.

Dr. Burgis: The occasion of this debate, the moving of an alteration in the Article. The expression desired two things excepted against, though one of them only came into this debate. The maine thing is departing from grace given, whether this a proper expression in any degree. A good motion stated if we carefully consider, all will be reconciled.

It is true that which is the immediate issue and fruite of the Spirit cannot be lost. The doubt is of the increase and augmentation. That admits of an augmentation and therefore of a diminution. It is in the state of regeneration as in the state of nature.

There is one universal disease that doth corrupt and defile the whole man, that is prinitas ad malum. But when a man comes to be born and grows up this breakes out.

A man comes to multiply acts and soe habitually becomes a drunkard.

Soe in the state of regeneration ther is a seed of God in the heart of man [ ] in many places in scripture called "the Spirit". "The new Spirit" that God hath promised, this is that universall habbit that is infused by God in a man's regeneration.

Out of this, as God is pleased to assist and enable a

Dr. Burgis: (continued) man, a man comes to exercise that particular duty and virtue, this is the meaning of that 5 Gal. 22.

Out of this universall habit of grace Christians doe come by degrees to the exercise of grace which grows up to a habit.

5 Heb rews

This particular habit.

Now the difference is not between the universall habit, whether this subject to diminution, but then improvements and increments of this by reason of use. It falls out that man neglects the use and exercise of it, and in this ther is a falling away from the particular habit which he hath attained unto by use, and now by disuse. ∩

∩ read: "and may faile of the grace of God attained".

Mr. Gibbon: A habit is nothing else but a helpe to a faculty.

Those helpes may come two wayes:

- 1) By way of acquisition
- 2) By way of infusion. ∩ ∩.
- 3) Superadded grace which may come two wayes. Acquired habits may be lost not only gradually but specifically. For these superadded grace given to a man merely as he carryes himself, ther are increases and diminutions of it.

For those who are superadded, by themselves those may be lost.

All the query is about those that are essentially necessary to ∩salvation∩ ∩.



Mr. Bathurst:

the gifts are without repentance. The gift of justification and sanctification. But I dare not hence conclude that there is no decay of grace.

Mr. Rayner: Our question is of infused habits. I know that that is infused of God anything in the creature can overthrow it.

[ something of intermitting  
[ ] If there be a neglect  
of the means the act will be intermitting without any diminution  
of the habit.

When there is an admonition of corruption, grace may be overborne, and yet no diminution of the habits [ ]  
[ ] contrary to the rule in natural habits.

Mr. Hericke: A double work of God

in Himselfe, in us. Both these are unchangeable.

"Set as a seal upon thy heart". Habits of grace have no degrees. Whatsoever is seminall is eternall.

Mr. Woodcocke: You argued a place out of the Hebrews for diminution of grace, I shall second it with another - 3 Hebrews 13.

How the habit of sin can be increased, and not the habit of grace, I do not understand.

Mr. Seaman: The alteration in the Article occasions a debate

concerning the nature of grace. All grace whatsoever comes under the notion of an accident. Accidens est quod potest adesse.

A rational creature is the subject and he may have grace or want it, and yet be rational. This is cleare in the

Mr. Seaman: (continued) case of devells, they are angels though wholly deprived of grace. Soe men fall. And therefore of itselife, loosable as well as that which is got by humane industry, as infused.

A regenerate man, if consider his grace in the proper nature of it, is loosable. To consider it according to the will of God, a two-fold grace:

Necessary, as ex supposito both ratione finis and pacti.

Now this is under another notion, not as an accident, forma informans. I call that necessary grace which is absolutely necessary to make him to be a Christian. It is not this or that degree. A man may lose grace to the very lowest degree, that first habit is of an eternal nature -- posito pacto and ratione finis. It is said ther be noe threatening. If ther be a promise ther must be supposed a threatening.

∟

∟.

Mr. Price: Answered something offered, grace called the image of God. If say, the image of God may be lost, but our Article stands out, only impaired. God will never take His divine nature, but in a man, nature may decline, soe the divine nature may also decline.

Ther are two seeds, the seed of grace in the soule, that speakes of the seede of the word. If anything would impaire grace it must be afflictions, but Godly recover strength in afflictions. But experience is against this. It is sufficient that for the present it be impaired, as cast water upon lime, oyle and water. Gifts without repentance, true God doth recall any

Mr. Price: (continued) one gift.

Reason from the sun, it is not eclipsed - the moon  
doth lose some light.

Mr. Coleman: Habits may be impaired because they may be increased.

4 Prov. 18. 57 Esa. 17. 63 Esa. 17.

A prevention of falling 12 Heb. 27.

Mr. Goodwin: We grace, thus farre that acts of grace we may depart  
from [ ] . All superadded graces depart  
from likewise. The question is of those aquisite habits that  
come by a man.

The shooke may remaine.

Its said a man may lose of that see farre as he shall  
not lose of all totally.

Paul was a strong man at his first birth. As all  
seminall things, continence see likewise. What is of a  
substantiall grace continues too and that in nature. It is true  
he may grow weaker but that which is of substance in his growth  
continues - he doth not grow a dwarfe againe. Consider the  
parable of the talents, not only what was given him but what he  
had gained was rewarded.

That which is purchased by the death of Christ, in  
point of sanctification, is forever, 10 Hebrews 14.

Christ hath dyed to bring a man to such a station and  
fulnesse of stature, and they lose nothing of that. For that  
if promised then threatened. That you shall never fall away is  
promised, but the contrary is never threatened.

For that of punishing in losse of grace; in all such

Mr. Goodwin: (continued) afflictions as are temporary God may punish His spiritually, with such afflictions as to take away joy. I may have grace but not joy.

Joy [ ] in order  
to temporell life [ ] but that God  
should punish in that which is in order for eternall life, this  
is not a temporary punishment.

An aquisition of habits.

A: ther is indeed a quicknesse to doe which is not a substantiall habit in a Christian, as in young Christians they have lesse grace but a greater quicknesse. [ ]

One objection I know not how to answer; - if the habits of sin increase the habits of grace decrease. The former I confesse  
6 Rom 19. [ ]

].

Mr. Seaman: If nae certain degree of grace be necessary necessitate meriti to bring us to salvation; the highest degree of it is necessary necessitate precepti.

Mr. Goodwin: Not only sae, much grace puts a man into the state of grace, but the degrees of grace God requires are necessary to salvation.

An order from Lords and Commons to fall upon discipline.

Mr. Sey: Mr. Carter examined and hath certificate; and a testimoniall brought in and attested by Mr. Palmer.

Ordered: To lay aside the businesse of the Articles and to consider what is to be done upon this order of the Lords and Commons tomorrow morning.

October 13th. 1643 Fryday Morning

Mr. Sey: A motion about some recommended, not in orders.

Dr. Gouge: Not only for the sacraments, but for the preaching of  
the word ther must be outward call.

That in the first place we may advise how ther may be  
way for the admitting of them.

Mr. Raynor: The iniquity of the times hath been such as  $\int$   
 $\int$  if the Assembly try them they may be  
a reasonable call.

An Order from the House of Commons.

Mr. Palmer: Made report for the Comitty of the Declaration:

Algate: Mr. Wilson, Mr. Bance, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Hawes,  
Mr. Channell, Dr. Smith, Dr. Stiles, Mr. Holsworth,  
Mr. Newcomen.

Andrewes in Holborne - Mr. Coleman

Ludgate - Mr. Michaelthwaite

Benuith Pauls Wharfe - Mr. Arrowsmith

Peters of the Hill - Mr. Carter of Dinton.

Alhallowes Hony Lane

Clement Denes

Ordered Scribes shall  $\int$ write to the churches to arrange this  $\int$

Andrewes Undershaft - Mr. Roborough

Olives Silver Street - Mr. Clayton.

Church Wardens.

Mr. Sey: Mr. Sheffield for Tunbridge, a certificate from 3 of the  
Assembly.

A motion for Munday to be a day of fast and some men apoynted to the worke and some to preach.

Resolved that Munday next be kept as a day of fasting and prayer for the Assembly in this place.

Ordered exercise shall be "the word and prayer time from 9 to 4".

Persons: three to pray, two to preach.

Dr. Burgis	)	
Mr. Goodwin	)	to pray
Dr. Stanton	)	
Mr. Palmer	)	
and	)	to preach.
Mr. Whitaker	)	

Articles of the Church of England

Article XI

Of the justification of man  
We are accounted righteous before  
God, only for the merit of our Lord  
and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by faith,  
and not for our own works or  
deservings.

Wherefore, that we are justified  
by faith only, is a most wholesome  
doctrine, and very full of comfort,  
as more largely expressed in the  
homily of justification.

Article XII

Of Good Works.

Albeit that good works which are  
the fruits of faith, and follow

Revised Articles of the Assembly

Article XI

Of the justification of man before  
God.

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

Article XII

Of Good Works.

Good works which are the fruits of  
faith, and follow after

justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment, yet they are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

#### Article XIII

On Works before Justification.

Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace or [as the school authors say] deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin.

justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgement, yet are they, notwithstanding their imperfections, in the sight of God pleasing and acceptable unto Him in and for Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruits.

#### Article XIII

Of works before Justification.

Works done before justification by Christ and regeneration by His Spirit, are not pleasing unto God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or [as the school authors say] deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done they sinfull.



Article XIV

Of works of Supererogation

Voluntary works besides over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required, whereas Christ sayeth plainly, "when that you have done all that are commanded of you, say, we are unprofitable servants".

Article XVI

Of Christ alone without sin. [While this was debated no change was made to the Article as it stood.]

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh and in His Spirit. He came to be a lamb without spot, Who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin [as St. John saith] was not in Him. But all the rest although baptised and born again in Christ yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.

Article XIV

Of works of supererogation

Voluntary works besides over and above God's commandments which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required, whereas Christ saith plainly, "when ye have done all that are commanded to you, say we are yet unprofitable servants."

Brief biographies of those continental theologians cited in  
the Ms. Minutes of Session 45-74

Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274)

One of the outstanding Medieval theologians, whose theological definitions and philosophical speculations have passed into all types of theology. Augustinian in emphasis, many of the reformers unconsciously accepted much of his methodology. He is cited twice in the debates on the revision of the Articles, and often his definitions are used even though they are not always acknowledged, as is the case with Session 62, where his definition of heresy is the one accepted by the delegates. (F. C. Copleston, Aquinas).

Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609)

A theological professor at Leyden, who entered into a theological controversy with Franciscus Gomarus, one of his colleagues, on the topic of predestination. His was a moderate position that became more extreme after his death, and aroused the Calvinists of Holland. The controversy led to the Synod of Dort in 1619 at which the Calvinists triumphed. Eventually the Arminianism of the followers of Arminius became one of the chief errors dealt with by the Assembly, especially as it had been supported by the deposed Archbishop Laud. (C. Bangs, Arminius, a study in the Dutch reformation.)

Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621)

A Jesuit theologian who became a cardinal. He taught at the New Roman College and his ability as a controversialist

gained him a fine reputation. In his book on controversy he laid the foundation of missionary polemic. He was answered by various reformed theologians who recognised the danger which his learning and position presented to the reformation. He gained notoriety in England by entering into controversy with James I. The Westminster divines mentioned him only once and then only as having been refuted by Chamier (Session 54). As a Romanist he was seen as a danger to be combated.

Theodore Beza (1519-1605)

A humanist and theologian he was Calvin's successor at Geneva. As such he exerted considerable influence on the whole of the reformed church. He was a leading polemicist and controversialist of his day. His edition of the New Testament with his own extensive footnotes became standard in England and Scotland, and his reputation was second to none with the Assembly divines. He is always cited as an authority, and with approval. (Sessions 50, 57 and 71). (H.M. Baird, Theodore Beza; R. M. Kingdon, Geneva and the consolidation of the French Protestant Movement.)

Tomasso de Vio Cajatan (1465-1534)

Dominican cardinal and theologian. He was a follower of Aquinas and a favourite at Rome because of his defence of the power and monarchical supremacy of the Pope. He met Luther on three occasions and failed each time to make him recant. His biblical writings were obviously known at the Assembly though he is only cited once (Session 45) and then to be contradicted.

John Calvin (1509-1564)

French humanist and reformer whose establishment of Protestantism at Geneva provided a model for most Reformed Churches. His output of Biblical exposition and theological treatises make him one of the most influential of theologians. His Institutes became one of the most important textbooks of theology. His influence with the Assembly is shown by the fact that he is the most cited author. (Sessions 50, 54, 55, 68 and 72). On each occasion that he is cited it is with approval. (J. B. Rogers, Scripture in the Westminster Confession).

Joachim Camararius (1500-1574)

German reformer noted as a philologist, humanist and outstanding Greek scholar. Participant in the Colloquays of Speier and Augsburg, he was a friend of Melancthon. His scholarship is noted in the Assembly debates but his work is referred to only once. (Session 45).

John Cameron (1560-1625)

Theologian who taught at Saumur and attempted the theological reconciliation of Ramist Empiricism and Federal theology. This involved him in denying the nature and grace division of earlier formulations, and provoked a dispute with Daniel Tilenus. As reference to both theologians is made, the Assembly was obviously aware of such differences on the continent. Camero is mentioned once (Session 47) but none of his works are cited.

Daniel Chamier (1565-1621)

French reformed theologian. He was an ardent maintainer of the right of the minority Protestant church in France. He was also a delegate from the French church to the Synod of Dort. As minister and professor at Montauban his learning and wisdom attracted many students. His attacks on Roman theologians earned him further reputation as a defender of the reformed faith. He is cited twice with approval in the minutes. (Sessions 45, 54).

Ambragio Contarini (1484-1552)

A Dominican theologian and polemicist of considerable influence. He was an opponent of Cajatan and published against him. When a delegate to the Council of Trent, he was attacked as a free thinker. His name amongst those of the others as a source cited by the Assembly shows that the delegates were aware of the doctrinal controversies within the Roman church. He is mentioned once at the same time as Cajatan. (Session 45)

Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641)

Dutch theologian and leader of the strict Calvinist party at the Synod of Dort. He had entered in to controversy with Arminius when they were colleagues at Leyden over the subject of predestination. After Dort, where his party carried the day, he retired to Saumur and Gronigen. He was cited with approval at the Assembly. (Sessions 48, 50).

Tileman Hesshusen (1527-1588)

Lutheran theologian and bishop of Samland whose defence of the idea that Christ was omnipotent in his humanity because of his two natures, was opposed by Beza. The Assembly minutes refer

to him only once (Session 66) but in so doing they show the awareness of continental debate.

Franciscus Junius (1545-1602)

Reformed theologian, taught at both heidelberg (1584) and Leyden (1593). He was a disciple of Calvin and adopted his theological method and defended his theological position. His famous writings were against Robert Bellarmine and later against the anti-Trinitarians. His book on the use of the Old Testament in the New was amongst the first of its kind. He was respected by his contemporaries as is mirrored in the Assembly debates, where he is cited twice with approval and respect. (Sessions 48, 50).

Martin Luther (1483-1546)

The great German reformer whose theology fired and sustained the Reformation. From Wittenberg he established a church which owed no allegiance to the Roman Pontiff, and produced a theology which was based upon a principle of the authority of scripture as understood by the interpretive principle of justification by faith. His numerous writings while known to the Assembly were not often cited. His works are referred to three times in all (Sessions 45, 47, 72) though his theology taken in its totality was not acceptable. (R. Bainton, Here I stand; A. G. Dickens, Martin Luther and the Reformation.)

Philip Melancthon (1497-1560)

German reformer who was amongst the most accomplished humanists and theologians of his time. His attempts to bring about a reconciliation between Luther and the reformed churches, and the Catholic church failed. Because of this irenic spirit

Melanchthon was never fully supported by any party, though all accepted his undoubted ability. That he was only cited once (Session 54) reflects the distrust with which he was regarded. (R. Stupperich, Melanchthon; M. Mogness, Melanchthon, Reformer without honour).

Casper Olivianus (1536-1587)

German reformer, educated at Paris, Orleans and Bourges. He visited Geneva where he came under the influence of Calvin. When teaching at Treves, his evangelical forthrightness resulted in his imprisonment. After the intervention of Elector Fredrick III, he was given a teaching post at Heidelberg from where he helped to produce the Heidelberg Catechism. His reputation grew with the widespread use of the Catechism, at the same time his writings were disseminated. He is referred to only once in the text. (Session 46).

Andreas Osiander (1498-1565)

A German reformer who advocated the distribution of both elements in the sacrament of communion. He attended the Colloquay of Marburg where he sided with Luther against Zwingli. His doctrine of justification whereby new believers became partakers of the divine nature was condemned only after bitter controversy. Osiander is referred to only once in the sessions. (Session 43). Then it is to condemn him.

Johannes Piscator (1546-1625)

German theologian who taught at Strasburg and Heidelberg. A follower of the Ramist method he wrote commentaries on both the Old and New Testaments. However he denied the dogma of the active

work of Christ asserting that "whosoever denies that Christ was subject to the law, denies that He was a man". He argued that if the active obedience were imputed then man would be freed from obedience as well as the curse. His doctrine caused great debate both on the continent and in the Assembly. That he was cited four times at the Assembly (Sessions 46, 52, 72 and 48) shows how widespread was the controversy. That he was variously attacked and supported shows how even the Assembly was divided. Eventually his doctrine was condemned by most churches. (F. L. Bos, Johan Piscator).

Girolamo Savonarola (1452-1498)

Italian reformer. He was a Dominican preacher who gained fame after preaching a series of sermons on the Apocalypse. Settling in Florence, he became Prior of San Marco. He attacked the influential Medici family and encouraged democracy of the sort to be seen at Venice. His anti-papal statements provoked Alexander VI and when he placed a ban on the city the mob turned against Savonarola and allowed him to be burnt. He is mentioned only once in Session 45. (R. Ridolfi, The Life of Girolamo Savonarola).

John Duns Scotus (1266-1308)

Scholastic theologian who disagreed with Aquinas and asserted that faith was a matter of will and could not be supported by logical proofs. Although he argued by reason to the existence of God, he taught that all knowledge of God would only come by sheer belief. His theological distinctions were not favoured by the reformation theologians, as they were regarded as being too subtle and obscure. He is cited only twice. (Sessions 45, 70).

(E. Bettioni, Duns Scotus, the basic principles of his philosophy.)



Abraham Scultetus (1566-1624)

German reformed theologian. Taught at Heidelberg. His works, as well as his career, were irenic in tone, and he sought the unification of Protestantism. His works were well known in his lifetime. However, his influence declined rapidly at his death. He is mentioned only once in Session 46.

Lelio Sozzini (1525-1562)

He, with his nephew Fausto (1539-1604), were the forces behind the foundation of Socinianism. They taught a rationalist interpretation of Scripture, an acceptance of Jesus as the revelation of God, but nevertheless solely a man; no resistance; the separation of church and state; and the doctrine of the death of the soul with the body. Socinianism mentioned only once (Session 47) and then it was condemned. (G. H. Williams, The Radical Reformation).

Daniel Tilenus (1563-1633)

A reformed theologian, who taught at Saumur until he was attacked by DuMoulin over his allegedly Zwinglian eucharistic theology, and also his understanding of the hypostatical union. He also entered into debate with Camero about his understanding of grace. This dispute was suppressed by the French National Synod of Tomeia. The Assembly, as has been already stated, showed their knowledge of continental debate by referring to him at the same time as Camero. (Session 47).

Peter Martyr Vermigli (1500-1562)

An Augustinian monk, he became a reformer. Forced by his order to leave Italy, he went to Strasburg and later Oxford.

He disputed the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, and attacked Stancaró's doctrine as the merit of Christ. His time spent at Oxford made him a favourite author of the English Puritans and it is surprising to find so little reference to him in the text. (Session 49). (P. McNair, Peter Martyr in Italy).

APPENDIX 3

A list of those recorded as having taken part in the debates on the revision of the Thirty-nine Articles, together with bibliographical references where possible.

John Arrowsmith (1602-1659)

Master of St. John's Cambridge and Regius Professor at the University.

Reid I 106 f; D. N. B. II 124 f.

Theophilus Bathurst

Nothing is known of this delegate.

Thomas Baylie (1582-1663)

Rector of Maningford, later became a conventicle preacher.

Reid I 130 f; D. N. B. III 447 f.

Cornelius Burgess (1589-1665)

One of the two Assessors appointed to deputise for the Prolocutor. He was removed for petitioning Parliament privately, but subsequently reinstated.

Reid I 68 f; D. N. B. VII 301.

Jeremiah Burroughs (1599-1646)

Independent. A member of the five "dissenting brethren" who defended a congregational position at the Assembly.

Reid I 155 f; D. N. B. VII 445; N. I. D. C. C. 169.

Edmund Calamy (1600-1666)

One of the Smectymnus group of polemicists. An anti-Independent Presbyterian.

Reid I 165f; D. N. B. VIII 227; N. I. D. C. C. 174.

Sir John Clotworthy (d. 1665)

Antrim landowner. M.P. for Maldon 1640 and opposed Laud and Strafford. Expelled from the Commons after being accused of embezzlement.

D. N. B. XI 126.

William Carter (d. 1658)

Became a Congregationalist, was minister in London.

Reid I 190 f.

Thomas Case (1598-1682)

A Presbyterian yet Royalist. He was a lecturer at London and became Chaplain to Charles II.

Reid I 204; D. N. B. IX 264.

Humphrey Chambers: (d. 1662)

Minister of Pewsey in Wiltshire.

Reid I 221 f.

Thomas Coleman (1598-1647)

He was a Hebraist of fame, and Rector of St. Peter's Cornhill.

Reid I 236 f; D. N. B. XI 290.

John De la Marche

Minister of the French Church, London.

Reid II 70 f.

Daniel Featley (1582-1645)

Controversialist and Provost of Chelsea College. Later he was expelled because, as a supporter of episcopacy and a Royalist, he passed on information from the Assembly to Ussher, who was with the King at Oxford.

D. N. B. XVIII 276.

Thomas Gataker (1574-1654)

Lecturer at Lincoln's Inn and Rector of Rotherhithe.

Reid I 283 f; E. N. B. XXI 60.

John Gibbon

Minister of Waltham.

Reid I 315 f.

Samuel Gibson

Minister at Burley, Rutland.

Reid I 316.

Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)

Independent leader of the five "dissenting brethren".

Reid I 319 f; D. N. B. XXII 148; N. I. D. C. C. 423.

William Gouge (1578-1653)

Fellow of King's Cambridge. Rector of St. Ann's Blackfriars.

Reid I 343 f; D. N. B. XXII 271.

Stanley Gower

Minister of Brompton-Bryan.

Reid I 363 f.

John Greene

Minister of Pencombe, Hereford.

Reid I 364 f.

Henry Hall

Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge.

Reid II 5 f.

Charles Herle (1598-1659)

Represented Lancashire at the Assembly. He was appointed

Prolocutor 1646.

Reid II 24 f; D. N. B. XXVI 246.

Richard Herricke (1600-1667)

Warden of Manchester Collegiate Church, and one of those who established Presbyterianism in Lancashire.

Reid II 30 f; D. N. B. XXVI 325.

Thomas Hill (d. 1653)

Master of Trinity Cambridge and Vice-Chancellor of the University.

Reid II 34 f; D. N. B. XXVI 423.

Thomas Hodges (d. 1672)

Minister of Kensington.

Reid II 42 f.

Joshua Hoyle

Master of University College Oxford, and Regius Professor of Divinity at the University.

Reid II 45 f; D. N. B. XXVIII 134.

John Ley (1583-1662)

Prebendary of Chester and President of Sion College.

Reid II 50; D. N. B. XXXIII 207.

John Lightfoot (1602-1675)

Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge, and a Vice-Chancellor of the University. An Erastian.

Reid II 55 f; D. N. B. XXXIII 229; N. I. D. C. C. 596.

Matthew Newcomen (1610-1669)

A member of the Smectymnus group and a lecturer at Dedham.

Reid II 87 f; D. N. B. XI 324.

Philip Nye (1596-1672)

A moderate Independent who assisted with the drafting of the Solemn League and Covenant.

Reid II 89; D. N. B. XLI 279; N. I. D. C. C. 719.

Herbert Palmer (1601-1647)

Lecturer at Westminster Abbey and famous as Catechist. Later became President of Queen's College, Cambridge.

Reid II 95; D. N. B. XLIII 130.

William Price (d. 1666)

Minister of the Presbyterian Church at Amsterdam.

Reid II 128; D. N. B. XLVI 324.

William Rayner (d. 1666)

Minister of Eggham, Surrey.

Reid II 127 f.

Sidrach Simpson (1600-1655)

Independent, one of the five "dissenting brethren". Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

D. N. B. LII 277.

Lord Say and Serle (1582-1662)

William Fiennes, Lord Lt. of Oxfordshire, Cheshire, and Gloucestershire.

D. N. B. XVIII 433.

Lazarus Seaman (d. 1675)

Rector of All Hallows, Bread Street. Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Reid II 133 f; D. N. B. LI 162.

Obadiah Sedgwick (1600-1658)

Chaplain to Sir Horace Vere, Rector of St. Paul's, Covent Garden.

Reid II 141; D. N. B. LI 183.

John Selden (1584-1654)

Lawyer and Erastian member of the Assembly.

D. N. B. LI 212; N. I. D. C. C. 895.

Peter Smith

Reid II 148.

Edmond Staunton (1600-1671)

Vicar of Kingston-on-Thames and President of Corpus Christi.

Reid II 152; D. N. B. LIV 112.

Peter Sterry (d. 1672)

Chaplain to Cromwell. A Cambridge Platonist.

Reid II 174; D. N. B. LIV 224.

Francis Taylor (d. 1662)

Minister of Yalding, Kent.

Reid II 179.

Thomas Temple.

Minister of Battersea.

Reid II 182.

Anthony Tuckney

Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge and Regius Professor of  
Divinity at the University.

Reid II 186 f.

William Twisse (1578-1646)

Prolocutor of the Assembly. A theologian with an international  
reputation.

Reid XX I 37; D.N.B. LVII 397-9; G.G.R. 5 1090; H.S.H.E.R.K. 12 45.

Thomas Valentine

Minister of Chalfont St. Giles.

Reid II 190 f.

Richard Vines: (1600-1656)

Presbyterian who served on the drafting committee of the Confession  
of Faith. He was an Amyraldist.

Reid II 191 f; D. N. B. LVIII 369; N. I. D. C. C. 1020.



George Walker (d. 1651)

Minister of St. John Evangelist's, London.

Reid II 199 f.

Jeremiah Whitaker (1599-1654)

Rector of St. Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey.

Reid II 216; D. N. B. XLI 16.

John White (1575-1648)

Rector of Holy Trinity, Dorchester.

D. N. B. XLI 59.

Henry Wilkinson (1610-1675)

Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Lady Margaret Professor of  
Divinity at the University.

Reid II 247 f; D. N. B. LXI 269.

Thomas Wilson (1601-1653)

Minister of Otham and Maidstone, Kent.

Reid II 251 f.

Francis Woodcock (1614-1651)

Minister in London; youngest member of the Assembly.

Reid II 265 f.

Thomas Young (1587-1655)

Master of Jesus College, Cambridge.

Reid II 267; D. N. B. LXIII 392.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Table of Abbreviations and Reference Works consulted.

Collection of State Papers, Domestic, cccclxxii - London, 1640

- D.N.B.            Dictionary of National Bibliography.  
Ed. Leslie Stephen, 1884-1905.
- G.G.R.            Die Religion in geschichte und gegenwart,  
Ed. H. F. Von Campenhausen, Tubingen, 1957.
- N.C.E.            New Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, 1957.
- N.I.D.C.C.        New International Dictionary of the Christian Church,  
Ed. J. D. Douglas, Exeter, 1974.
- N.S.H.E.R.K.     New Schaff-Hertzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,  
Ed. S.M. Jackson, New York, 1912.
- P.G.             Patrologia cursus completus, Series Graeca,  
Ed. J. P. Migne, 162 vols. Paris, 1857-66.
- P.L.             Patrologia cursus completus, Series Latina,  
Ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols. Paris, 1844-64.
- J.C.             Journal of the House of Commons, 1640-46.
- J.L.             Journal of the House of Lords, 1623-45.

I - PRIMARY SOURCES

Dr. Williams' Library, London.

Records of Nonconformity. 1 - 3.

Minutes of Westminster Assembly, 4th. August, 1643 to  
25th. March, 1652.

New College Library, Edinburgh.

Transcription of Minutes of Westminster Assembly by Sir E. Maude  
Thompson, procured by a committee of the General Assembly of the  
Church of Scotland.

Pamphlets, British Museum, London.

E 105(34)

An Ordinance of Parliament for the calling of an Assembly of  
Divines to be consulted with by Parliament for the setting of the  
government and lyturgy of the Church of England, with the names of  
all ministers and others appointed for the same.

Printed for John Wright. 1643.

E 62(1)

A proclamation of Parliament summoning the Assembly of Divines  
to meet on July 1st. 1643. Printed for John Wright. 1643.

E 62(2)

A proclamation of Parliament ordering ministers to pray for the  
Assembly of Divines. Printed for John Wright. 1643.

E 63(19)

A copy of the petition of the Divines of the Assembly delivered  
to Parliament, 19th. July, together with the answer to the second  
petition. Printed for G. M. for Christopher Meredith. 1643.

E 67(10)

A letter from the Assembly of Divines in England to the Generall Assembly in Scotland, together with the answer of the Generall Assembly of Scotland thereunto. For John Bellamie and Ralph Smith. 1643.

E 70(22)

The Covenant, with a narrative of the proceedings and solemn manner of taking it by the House of Commons and the Assembly of Divines, 25th. September. For Thomas Underhill. 1643.

E 162(3)

Diaries of Sir Simonds D'Ewes.

E 197(1)

Collection of Speeches (1642) by Sir Simonds D'Ewes.

E 294(4)

Two letters, the one from the Scottish Commission at London to the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, the other from the Synod of Divines in England to the Generall Assembly of Scotland, 23 January and 13 February. Printed by J. Ramworth. 1645.

II - PRINTED SECONDARY SOURCES and REFERENCES

- St. Ambrose, Exposito Evangelii secundam Lucam, Patrologia Latina 14/15. Edited J.P.Migne, Paris 1845.
- St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologia, translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London 1916.
- B. G. Armstrong, Calvinism and the Amyraut heresy, Michigan 1969
- St. Athanasius, Contra Arianos Oratio II, In Patrologia Graeca 26. Edited J.P.Migne, Paris 1857.
- St. Augustine, Epistolarum Classis III, Epistola CL.  
P.L. 33 Migne, Paris 1861.  
In Joannis Evangelium, tractatus CXXXIV,  
P.L. 35 Migne, Paris 1865.  
Errationes in Psalms In P.L. 36/37  
Migne, Paris 1865.  
De Spiritu et Lettera liber unus, P.L. 44  
Migne, Paris 1861.  
De Gratia et libro Arbitrio liber unus,  
P.L. 44 Migne, Paris 1861.  
De Nuptiis et concupiscentia libri II,  
P.L. 44 Migne, Paris 1861.
- Robert Bellie, Letters and Journals, Ed. Laing Bannatyne Club 73, Edinburgh 1842.
- Roland Bainton, Here I stand, 1950.
- H. M. Baird, Theodore Beza, the counsellor of the French Reformation, 1899.
- F. J. Bethune-Baker, Nestorius and his teaching, London 1908.
- C. Bangs, Arminius, a study in the Dutch Reformation, 1971.
- St. Bernard, Ad Milites templi de laude novae militiae liber,  
P.L. 182. Migne, Paris 1862.  
Sermones in Cantica Canticorum, P.L. 183,  
Migne, Paris 1862.

- E. Beltoni, Duns Scotus, the basic principles of his philosophy, translated by B.M. Bonansea, 1961.
- W. Beveridge, History of the Westminster Assembly, Edinburgh, 1904.
- Theodore Beza, Annotationes majores in Novum Dn. Nostri Jesu Christi testamentum. In duas .. partes .. noua autem haec editio multo correctior, Geneva 1594.
- Iesu Christi D.N. Novum Testamentum, sive novum foedus. Cuius Graeco contextui respondent interpretationes duae: una, vetus altera T. Beza, diligenter ab eo recognita. Eiusdem Th. Beza annotationes, quas itidem hae tertia editiones recognovit et accessione non parva locupletavit, Geneva 1598.
- F. L. Bos, Johann Piscator; ein Beitrag zur geschichte der reformierten theologie, Kampen 1932.
- R. Bronkema, The Essence of Puritanism, Goes 1929.
- T. de Vio Cajatan, Epistolae Paulig<sup>ae</sup> aliorum apostolorum ad Graecam veritateri castigate, et per Reuerendissimum Dominum Dominum Thomas de Vio, Caietanum Cardinalem Sancti Christi, iuxta sum literalum enarrate, Paris, 1532.
- John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion, translated H. Beveridge, London, 1957.
- In Evangelium secundum Iohannem, Geneva, 1553.
- Commentarii in Isaiam Prophetam, Geneva, 1583.
- Letter CCXXIX "To the Protector Somerset" in Letters of John Calvin, Ed. Jules Bonnet, Translated D. Constable, Edinburgh, 1855.
- S. W. Carruthers, Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly, Lancaster, 1943.

- I. Camerarius, The New Testament. Translated out of the Greek by T. Beza with brief summaries and expositions upon the hard places by I. Camerarius and P. Lofeler Vellerius, London, 1559.
- J. K. Cameron, Letters of John Johnston and Robert Howie, St. Andrews, 1963.
- D. Chemier, Panstratiae Catholicae sive contraversiarum de religione adversus pontificos corpus, Geneva, 1626.  
Contraversiarum papatisticorum, quae his quator panstratiae, Geneva, 1642.
- St. Chrysostome, Monitum ad homiliam in illud, P.G. 51, Migne, Paris, 1862.
- W. S. Clarke, History of English Non-conformity, London, 1911.
- St. Clement I of Rome, Epistola I ad Corinthios, P.G. 1, Migne, Paris, 1861.
- Casper Contareni, Opera, Paris, 1571.
- F. C. Copleston, Aquinas, London, 1955.
- St. Cyril, Commentarium in Evangelium Joannis, P.G. 73, Migne, Paris, 1864.
- John Davenant, Praelectiones de Duobus in theologia controversis. Capitibus de iudice contraversiarum, primo. De iustitia habituali et actuali altero, Cambridge, 1631.  
Determinationes quaestionum quarundam theologiarum, Cambridge, 1634.
- J. R. DeWitt, Jus Divinum, Kampen, 1969.
- A. G. Dickens, Martin Luther and the Reformation, London, 1967.
- A. H. Drysdale, History of the Presbyterians in England, London, 1890.
- T. Erastus, Explicatio Gravissimae quaestionis utrum excommunicatio, quatenus religionem intelligentes et amplexantes, a sacramentorum usu propter admissum facinus arcet; mandatum nitatur divino an excogitata sit ab hominibus, London, 1589.

- O. Fatio, Methodes et Theologie, Lambert Daneau et les debuts de la scolastique reformee, Geneva, 1976.
- D. Featley, Dippers Dipt. Or the Anabaptists duck'd and plung'd over the head and ears, at a disputation at Southwark. The fifth edition augmented with severall speeches delivered before the Assembly of Divines. London, 1647.
- D. Hay Fleming, Subscribed copies of the Solemn League and Covenant, Edinburgh, 1918.
- S. R. Gardner, History of the Great Civil War, (3 Vols.) London, 1891.
- H. Gee & W. J. Hardy, Documents illustrative of English Church History, London, 1896.
- George Gillespie, Aaron's Rod Blossoming. Or the Divine ordinance of church government vindicated so as the present Erastian controversie is fully discussed, London, 1646.
- Franciscus Gomarus, Opera Theologica Omnia, Amsterdam, 1644.
- Gregory the Great, Morals on the book of Job, (In Library of the Fathers, Vols. 18, 21, 23, 31) Oxford, 1844-50.
- William Haller, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. London, 1955.  
Rise of Puritanism, New York, 1957.
- W. M. Heatherington, History of the Westminster Assembly, Edinburgh, 1882.
- C. J. von Hefele, Histoire des Conciles, translated W. R. Clark, London, 1897.
- Christopher Hill, Puritanism and Revolution, London, 1968.
- T. Hutchinson, History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1628-91, Boston, 1764.
- H. Jedin, History of the Council of Trent, translated E. Graf, London, 1957.
- St. Jerome, Opera Omnia X Novum Testamentum, Epistola ad Corinthos Secunda, P.L. 29, Migne, Paris, 1865.



- Franciscus Junius, Opera Theologica, Geneva, 1613.
- R. Buick Knox, James Ussher - Archbishop of Armagh, Cardiff, 1967.
- John Lightfoot, Journal of the Westminster Assembly, July 1st., 1643 - December 31st., 1644. In Works Vol. 13 Ed. J. R. Pitman, London, 1822-5.
- D. Longinus, Liber de grandi siue sublimi orationis genere. Nunc primum a F. Robortello . . in luce editus ejusdem annotationibus Latinus in margine appositis, Basel, 1554.
- Martin Luther, Lectures on Romans, in Works Ed. J. Pelikan, New York, 1960.  
Lectures on Deuteronomy, In Works Ed. J. Pelikan, New York, 1960.  
Ad Libram examini magistri nostri magistriam brosii Catharini defensoris sil vestri priera tis acer rimi. Responsio Martini Lutheri, Wittenberg, 1521.
- Ed. Brian Manning, Politics, Religion and the English Civil War, London, 1973.
- Justin Martyr, Extant Works, P.G. 1, Migne, Paris, 1861.
- P. Melancthon, Opera Omnium excudebant haeredes, Wittenberg, 1601.
- J. B. Marsdon, History of the Later Puritans, London, 1852.
- D. Mathew, Social Structure in Caroline England. Oxford, 1945.
- A. F. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly, Baird Lectures, 1882, Edinburgh, 1883.
- A. F. Mitchell and Struthers., Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, 1644-49, London, 1897.
- D. Masson, The life of Milton in relation to social, political and ecclesiastical developments of his time, Cambridge, 1859-94.
- M. Mogness, Melancthon. Reformer without honour, 1969.
- P. McNair, Peter Martyr in Italy, 1967.

- J. T. McNeill, The History and Character of Calvinism,  
New York, 1967.
- D. Neal, History of the Puritans, (5 Vols.) London, 1822.
- G. Nuttall, Visible Saints, 1640-60, Oxford, 1957.
- W. Ong, Ramus, Method and the decay of dialogue,  
Cambridge Mass., 1958.
- R. L. Orr, Alexander Henderson, London, 1919.
- John Quick, Synodicon in Galla Reformata, London, 1692.
- J. Reid, Assembly at Westminster -- Eminent Divines,  
(3 Vols.) Paisley, 1815.
- J. B. Rogers, Scripture in the Westminster Confession,  
Kampen, 1967.
- R. Ridolfi, The life of Girolomo Savonarola, 1959.
- John Rushworth, Historical reflections of private passages of  
State, Part 2, 1629-1640 (2 Vols.), Part 3,  
1640-1644 (2 Vols.), 1680, 1692.
- Samuel Rutherford, The divine right of Church government and  
excommunication, London, 1646.  
Peaceable and Temperate plea for Paul's  
presbyterie in Scotland, London, 1642.
- A. Ritschl, History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification  
and Reconciliation, translated H. R. McIntosh,  
Edinburgh, 1900.
- Ed. Conrad Russell, The Origins of the English Civil War, London, 1973.
- G. Savonarola, Exposito orationis dnice fratris Hieronymi  
Savonarole Ferrariensis ordinis Predicatorum.  
Et sermo eiusdem in vigilia natiuitatis domini  
coram fratribus habitus, Paris, 1517.
- P. Schaff, Creeeds of Christendom, (3 Vols.) 4th. Edition,  
New York, 1877-90.

- W. A. Shaw, History of the English Church 1640-60, (2 Vols.)  
London, 1900.
- Johannis Scoti, Opera quae supersunt omnia, Ed. H.J.Floss,  
Paris, 1853.
- T. Stapleton, De Universa justificationis doctrina hodie  
contraversa, Paris, 1581.
- R. Stupperich, Melanchthon. 1965.
- N. Sykes, Ecumenical Movements in Great Britain in the  
17th. and 18th. Centuries, in History of the  
Ecumenical Movement, Ed. R. Rouse & S.C.Neill,  
London, 1954.
- Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, translated  
R. Crawley, London, 1875.
- A. Van Schelven, Hot-Calvinisme Gedurende Zyn Eloetyd, Schotland,  
Engelände, Noord Amerika, Amsterdam, 1951.
- Peter Martyr Vermigli, The Common Places of the most famous and  
renowned divine Doctor Peter Martyr,  
translated A. Marten, London, 1594.
- C. V. Wedgwood, The King's Peace, London, 1956.  
The King's War, London, 1958.
- G. H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, 1962.

III - ARTICLES

- C. A. Briggs, Documentary History of the Westminster Assembly, Presbyterian Review, 1880 Vol. 1 pp 127-164.
- W. S. Crowley, Erastianism in the Westminster Assembly, Journal of Church and State, 1973, Vol. 15 pp 49-64.
- J. N. Figgis, Erastus and Erastianism, Journal of Theological Studies, 1900 Vol. 2 pp 73 f.
- E. W. Kirkby, English Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly, Church History, 1954 Vol. 23 pp 418 f.
- C. S. Pearson, Reluctant Radicals - Independents at the Westminster Assembly, Journal of Church and State, 1969 Vol. 11 pp 473-86.
- B. B. Warfield, The Westminster Assembly and its work, Princeton Theological Review, 1908 Vol. 6 pp 353 f.