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APPENDIX A: PUBLISHED WORKS OF THOMAS GOODWIN

In spite of the fact that he lived in a "pamphlet glutted" age, he was seldom drawn into the whirlpool of literary warfare. The loud epithets of paper pantomime which warped the personalities of many of the greatest Puritan figures never enticed Goodwin. Dr. W. M. Campbell has written recently, that the moderate Independents including Goodwin, stayed out of the pamphlet press because of political astuteness. William M. Campbell, The Triumph of Presbyterianism (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1958), p. 108. But this is to misunderstand Goodwin's basic nature, a nature revealed very clearly in some of his correspondence with John Goodwin early in 1640 (or perhaps 1639). John was attempting unsuccessfully to draw Thomas into a skirmish over the use of Church covenants. But his efforts were fruitless because Thomas wanted a "larger Compass" and "more time" to answer. This correspondence between John and Thomas Goodwin is found in the Works of the latter, Vol. IV (London, 1696), p. 47. Thomas Goodwin was not given to writing premature theological systems on the exigencies of the moment; he wanted time to think and to write, just as he did in 1658 when he wanted Thurloe to secure Irish funds for him so that he could retire from Oxford and finish some of his books. The books which Thomas Goodwin wrote are listed below and the ones with an asterisk (*) are those particularly useful in the study of the Presbyterian–Independent controversy. The list was compiled by comparing the catalogue of the British Museum, the Thomason Catalogue, the McAlpin Catalogue, the Works (1696 ed.), and the Works (1861 ed.).

Agnovation of Sinne... 1637, 1638 (two parts), 1639, 1643, 1659, found in Vol. IV, Works, (1861 edition)

Select Cases of Conscience... 1651, found in Vol. III, Works (1861 ed.).

This was a collection of earlier publications such as Child of Light Walking in Darkness and the Return of Prayers.

Child of Light Walking in Darkness... (preached eight years before according to the epistle "To the Reader"), first entered on April 19, 1635, I:36 (part two), 1638, 1643, reprinted in John Wesley's A Christian Library, vol. 6, 1819 edition, and also in the first number of a series of Ancient Reprints which began in 1855, found in Vol. III, Works (1861 edition)

Christ Set Forth... Meant as a preliminary to another about acts of Justifying Faith (To the Reader), 1642, 1643, 1645, 1647, 1651, 1653, reprinted in 1851, 1841 and in vol. 10 of Doctrinal Puritans, 1847. It appeared in vol. 6, 1819 edition, of John Wesley's Christian Library, found in Vol. IV, Works (1861 edition)

Christ the Universal Peacemaker: or the reconciliation of all the people of God notwithstanding all their differences (London: 1651). This is found in vol. V, Works (1861 ed.).

Discourse of the True Nature of the Gospel... (1695). There is a copy of this in the British Museum, but Goodwin's two books entitled The Glory of the Gospel and A Discourse of the Glory of the Gospel, vol. IV, Works (1861 ed.), did not appear until 1703, when vol. V, of the original edition of the Works was printed. There is no title by the name of The True Nature of the Gospel in
any collection of Goodwin's Works we have seen.

Encouragements to Faith. . .1645, 1647, 1650, found in Vol. IV, Works (1861 edition)

Exposition on Ephesians and Revelation. . .vol. 1, 2, 1842-44, Excerpts of Goodwin's Revelation appeared in 1796 in connection with the French Revolution's having been predicted by him. This is found in vol. I, II, Works (1861 ed.)

Ephesians and the Attributes of God. . .1835

Glories of Christ, 1818 (two issues), abridged by Isaac Watts, 1746

*Government of Churches. . .1722, 1696 Of the Constitution, Order, and Discipline of the Churches of Christ (London: 1696), vol. IV, Works (original edition). Also bound in this same volume is The Government and Discipline of the Churches of Christ, prepared familiarly by way of Question and Answer, which is a summary of the longer book on Church government. Some correspondence between John Goodwin and Thomas Goodwin concerning the use of Church Covenants is appended to the end of the volume.

*A Glimpse of Zion's Glory; or, the Church's Beauty Specified. Briefly laid open in a sermon, at a general Fast Day in Holland. (London: 1641), bound in vol. XII, Works (1861 ed.) The authorship of this sermon is discussed elsewhere in this thesis. Vide supra on eschatology.

*The Great Interest of States and Kingdoms. A Sermon Preached at the Late Fast Before the Commons House of Parliament. Feb. 25, 1645 (London: 1645), also bound in vol. XII, Works (1861 ed.)

Heart of Christ. . .1642, 1651, 1819, vol. 6 of Wesley's Christian Library, found in Vol. IV, Works (1861 ed.). In the nineteenth century, this book of Thomas Goodwin's stirred up an academic storm, because it was alleged that it inspired the Roman Catholic devotion to the Sacred Heart. On this whole question, vide Stephen Leslie et Sidney Lee (eds.), Dictionary of National Biography (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1890), pp. 148-150, XXII; et British Weekly, (June 9, 1898) vol. 24, p. 134 on La Colombier, etc. (The actual date of the Heart of Christ's first appearing is variously given. The D.N.B. gives it as 1643, but a copy dated 1642 is in the McAlpin Collection.)

Most Holy and Profitable Sayings of Thomas Goodwin...1660 (?), found in Vol. XII, Works (1861 edition).

Patience and its Work. . .written after the destruction of his library in the Great Fire of London, 1666, 1667, 1838, found in Vol. II, Works (1861 ed.)

Return of Prayers. . .1636 (two editions), 1638, 1641, 1643, 1651, 1819, vol. 7 of Wesley's Christian Library, 1823, 1825, 1839. This acknowledges indebtedness to a nobleman indicating that he had taken refuge with him during the years prior to his departure for Holland. This is found in Vol. III, Works (1861 edition).

*A Sermon of the Fifth Monarchy. Proving by Invincible Arguments, That the Saints
shall have a Kingdom here on Earth, Which is yet to come, after the Fourth Monarchy is destroy'd by the Sword of the Saints, the followers of the Lamb. Preached by Mr. Tho. Goodwin, on Nov. 5, 9, 10. By which it will appear, that it is for the same Truth (that formerly was so much contended for) that some of the People of God suffer at this day. (London: 1654). Apparently, this sermon was omitted from the Works.

State of Glory. ... copy of which is in the British Museum, dated 1654. There are two sermons of Goodwin with this title, however: Of the Blessed State of Glory Which the Saints Possess After Death, vol. VII, Works (1661 ed.); and An Immediate State of Glory for the Saints of Just Men, Upon Dissolution, Demonstrated, vol. XII, Works (1661 ed.). Another, by a similar title is bound in vol. V, Works (1703), entitled Of the State of Glory to which Christ is exalted in Heaven.


Tryall of Christian Growth. . . . First printed during his absence from England, i.e. 1659 (To the Reader), 1641, 1643, 1650, 1819 (vol. 7 of Wesley's Christian Library), found in Vol. III, Works (1861 edition).

Treatise of Heaven. . . . 1638

Extracts from Thomas Goodwin called "A Sweet Morsel, or divine Cordial" by Philip Rose, printed 1629.

Two discourses of Punishment of Sin in Hell (1693), British Museum. Another is dated 1680, Of the Punishment of Sin in Hell, also found in the British Museum. Goodwin's sermons on this subject are bound in vol. X, Works (1661 ed.), entitled An Unregenerate Man's Guiltiness Before God, etc. and the XIIIth Book concerns "the punishment of sin in hell."

Vanity of Thoughts. . . . 1637, 1638 (two editions), 1643, 1650, 1850, found in Vol. III, Works (1861 edition)

*The World to Come; or the Kingdom of Christ Asserted. . . . 1655, bound in vol. XII, Works (1861 edition)

*Zerubbabel's encouragement to finish the temple (London: 1642), bound in vol. XII, Works (1861 ed.)

Several tracts were issued by Goodwin under joint authorship with others and all omitted from the collected Works:

*A Copy of a Remonstrance Lately Delivered in to the Assembly By Thomas Goodwin, Jeremiah Burroughs, William Greenhill, William Bridge, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simson, and William Carter. Declaring the Grounds and Reasons of their declining to bring in to the Assembly, their model of Church Government. (London: 1645), not found in Works.

*Independent's Declaration. . . . 1647
*The Principles of Faith, presented by Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson and other Ministers to the Committee of Parliament for Religion. Thomson's date is Nov. 2, 1654. In Holland, this was published under the title De Fondamenten des Geloofs, representeert by Mr. T.G., Mr. Nye, Mr. S. Simpson, an andere ministres, den de Cocommitteerden van't Parlement, ter saecke van religie, etc. (Amsterdam, 1654). Goodwin's Principles of Faith were not universally acclaimed. Thomson says that on Nov. 28, 1654, Christopher Atkinson's The Sword of the Lord drawn and furnished against the man of sin. In answer to a panic by Thomas Goodwin, one Nye, and Sydrach Simpson, appeared in answer to it.

*The Grand Debate Concerning Presbyterian and Independency by the Assembly of Divines convened at Westminster by authority of Parliament, etc. (1652).

*Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren. . .1645, 1648

*The Humble Proposals of Mr. Cen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Simpson and other Ministers under debate by a Committee for the furtherance and propagation of the Gospel in this Nation. (1652). There is a reprint of this in the Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society, IX (1924-1926), 21ff., article entitled "The Independents of 1652" by F.J. Fowick. This is the first time that Owen's name precedes Thomas Goodwin's at the head of the Dissenting Brethren. Vide appendix article on the leadership of the Brethren.

*Apologetical Narration. . .(1643, several editions), and reprinted in Haller's *Tracts on Liberty*, 1934. Unfortunately, the *Narration* is not included in the Works.

This tract was a petition to Parliament for a limited toleration of the moderate Independent party. It set forth the general principles of their church polity in the most modest and advantageous language. The importance of the document to the history of religious toleration can scarcely be underestimated. G.P. Gooc, in his *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 1927), p.111, says that it marks a turning point in the history of Independency in England.

Very probably, Thomas Goodwin never authored a more controversial piece of literature. It was immediately beset on every hand by literary violence. The literary situation surrounding the *Narration* was so confused that John Goodwin wrote, in his *A Reply of two of the Brethren to A. B.* etc. (London: n.d.), p.1, that "many Replies in a few weeks [i.e., to the *Narration*] apparently have turned the world, if not the Church, upside down; most men seeming to be resolved before the Arguments are solved." Baillie, too, mentions the literary storm raised by the *Narration* saying that "many pens have fallen more sharpie than we on their *Apologetick Narration*." Vide a public letter of April 2, 1644, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie* etc. (ed. by David Laing, Edinburgh: printed for Robert Ugle, 1841), p.146, II. The lists are found in Wilbur K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England 1640-1660* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1958), p.370n; et William Haller (ed.), *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution 1658-1647* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), pp.51,52. Haller discusses the *Narration* at length in chap. VI entitled, "The Appeal to Public Opinion." It is to be hoped that the work of the Rev. Ernest Parsons, West Bromwich, will soon be forthcoming. He has been preparing a history of the
Apologetical Narration for several years.

The date of the Apologetical Narration has given much cause for discussion. Henry Martyn Dexter, The Congregationalism of the Past Three Hundred Years As Seen In Its Literature (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876-79), p.659, gives the general date of January, 1644. A. H. Drysdale, History of the Presbyterians in England: Their Rise, Decline, and Revival (London: Publication Committee of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1889), p.299, reasons that it must have been February, 1643/4 when it first appeared.

Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Great Civil War 1642-1644 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1894), p.263, I, hesitantly suggested that its date was January 1, 1644, but even the author doubted his own suggestion. The confusion results primarily from the system of dating. In England, the old style of dating prevailed until 1750, whereby the first of the year came on March 25th, corresponding with the Parliamentary calendar. In Scotland, however, the new style of dating from January 1st prevailed from 1600 on. The Narration itself bears the date 1643, but this includes any time from March 25th, 1643 to March 24th, 1644. Berndt Gustafsson's The Five Dissenting Brethren: A Study On the Dutch Background of Their Independistism (Upland: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1955), p.9ff, gives a more complete discussion of the date of the Narration reasoning that the date of its distribution to the Assembly was January 4th, 1643/4 and that it was printed in December, 1643. Edwards, in his Gangraena, p.50, Part II, asserted that the Narration came out in December, 1643, but if this is true, then he saw it before the members of the Westminster Assembly, which seems not at all likely. It is this reference upon which Gustafsson relies for his dubious opinion. Thomason dated it January 3rd, 1643/4. H.M. Hetherington, in his History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (Edinburgh: James Gammell, 1878, fourth edition), p.187, dates it at the end of January or early February, 1643/4. Baillie's first mention of it is in a letter of February 18th, 1643/4. Vide Baillie's Letters, op. cit., pp.129-130, II. Gustafsson's reference to Baillie in this regard is pp.420, 421, I, which seems to be a different edition. In a letter of January 1st, 1643/4, Baillie's Letters, op. cit., p.128, II, there is no mention of the tract which seems strange if Edwards was authentic in saying that it came out in December. The date must be somewhere between Jan. 1, 1644 and Feb. 10, 1644, but could hardly be after Feb. 9, the date Thomason gives for Roger Williams's Queries. The difficulty remains to determine exactly what prompted its publication and the subsequent date. Gustafsson is probably right in saying that its appearance was connected with something that happened in the Assembly towards the end of December, but unfortunately, there is a gap in the published minutes from December 20th 1643 to February 15, 1644. Vide Five Dissenting Brethren, op. cit., p.12.

Gustafsson's admission that it is a "hazardous work to decide what it finally was that compelled the brethren to publish this tract" (loc. cit.), is further enhanced by the fact that the credibility of both Edwards and Baillie is extremely doubtful. Since Gustafsson relies on these two witnesses for his reasoning, the subsequent conclusions are questionable.

Baillie's complete statement is as follows:

"At last, forseeing they behooved ere long, to come to the point they put out in print, on a sudden, an Apologetical Narration
of their way, which long had lyen readie beside them, wherein they petition the Parliament, in a most able and cunning way, for a toleration, and withall lends too bold wayses to all Reformed churches, as imperfyte yet in their reformation while their new medall be embraced, which they sett out in generall so well faried as they are able. This piece abruptlie they presented to the Assemblie, giving to every member a copy; also they gave books to some of either House." This a pears in Letters, op. cit., p.129, 139, II, Feb. 18, 1644, to W. Jpeng.

If Baillie is right in saying that they had possessed the Narration for some time before its first public appearance, then we must yet find a reason for its eventual release. Edwards, in his Antapologia, op. cit., p.5, believed that the document was issued in order to offset the criticism of Independents outside the Westminster Assembly who were unhappy with the agreement of their leaders not to gather any more churches. Vide supra on "Gathered Churches". Gustafsson, op. cit., p.12, suggests that the petition of the Baptists from Amsterdam for a full liberty of conscience was the occasion of the Narration's appearance. But there is perhaps another possibility which better fits the facts. Lightfoot records that the Scottish Commissioners gave out copies of a book of their own church government to the members of the Assembly on January 24th, 1643/4 in his The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines etc. (ed. by John Rogers Pitman, London: 1624), p.119, Works, vol. XIII. Cf. Carruthers, op. cit., pp. 111, 112, who discusses this Scottish book. The day following (January 25th), Stephen Marshall brought in a further paper from the Scottish Commissioners. Vide Lightfoot, op. cit., p.119. Such an open attempt by the Scots to influence the Assembly in favor of their system, we believe, was the immediate reason why the Independents decided to release their Apologetical Narration. If this is so, then the tract appeared after January 24th. Neither the Minutes, Lightfoot's Journal, nor George Gillespie's Notes say anything about the Narration being distributed anytime in January, which seems strange if Gustafsson, et al. are correct. Edwards contended, in fact, that the tract was intended to embarrass the Scots, because the Independents recognized them as their real antagonists [Antapologia, op. cit., p.5]. And if this were true (as probably it was) then the Narration appeared after the Scottish documents. It would also lend light to Alexander Forbes's statement in his An Anatomy, op. cit., p.3, that the Apology came onto the stage in "a nick of time". Furthermore, it better explains Roger Williams's intention when he wrote his Queries of Highest Consideration etc. addressed to both the Apologists and the Scottish Commissioners. In the public mind, there is little doubt but what the Narration and the Scottish "book" on government were connected with each other. It might be that the Narration prompted the Scottish answer as well as vice versa. Baillie remarked that the Scots intended to vindicate themselves from its aspersions [supra] but there seems to be little on either side to prove conclusively the argument. Both William Hailor and Wilbur K. Jordan disagree with this hypothesis. They say that the Scots brought out their apology after the Narration appeared in print. Vide Hallor's article entitled, "The Word of God in the Westminster Assembly", Church History, XVIII (Dec., 1949), p.212; et Jordan, op. cit., p.370n. But if Baillie's statement is true that the Apology had been in existence a long time before it came out in print, it is certainly
It is possible that the Scots had seen it and prepared their answer before January 24th. That the Independents did not rush into print with their apology is almost certain, because of (1) Baillie's assertion that they had had it a long time before they presented it; (2) because Thomas Goodwin, its principal author, would never allow anything with his name on it to be published prematurely; (3) on the day the Narration was distributed in the Assembly, Baillie [Letters, op. cit., p.130] tells that the Independents gave a huge feast for all the members, indicating a certain amount of preparation for the event.

The complete works of Thomas Goodwin began appearing soon after his death in 1680. Volume I, 1681; II, 1683; III, 1692; IV, 1697; V, 1704.


The best but unfortunately still incomplete edition appeared in 1861 with a memoir by Robert Halley in twelve volumes.

Several of Goodwin's pieces were evidently not published until the first collection of his works appeared after his death. These included such books as his Government of Churches and others already mentioned. Besides the editions in the collected Works, we have found no earlier editions of the following:

Of the Creatures, and The Condition of Their State By Creation, vol. VII, Works (1861 ed.).


Man's Restoration By Grace, vol. VII, Works (1861 ed.).


Of Christ the Mediator, vol. V, Works (1861 ed.).

The Supereminence of Christ Above Moses, vol. V, Works (1861 ed.).

The One Sacrifice, vol. V, Works (1861 ed.).

Reconciliation By the Blood of Christ, vol. V, Works (1861 ed.).

Three Sermons on Hab. 1.1,2., vol. V, Works (1861 ed.).

A Discourse of Election, vol. IX, Works (1861 ed.).

A Discourse of Thankfulness, vol. IX, Works (1861 ed.).

The Knowledge of God the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, vol. IV Works (1861 ed.).
Of the work of the Holy Ghost (the Third Person of the Trinity) In Our Salvation, vol. III, Works (1861 ed.).

In addition to these works written by Goodwin, himself, the following is a list of works written by others which he assisted in bringing to the press:

Jeremiah Burroughs, 9th, 10th, 11th Books. . .1655
Jeremiah Burroughs, Four Books on the 11th Chapter of Matthew. . .1659
Jeremiah Burroughs, Gospel Conversion. . .1648
Jeremiah Burroughs, Gospel Worship. . .1648
Jeremiah Burroughs, Rare Jewel of Christian Contentment. . . 1648, 1649, 1645
Jeremiah Burroughs, Two Treatises. . .1649

E. Coles, the Elder, A Practical Discourse of God's Sovereignty. . . 1678, 1708, 1718, 1768, 1794 (letter to the reader written by John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, and S. Annesly).

*John Cotton, Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. . .1644 There was probably no more important book to the Presbyterian-Independent Controversy ever published than this one. Through it, John Owen was converted to Independence in 1645. Vide Daniel Cawdrey, Independence Further proved to be a Schem. Or A survey of Dr. Owen's Review of the Tракt of Schism; With a Vindication of the Author from his Unjust-Clamours and False aspersions. (London, 1659), p. 47 et al. Fletcher, op. cit., p. 39, IV.


John Preston, Doctrine of the Saint's Infirmities. . .1630 (?), 1636, 1638, (an epistle written by Thomas Goodwin and T. Ball is prefixed)

Richard Sibbes, Excellence of the Gospel above the Law. . .1639 (published by Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye)
John Preston, *Golden Scent*... .1638 (ed. by Thomas Goodwin and T. Ball)
John Preston, *Life Eternal*... .1631 (two editions), 1633, 1634, epistle dedicatory by Thomas Goodwin

John Preston, *Sermons preached before the King*... .1631, published by Goodwin

Richard Sibbes, *Bowels Opened*... .1639, 1641, ed. by Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye

Richard Sibbes, *Christian Portion*... ed. by Goodwin

Richard Sibbes, *A Fountain Sealed*... .1637, 1638

Richard Sibbes, *The Spiritual Man's Aim*... .1637

G. B. [Lownd], *Voyage From Heaven*... .1659

Jeremiah Burroughs, *Excellency of Holy Courage*... .1661

Jeremiah Burroughs, *Exposition on Hosea IV-X*... .1650

Jeremiah Burroughs, *Exposition on Hosea XI-XIII*... .1651

Jeremiah Burroughs, *Gospel Reconciliation*... .1657

Jeremiah Burroughs, *Tenth Book*... .1654

Jeremiah Burroughs, *Treatises of*... .1656

Samuel Torshell, *Hypocrite*... Preface written by Thomas Goodwin according to correspondence with S.W. Carruthers to whom we are indebted for this bit of information


In spite of the fact that Richard Baxter would not recommend one single book of Thomas Goodwin, Baxter does speak highly of John Goodwin, John Robinson, and John Owen, as well as other Independents. Vide *Directory*, p. 196-7, Part III. The surprising thing about Baxter's comments is that he mentions at least 110 books in his "The Forrest Library" and 886 books in his "Poorer Library" and 404 books in his "Poor Man's Library"... . a total of 1402 books. Although the list includes books on medicine, geography, history, as well as theology, it is significant that the name of Thomas Goodwin is notoriously absent.

There is much historical evidence that Goodwin was read by many not only in his own day, but also in succeeding eras. Witness the many different reprints of several of his works. Witness, too, the testimony of John Goodwin in 1639, that anonymous literary pieces were even then circulating under the name of Thomas Goodwin although he had no hand in their production. Publishers sought to increase their circulation
by surreptitiously using the name of Goodwin. Correspondence, op. cit., p. 40. Evidently, Thomas Goodwin was already widely known and read. Witness also, the testimony of the anonymous publisher of one of Goodwin's sermons who mentions having read several other of Goodwin's works. Thomas Goodwin, A Sermon of the Fifth Monarchy, etc. (London: 1654), "To the Reader", unpagd. Once, Parliament passed a resolution forbidding the printing of any of Goodwin's sermons without his approval. It is noteworthy that the foregoing sermon has no notice of Parliamentary approval or sanction to print it and it is assumed that it was stolen by the publisher.

A letter from a Mr. Jo. Tilsley concerning the purchase of books for the library at Bolton is typical:

"I spoke with some chiefe of Bolton, whose desire to have no erroneous Authors Or that have any tincture thereof, though mixed with[th] never so much other good matter for feare of infection! Particulary by all means they would not have One Independent writer in all the number, by any means how excellent soever for feare of any of there falling in love with the way for the man's sake. This makes I have purposely omitted many excellent authors e.g. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Burroughs, Greenhill, Caryl, Bridge. . .Shepherd. As alsose upon the other account Dr. Jerem. Taylor, Hammond, Chillingworth, Baxter." [Richard Copley Christie, "The Old Church and School Libraries of Lancashire", printed for the Chatham Society, (1885), p. 23, dated April 5th, 1655]

The significant features of this evidence are:

(1) It comes from a Presbyterian stronghold, i.e. Lancashire;

(2) it shows how high a reputation was placed on the lives of the Independent leaders whom it was feared might lead men astray because of their holiness;

(3) it shows that Thomas Goodwin was more feared than any other writer as an opponent of Presbyterianism in that he topped the list of banned books;

(4) it testifies that Richard Baxter's books were banned in a Presbyterian community because it was thought that he was an Episcopalian along with Jeremy Taylor, Hammond, et al. (Lancashire was not the only place where Independent books were not welcome. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland prohibited them in 1647. Vide Hanbury, op. cit., p. 604, 352, III.)

It is also known that some of the books of Thomas Goodwin were purchased for the Manchester Church Library in 1665 (?). Christie, "Libraries", op. cit., p. 45. The reference says that these were the "Works" of Thomas Goodwin, but this is a mistake, because the Works did not appear until past 1681. More likely, the book was Certain Select Cases of Conscience (1647). At any rate, it was bought for the phenomenal price of £6. Loc. cit., ftnt. A copy of Certain Cases (London: 1647) was in Magdalen Hall and was sold eventually by Hertford College. Vide Andrew Clark (collected by), The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, described by himself. (Oxford: printed for the Oxford Historical Society at the Clarendon Press, 1891), p. viii, II. The editor says that he saw this book in the shop of Mr. B. H. Blackwell, 29th Dec. 1891 with an inscription: "Liber aulae Magd. Oxon. 1656, ex dono Johannes Ryland." A copy of Baxter's Saints Everlasting Rest, 6th edition, (1656) was also sold along with Goodwin's book and seen in 1891 by the editor. Baxter had not yet eclipsed his fellow puritan and both were deemed unwanted at the same time! Another copy of
Goodwin's *Select Cases* was bought for the Turton Library for 6/6 according to a catalogue of 1659. Christie, op. cit., p.58.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Wilson in his *Dissenting Churches*, op. cit., p.454, III, wrote that the Works of Thomas Goodwin "used to be sold for waste paper, but now obtain a high price". And Andrew A Bonar, in his *Letters of Samuel Rutherford* (Edinburgh and London: Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier, reprint of 1891 edition), p.618, ftnt., described Goodwin's books as being "invaluable".

Nine Caps's greatest disciple, Alexander Whyte, once said:

"Let them [any young minister] put aside all ephemeral and all impertinent books till they have mastered Goodwin, and see what their best people will say about their preaching. God bless you and them, is the prayer and benediction of a lifelong student of Thomas Goodwin." (from *The Spiritual Life: The Teaching of Thomas Goodwin As Received and Reissued by Alexander Whyte*, etc. (Edinburgh and London: Oliphants Ltd., n.d.), p.138.)


A book order written in the form of a letter to Mr. Val Ormond, dated August 11, 1698, says: "The Goodwin I was a looking at You may send me if it be not gone," Richard Trappes-Lomax (ed.) "The Diary and Letter Book of the Rev. Thomas Broadbank 1671-1709", (printed for the Chetham Society, 1930), p.136. This man feared that the book would be gone indicating that others, too, were on the lookout for some of Goodwin's works. Another letter, written previously to Mr. Ormond, July 22, 1698, says:

"If you have not parted with th' Goodwins antiquities I had some
mind of when I was with you, you may keep it for me, and I shall either come or send for it." Ibid., p.130.

Goodwin’s book on the Revelation evidently had a wide circulation. Several writers in the seventeenth century as well as the eighteenth referred to it. Benjamin Keach took violent exception to it in his Antichrist Stormed (1689), an answer to Goodwin’s eleventh chapter of Revelation. Increase Mather, in his A Sermon Shewing, That the present Dispensations of Providence declare, That wonderful Revolutions in the World are near at Hand; etc. (Edinburgh: 1713), p.24, quotes from it. Vide also The French Revolution forseen, in 1679. Extracts from an exposition of the Revelation by an eminent divine of both Universities, in the beginning of the last century. (London, s.a.) Vide also Ritualism, predicted two hundred years ago. A Prophetic description of the Oxford Tract heresy, copied from Goodwin’s Exposition of the Revelation. Works. 1683. Vol. II, pp. 65-57 (Cheltenham, s.a.)

In the nineteenth century, too, there was an awakening of interest in Thomas Goodwin. Not only were his works published several times during this period, but he is referred to by many different writers in different connections. Robert Barclay, writing in The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876), p.387, inadvertently gives one of Goodwin’s Westminster Assembly arguments against Presbytery, evidently without knowing the original author of it. We find Dr. Fye Smith referring to Goodwin in 1806, favoring communion every Lord’s Day. Vide Albert Peel, Christian Freedom. The Contribution of Congregationalism to the Church and to the World. (London: Independent Press Ltd., 1938), p.72, who cites this pamphlet of Dr. Fye’s. Still another scholar, Dr. Black, a friend of Alexander Whyte, once raised the question of Dryden’s having been influenced by Goodwin's interest in Ovid’s 15th Book, Metamorphoses. Barbour, op. cit., p.600.
APPENDIX B: THOMAS GOODWIN, LEADER OF THE DISSENTING BRETHREN AT THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

To what extent Thomas Goodwin was regarded as the Independent paragon, the Presbyterian *beta noire*, is not easily determined in history books. The practice of many writers in neglecting him and the difference of opinion among those who have remembered him, causes the student serious difficulty in determining Goodwin's proper place in history.

In no way has Thomas Goodwin been more palpably misunderstood than at the Westminster Assembly, the years 1640-1650 especially. The central consideration for us is whether or not he was the recognized leader of contemporary Congregationalism. Until now, at least, there has been very little agreement about this question. Wilbur K. Jordan, Development of Religious Toleration in England, 1640-1660 (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1936), p.121, says that John Goodwin (and not Thomas) was the "intellectual leader of the Independents". Probably, Jordan is reading back some of the eighteenth century admiration for John Goodwin into his estimate, but nevertheless there are many who would agree with the statement. Another writer thought that William Bartlet "was the spokesman of the Independents generally." F. J. Powicke, (ed.) Essays, Congregational and Catholic, p.292. Others have given the nod to Jeremiah Burroughs, one of the Dissenting Brethren in the Westminster Assembly and whose books were subsequently edited and published by Thomas Goodwin *et al.* E.g. Robert Baillie, The Letters and Journals of... (ed. by David Laing, Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841), p.303, 1, letter dated Feb. 26, 1641 from London speaks of "Er. Burrowes and his colleagues." Cf. S.W. Carruthers, "Authorship of an Anonymous Pamphlet", Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, Vol. 6, (1936-1939), p.57, who identifies an obscure pamphlet entitled The Petition for the Prelates briefly examined (1641) with the one Baillie referred to in his letter mentioned above. If this be true, then in 1641 Burroughs was thought by some to be the leader of the Independent party. Winthrop S. Hudson, in an article entitled "Denominationalism As a Basis for Ecumenicity: A Seventeenth Century Conception.", Church History, Vol. XXIV: no. 1, (March, 1955), p.57, says that Burroughs was "the most influential spokesman of the Dissenting Brethren" in the Westminster Assembly. John Hunt, Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of Last Century (London: Strahan & Co., 1875), p.205 n., mentions fourteen outstanding Westminster Assembly divines but nothing of Thomas Goodwin. Jeremiah Burroughs is the only Independent on the list.

Several writers have suggested that John Owen was the leader of the Independents, but most of these would say that Owen's star did not shine in its brilliance until the late 1650's and post-restoration era. Baxter thought that Owen had become the leader of the dissenting brethren in the 1650's. Vide Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Visible Saints, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), p.16. Cf. A True Catalogue or an Account of the Several Places where Richard Cromwell was proclaimed Protector, (1659), pp. 23-25, which states that Goodwin was the spokesman of "above an hundred Congregational churches from several parts of the nation." Cited in Godfrey Davies, The Restoration of Charles II, 1658-1660 (London: Oxford University Press, 1955), p.10. It was Thomas Goodwin and not John Owen, who presented the Savoy Declaration to Richard Cromwell in 1658. Nor would it seem that Owen was held in higher regard than Goodwin in the early Restoration era. A letter of Hooke to Goffe, June 24, 1663, tells how Charles II sent for the Independent leaders including Goodwin, Nye and Caryl and "Dr. Goodwin being their mouth, by agreement, acquainted the King (of the Congregationalist views)"; cited in John Waddington, Congregational History, 1567-1700, In Relation to Contemporaneous Events, and the Conflict for Freedom, Purity, and Independence. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.,

Another testimony to the Restoration leadership of Thomas Goodwin is a tract entitled The Lawfulness of hearing the Publike Ministers of the Church of England, etc. (London: 1683), which has his name listed before Owen's on the title page as a leading Independent. Both are succeeded by Philip Nye and John Robinson however. Owen has been more easily remembered by succeeding generations because of his connections with popular controversies in the press. Thomas Goodwin never was.

A crowning attempt to elevate John Owen into prominence as a leader of the Independent cause is found in Earnest A. Payne, The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England (London: S. C. M., Press Ltd., 1944), p. 50, who mistakenly says that John Owen was "one of the five dissenting brethren present at the Westminster Assembly." Owen was not invited to take part in the Assembly, was never present there (even as a visitor so far as the records show), and was not converted to Independency until some time after the reputations of the other "dissenters" were well established in obloquy.

There is only one serious contender with Thomas Goodwin for top honors in being named "leader of the Independents". It is Philip Nye. Many historians have named him chief of the dissenting brethren in the Assembly. Among these is Thomas McCrie, Annals of English Presbytery (London: James Hisbet, 1872), p. 170f. One contributing cause to this view of Philip Nye is an engraving which has hung in many Congregationalist homes. It shows the divine in the foreground with the other Dissenting Brethren behind him and the Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly gloomily at them from the shadows as Nye championed both civil and religious liberty. The picture gives a completely erroneous idea on two counts: first, because Nye was not the leader of the Dissenting Brethren, and secondly, because none of the Dissenting Brethren championed as much liberty as some have been willing to believe. W. H. Stowell, in his History of the Puritans in England and the Pilgrim Fathers (London: T. Nelson, 1849), gives sketches of Nye and Burroughs as two leaders of the Dissenting Brethren in the Westminster Assembly, but fails to mention Goodwin (pp. 271-282).

Just prior to the convening of the Assembly, Philip Nye and Stephen Marshall were delegated by the Parliament to go to Scotland and to entreat for a league and covenant. The choosing of Nye for such a task has been interpreted by some to mean that he was the recognized leader of the Independent party in England in 1643. Vide Adam Stewart, Some Observations and Annotations Upon the Apologetical Narration, etc. (London: 1643), epistle, unpaged; et Baillie, Journals, op. cit., p. 81, III, who speaks of Nye as the "head of the Independents". But this action could be interpreted in at least four different ways: (1) that Nye was the true leader (2) that Parliament had overestimated the strength of the Independent party and of Nye's position which is what Stewart thought (3) it was only a sop by the Presbyterian critics of Independents (4) Nye had more political influence than any other Independent of the day. Probably, the last is closest to the truth. Albert Peal, in his article entitled "Congregationalism in 1655", Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society, XII (1937-1939), p. 173n., asserted that Philip Nye and William Bridge were the two leaders of the Dissenting Brethren. The same opinion is also expressed in Peal's edition of The Savoy


A few historians have declined to make any decision of prominence between Nye and Goodwin, mentioning them both as leaders of the Westminster Assembly Independents. Such e.g. are Phillip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom with A History and Critical Notes (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1878), p.547; et the Bicentenary of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, held in Edinburgh, July 12th & 13th, 1843; containing a full and Authentic report of the addresses and conversations. (Edinburgh: 1843, published under the Sanction of the Assembly), p.34f., which cites part of an address by Thomas McVie.


Disagreement among the various historians regarding the leadership of the English
Congressional party at any given period of the seventeenth century is part of the raison d'être of t is then. Three lines of investigation lead to the conclusion that Thomas Goodwin has been overlooked as perhaps the greatest and most influential Independent of 1640-1660. These three areas of investigation are: (1) the various documents and literary productions put out by the Independent leaders of the period almost always have Thomas Goodwin's name first as though he were the prime mover in these affairs; (2) a careful statistical study of the primary documents relating to the Westminster Assembly show conclusively that Thomas Goodwin exercised more influence than any other person of either party; (3) the testimonies of various members of the Assembly that Goodwin was the recognized leader. ... and not Philip Nye.

In every instance we have discovered, when Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye collaborated on the publishing of any piece of literature, the former and not the latter seems to have taken the initiative and his name appears first. John Norton, *Economica ad Totam Quaestionem Sulloram etc.* (London: 1643), epistle to the reader, *lector Seneveli*, signed by Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, and John Simpson, dated Feb. 16, 1647/8; Thomas Hooper, *A Survey of the State of Church-Mistraining*, etc. (London: 1648), epistle from Thomas Goodwin telling how he was asked to peruse this book in the printers, an indication of the esteem others had for him as the literary spokesman of the moderate Independents; John Cotton, *The Laws of the Kingdom of Heaven*, etc. (London: 1644, reprinted in Boston by Tappan and Jemmet, 1845), epistle has Goodwin's name before Nye's; Jeremiah Burroughs, *Rare Jewel of Christian Contentment*, (London: 1650) has Goodwin's name before any of the other publishers, including Nye. *Vide Appendix* "A" for several more joint works of Goodwin and Nye. Even in the joint pasteurship which Philip Nye and Thomas Goodin held in the Congregational Church in Arnhem, the latter was given precedence over the former. Thomas Edwards, in his *Antiquities*, etc. (London: 1646), p. 118, in speaking of the meditation between the churches of Arnhem and Rotterdam gives no indication that Goodwin was not the sole pastor of the church. There is no mention of Nye. In listing the Independent leaders in Westminster, Edwards usually placed Goodin's name before Nye's. *Vide* pp. 165, 167, *c.e.* In Goodin's biography written by his son, there is no mention of Nye being pastor of the Arnhem church either. *Vide* *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* (London: 1704), p.xviii, V.

Furthermore, in the various documents of the Westminster Assembly, Goodwin's name always appears first and then Nye's. On February 3rd, 1647/8, Goodwin was named along with Jeremiah Whitaker to peruse *such papers and writings of the Assembly* as Mr. Breyfield hath order to print.* The Grand Debate (n.p., 1552), found in the page immediately after the title page, but unaged. Eventually, the products of this investigation were issued as the Grand Debate and it is significant that Goodwin was selected to edit it. His name heads the list of dissenting brethren to every debated proposition. Cf. *e.g.*, pp. 40, 85, 113f., 113, 133, 192. The fact that Goodwin's name takes precedence over all the others is significant in that he did not always register his dissent first. *Vide* appendix article on Dissent in the Westminster Assembly. The Apologetical Formation (London: 1643), *et A Copy of a Repentance lately Delivered in to the Assembly* etc. (London: 1645), both have Goodwin's name at the top of the list of signers. In a mutual agreement of leading Westminster Assembly Presbyterians and Independents, Goodwin's name comes conspicuously at the first of the list. Certain Considerations to Dish-awaid Men from Further Gathering of Churches in this present Juncture of Time. *Subscribed by divers Divers of the Assembly, hereby mentioned.* (London: 1645). In the list of signers, Thomas Goodwin's name is misprinted "John Goodrin".

Early in the 1640's, John Dury selected Thomas Goodwin as the influential Independent with whom to correspond about ecclesiastical rapprochement. *Vide* J. Hinton

Another bit of evidence is that of Roger Williams who writes in his Queries of Highest Consideration Proposed to Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Philip Nye, Mr. William Bridges, Mr. John Burroughs, Mr. Sidz. Simpson and to the Commissioners from the General Assembly (so called) of the Church of Scotland Upon occasion of their late printed Apologies for themselves and their Churches, etc. (London: 1644), as though Goodwin were the recognized leader.

The primary sources of the Westminster Assembly reveal that Philip Yea lacked the respect and admiration which Thomas Goodwin had. Robert Baillie reported in a letter to his cousin William Espie, dated December 7, 1643, that "we are not desperate of some accommodation; for Goodwin, Burroughs, and Bridge, are men full, as it seems yet, of grace and modestie... David Laing (ed.) The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, etc. (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841), p. 111, 111. Yea was not included in Baillie's remark. In an undated letter to Scotland, 1643, Baillie tells us about the debates over the Directory wherein Goodwin "troubled us so, that after long debates we could conclude nothing. For the help of this evil, we thought it best to speak with him in private; so we invited him to dinner, and spent an afternoon with him very sweetly. It were a thousand pities of that man; he is of manie excellent parts! I hope God will not permit him to go on to lead a faction for renting of the kirk. We and he seemed to agree prettie well in most things of the Directorie." Ibid., p.123. There is no record of the Westminster Scots ever having taken Philip Yea to dinner. And in fact, when Goodwin brought Yea to a meeting of the committee for the Directory, the Scots thought it "an impudent intrusion." Ibid., p.131, Feb. 18, 1644.

A month and a half later the controversy over government was becoming intense and Baillie again reported that "Goodwin took most of the speech upon him; yet they divided their arguments among them, and gave the managing of them by turns, to Bridges, Burroughs, Nye, Simpson, and Carryl. Truelie, if the cause were good, the men have plenty of learning, wit, eloquence, and above all, boldness and stiffness, to make it out..." Ibid., p.145, public letter, April 2, 1644. In the fall of the same year, it is evident from Baillie's letters that Goodwin is the recognized leader of the Independent faction in the Assembly. On September 16, 1644, the Scots reported on the debates over the sins of England which were supposedly causing military reverses in the field:

"We spent two days or three on the matter of a remonstrance to the Parliament of the sins which provoked God to give us this late stroke; and here we had the most free and strange parley! that ever I heard, about the evident sins of the Assembly, the sins of the Parliament, the sins of the army, the sins of the people. When we were in full hope of a large fruit of so honest and faithfull a censure, Thomas Goodwin and his brethren, as their custome is to oppose all things that are good, carried it so, that all was dung in the boxes, and that matter clean laid by." Ibid., p.228, public letter, Sept. 16, 1644.

Probably the reason why Goodwin ladd in such a debate was that Presbyterians were trying to insinuate that military reversals were due to failure to suppress sectaries and heresies and that God was angry at them for violating the Covenant. It is
significant that in Baillie's mind now, it is "Thomas Goodwin and his brethren". When the Directory was finally completed and sent up to the House of Commons, the Assembly wished that Thomas Goodwin be one of those delegated to present it. Baillie, op. cit., p. 242, Nov. 21, 1644, public letter. Evidently, the Assembly felt that Goodwin was not only the spokesman for his party, but also that he had some influence with Parliament and his presence would enhance the reception of their work. During most of the year 1645, Goodwin was absent from the Assembly working on the Independent Model of Government. Vide supra on Thomas Goodwin's Book on government. And it is plain that Baillie regarded his absence with ominous foreboding. Vide Baillie, op. cit., p. 291, July 1, 1645, public letter. The year following, Goodwin seemed to be the leading Independent spirit in the sub-committee on accommodation set up to bring about peace between the two Westminster parties. Ibid., p. 343, letter of Jan. 29, 1646(?).


From the Journals of John Lightfoot, it is also apparent that this Presbyterian member of the Westminster Assembly considered Thomas Goodwin the leader of the Independents in the assembly. In the debate over ordination by the ministers of London Lazarus Seaman desired that Goodwin "should state it" (i.e. the proposition). John Rogers Pitman, (ed.), The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, etc., (London: 1824), p. 127, Jan. 29, 1644, vol. XIII containing The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines; etc. In the same debate, Lightfoot records that Philip Nye attempted to frame the proposition, but that it was unsuccessful. Ibid., p. 129, Jan. 29, 1644. Although Nye presented a paper on the points of question, Thomas Goodwin presented another. Evidently, even Goodwin did not like the manner in which Nye had framed his thoughts. Loc. cit. The desire of the Presbyterians to allow Goodwin to state the questions for debate indicates the high regard in which he was held. On another occasion, the Assembly voted to postpone a part of the debate on government because Goodwin was not present. Ibid., p. 135, Feb. 7, 1644. This may have been courtesy, or it may have been that the Westminster Assembly would rather have dealt with the clearer reasoning of Thomas Goodwin than with the other Independents. Nye was caught in inconsistency too often. On February 5th, 1644, Philip Nye was so undiplomatic that he "bred some heat," (Ibid., p. 143) and on February 21, 1644, he was called to order for not keeping to the point in debate. Ibid., p. 168. Indicative of Goodwin's leadership is the way Lightfoot speaks of "Dr. Goodwin and his partners," (Ibid., p. 206, March 8, 1644) but he also speaks of "Nye and his partners" on another occasion. Ibid., p. 252, April 19, 1644. None of the four main primary documents of the Assembly (i.e. Lightfoot's Journals, Gillespie's Journals, the microfilmed unpublished minutes, and the published minutes) have any record of Goodwin's having been present on this day, however. He may have been absent.

The official minutes of the Westminster Assembly concur in the general picture painted by individual members present at the sessions. The picture is one of repeated disgust with the antics of Philip Nye and respect if not approval of Thomas Goodwin. At the end of the debate over the preface to the Directory, a committee was appointed to work out some more of the details. Two Independent members were appointed on this committee, Thomas Goodwin and Jeremiah Burroughs. Nye was not appointed even though
he had spoken three times in the preceding debate; Goodwin had spoken only once; and Burroughs not at all. The Assembly did not deem Nye's contributions in debate enough to warrant his serving on the committee. Vide Alexander F. Mitchell, at John Struthers (eds.), Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines etc. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874), p.4,5, sess. 326, Nov. 20, 1644. In the discussion of January 27th, 1644/5, Mr. Burgess used sarcasm to characterize Nye's "pedagogy" (pedagogy?). Ibid., p.44, sess. 369. Philip Nye was not much respected by some of the members of the assembly. Samuel Rutherford was so disillusioned by Nye's deportment on January 31, 1644/5, that he is reported to have said that it was "the saddest session that ever I sat in". Ibid., p.45, sess. 371. Two months later, on March 27th, 1645, Nye brought in some of his private propositions on church government which were debated and immediately thrown out. Rutherford complained that Nye was creating "new debate". Marshall averred that these propositions "were contrary to the whole way you have gone." And Henderson bemoaned that "we thought we had been near to the harbour, and now we are sailing out into the deep..." Ibid., pp.72, 73, sess. 404. Nye retorted that he was only exercising liberty of conscience. One reason why Philip Nye gained few friends in the Assembly was because he often dissented to propositions all by himself...and over seemingly insignificant issues. The other dissenting brethren did not uphold him in much of his captiousness. On May 9, 1645, sess. 435, ibid., p.90, he dissented to part of a committee report dealing with inspection of candidates for lay offices. On July 7, 1646, sess. 672, p.252, ibid., he dissented alone to a proposition against the Presbyterians. The rest of the Independents voted with the Presbyterians. Again, he dissented to a question in the Catechism on May 12, 1647, sess. 841, p.365, ibid., without the company of another Independent.

Contrary to the experiences of Philip Nye in the Westminster Debates, Thomas Goodwin often influenced the voting in favor of his motions. There is no record of the Assembly ever having passed one of Nye's propositions, nor of his having influenced many of the votes with his much speaking or his numerous dissents. On October 23rd, 1645, Goodwin dissented to a committee report for a petition to Parliament about the Sacrament. Because of his dissent, the Assembly voted to leave out the objectionable parts in the report. The minutes begin to speak of "them" in relation to the Independents, indicating that Goodwin's dissent had influenced their votes as well as his own. Ibid., p.158, sess. 523. In the spring of May 1646, the dissenting brethren asked the Assembly to be made into a committee to discuss the question of jus divinum. Ibid., p.229, sess. 627, May 6. Vide supra on Jus Divinum. Their request was granted six days later. Minutes, or. cit., p.231, sess. 633, May 14, 1646. Philip Nye had originally made the motion, but it is significant that when the Assembly appointed the committee, Thomas Goodwin was named first and Nye second, followed by Burroughs, Bridge, Simpson, Greenhill, Carter (Jr.), and Phillips. Consistent with his usual procedure, Nye promptly dissented to the terms imposed on the committee. Loc. cit.

The records show that the only time Philip Nye exercised any true leadership worthy of the name in the Assembly was after Thomas Goodwin had finally departed having given it up as a lost cause. Vide infra on statistics relating to the participation of Independents at the Westminster Assembly. Goodwin had many admirers at the precedent; Nye had few. Probably, the only friend he had there was Thomas Goodwin, himself! Three lines of inquiry reveal clearly that Goodwin was leader of the Independents in the Westminster Assembly.
APPENDIX C: PARTICIPATION OF THE INDEPENDENTS
IN THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY

There are four main primary documents relating to the Westminster Assembly:
(1) John Lightfoot's Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines: From
January 1, 1643, to December 31, 1644, etc. (ed. by John Rogers Pitman, vol. XII
Works, London: 1624); (2) George Gillespie, Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the
Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster. February 1644 to January
1645. (ed. by David Reek, Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846); (3)
Alexander F. Mitchell et John Struthers (eds.), Minutes of the Sessions of the West¬
minster Assembly of Divines etc. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874); (4)
the unpublished minutes in Dr. Williams's Library, London. Besides these documents,
there is Goodwin's book on government (vide supra, chap. 11 on literature), Baillie's
letters, and a host of pamphlet materials and sermons of the day. Lightfoot's and
Gillespie's respective accounts cover approximately the same period of time (i.e.
1644), the year of the debates on church government. They dovetail in many respects.
The official minutes have a long and interesting history, but now reside in Dr.
Williams's Library. They are in three volumes: the first volume consists of sessions
45-96, 87-119, 155-198 in three folios respectively; the second volume has the minutes
from April 12th, 1644 to Nov. 15, 1644 and the third volume has three folios embody¬
ing sessions 324-604, 601-900, 604-1163, respectively. Cf. Mitchell and Struthers,
op. cit., pp. vi, vii. Unfortunately, there is no record (in vol. I or anywhere else)
of the sessions from July 1st to Aug. 3rd, 1643, during which the first forty-four
sessions were held. Similarly, there are missing the sessions from Dec. 20th, 1643
to February 15th, 1644 (thirty-six sessions). The first and second volumes of the
minutes have never been published although we are grateful to the librarians of Dr.
Williams's for sending us a complete microfilm of them, which we examined in the
reading room of the Edinburgh City Library. Volume three of the minutes comprise the
volume published by Mitchell and Struthers (supra), but the sessions do not begin
until sess. 324, Nov. 15th, 1644, and so, we are obliged to depend more on Lightfoot
and Gillespie than we would like for information about that first year of the Assembly.
The microfilmed minutes are almost illegible and it is not surprising that they have
never been sufficiently deciphered for publication.

An history of the Westminster Assembly presented from the standpoint of the In¬
dependents has never been written and the hundreds of extant Presbyterian accounts
have not always given the minority party the credit they deserve in shaping the
destinies of the famous sederunt. In order to illustrate our main contentions concern¬
ing Thomas Goodwin, we have printed in the following pages a catalogue of his parti¬
cipation in the sessions alongside a similar catalogue of the other leading participants.
The results of this analysis reveal that Goodwin spoke more often (and probably) more
forcefully than any other member of either party. Our statistics mean more, too, when
it is remembered that divines were not allowed to speak at will or at length in the
debates. They were regulated by the chair and by the rest of the constituency. Cf.
Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p. 272, May 21, for an example of the Assembly's having
to give permission for two members to speak. The regulation of debates became one of
the methods by which the Presbyterians controlled the Dissenting Brethren and even
silenced them on occasions. Vide infra on the subject of discrimination.

And although our statistical studies reveal some uncomplimentary things about the
majority party in the Assembly, they also reveal that there was no discrimination re¬
garding prying appointments for their Independent Brethren. Lightfoot tells us that
on Jan. 15, 1644, "there was an order from the House of Commons, that some of our
Assembly should come to pray with them every morning... in the order in which our
names stood in the ordinance that called us together, we should go in order, one to the Lords' House and another to the Commons." Journal, op. cit., p.111. Actually, it would not appear that they always followed this rule, because of the frequency in which Independents were designated to pray. Probably, more of them were appointed for this task than their number in the Assembly warranted. In preaching appointments, however, there seems to have been some discrimination. On April 16, 1645, sess. 418 (Minutes, op. cit., p.81), Joseph Carrill was approved for St. Magnus, but his fellow Independent, Sydrach Simpson did not fare so well. On Jan. 13, 1646, sess. 775 (Minutes, p.321), there was evidently a report from the Committee for Plundered Ministers requesting Simpson to preach at the Chapel in Somerset House. A big debate ensued and nothing was decided. There was more discussion of the question on Feb. 4, 1646/7, sess. 785 (ibid., p.326), as well as on Feb. 10, 1646/7, sess. 789 (ibid., p.329). On Feb. 16, 1646/7, sess. 793 (ibid., p.330), the Simpson debate was postponed and again on Feb. 25, 1646/7, sess. 796 (ibid., p.332). The day following, a committee for examining ministers for Wales was appointed without any Independents and it looks as though the Presbyterians were attempting to keep all Congregationalists out of pulpits. Vide Minutes, p.333, sess. 799, Feb. 25, 1646/7. Simpson's case came up again on March 2, 1646/7, sess. 801 (ibid., p.333) but was put off because of his being ill. It was also voted at this time to give no reasons to the Committee for Plundered Ministers (a Parliamentary body) as to why the Assembly had delayed Simpson's case so long. It is uncertain whether or not anything was ever decided about the case. Simpson's name appears again on July 8, 1646, sess. 877 (ibid., p.396), when he and Carter dissented to the wording of the Larger Catechism on scandalous sins, but nothing is said about his appointment to Somerset House. The paucity of preaching appointments delegated to Independents is clearly seen in our charts, and even though there may have been individual cases such as Carrill's, and possibly Goodwin's, where Independents were asked to preach somewhere, yet the evidence indicates that Presbyterians attempted to keep them out. We mention Goodwin as possibly another exception, because the Minutes, p.535, sess. 1145, Dec. 1, 1646, say that he was to "be approved upon", but the particulars are missing. This may have been a preaching appointment or perhaps some other position. At any rate, this is the last time his name appears in the official minutes.

Catalogue of Lightfoot's Journal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Preach</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Goodwin</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue of Lightfoot's Journal (continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Preach</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henderson (Scot)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley (Scot)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherfurd (Scot)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie (Scot)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland (Scot)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wariston (Scot)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogue of Gillespie's Notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland (Scot)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie (Scot)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruterfurd (Scot)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warriston (Scot)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson (Scot)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley (Scot)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Goodwin</td>
<td>3 (Mar. 4, 1644; May 23, 1644; June 5) [Sub-Committee Directory]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>2 (April 11, 1644; May 23, 1644) [Sub-Committee Directory]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie (Scot)</td>
<td>3 (May 23, 1644; June 5, 1644; June 5, 1644) [Sub-Committee Directory]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson (Scot)</td>
<td>2 (June 5, 1644; June 5, 1644) [Sub-Committee Directory]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue of Gillespie’s Notes (continued): account of the Grand Committee on Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Preach</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Goodwin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warriston (Scot)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie (Scot)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson (Scot)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogue of the published Minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Preach</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Goodwin</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall (Presbyterian)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(figure includes both prayer and preaching appointments)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouge (Presbyterian)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(figure includes both prayer and preaching appointments)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds (Presbyterian)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(figure includes both prayer and preaching appointments)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue of the unpublished Minutes (microfilmed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Preach</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Goodwin</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All of these figures are only approximate and we do not make peremptoriness our guide. The illegibility of the microfilmed minutes make accuracy unattainable.

Section (a): The Debates in the Westminster Assembly

Every member of the Westminster Assembly had to subscribe to the "protestation" before he could sit in the sessions. Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p.4, July 8, 1643 gives it as follows: "I, A.B. do seriously and solemnly protest, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly, whereof I am a member, I will not maintain anything 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." Much of the subsequent differences of opinion in the sederunt had its roots in the ambiguity of the second part of the "protestation", because of the subjective nature of determining what was "most to the glory of God" and the "peace of his church". Thomas Goodwin warned the Assembly that it should "establish nothing but what you have full, clear, and general light for. Condemn nothing, and suffer nothing to be condemned, in which you, in your consciences are doubtful there may be a truth." Vide John Waddington, Congregational History, 1567-1700 etc. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), p.411. Cf. Carruthers, Everyday Work, op. cit., p.48, who also discusses this speech of Goodwin's in which he feared that minority views might not be given full liberty of expression.

These early fears of the leader of the Dissenting Brethren proved to be prophetic, because the primary records of the Assembly reveal many evidences of Presbyterian discrimination against the small group of Independents. Besides the matter of dissent and committee appointments, which have been discussed elsewhere, there were many uncharitable actions against the minority party in the debates. At the outset, Goodwin and his fellows objected to the procedure of debate adopted by the Assembly in determining church government. He wanted to take up the jus divinum problem first, but the Presbyterians voted that their system "may be" found in the Scripture. Vide his Constitution, op. cit., p.176. Cf. Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p.20, Oct. 17, 1645. Lightfoot, of course, was one of the leading spirits behind the defeat of the Independent proposal, because he hoped to avoid premature censure of his Eratianism. The Independents wanted to find out what "should be" instead of what "may be" in the Scriptures,
but their opponents complained that this would take "a quarter of years Debate". Loc. cit. Goodwin's main contention was that the Presbyterian procedure forced the Independents to prove a negative, that Presbytery "may not be", when it is logically impossible even to prove a universal negative. Ibid., p.177. He also objected to "the vast indeciniteness, and indeterminate Ambiguity and uncertainty of that Term 'Presbyterian Government, over many Congregations'." Loc. cit. A lack of adequate definition hampered Independent debate. He pointed out that the Assembly procedure enabled the Presbyterians to prove their government on "the lowest Terms" (i.e. "it may be") and that the proposition was so worded that it could be defended in many possible senses. Independents simply did not know what they were arguing against, because the church was not yet set up, the Assembly refused to define "Presbytery", and the Independent proposal to discuss Jus Divinum first was defeated. Eventually, the Dissenting Brethren were forced to debate Presbytery as it was De facto in Scotland and this is what brought the Scots and Independents into conflict in the Assembly. Ibid., p.179. Cf. supra, on the Jus Divinum controversy.

But there is other evidence of discrimination. On March 12, 1644, there was some suggestion of an accommodation with the Independents, but Goodwin rightly pointed out that the Assembly's proposition for Presbytery was already voted and that it was too late to palliate dissenting voices. No doubt such high-handed action only hardened the opposition in the sederunt. Bridge once complained that the Dissenting Brethren had been gagged in debate before they could say all in their case. Vide Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p.531, Nov. 15, 1644.

One of the most complete arrangements of Presbyterian discriminatory practice in the Westminster Assembly is found in the Copy of a Remonstrance Lately Delivered in to the Assembly by Thomas Goodwin etc. (London: 1645), where the Independents said they had been wronged in the following particulars: (1) the Assembly laid aside the Independent propositions on ordination (p.4); (2) they were refused the right to present papers to the Assembly unless they were previously appointed to a committee for that explicit purpose (loc. cit.); (3) the Presbyterians seldom allowed Independents to state the questions for debate and when they requested permission to do so, were told that "the Assembly sate not to argue the opinions of a few men, but that if we had anything to say to the assertion brought in, we might" (loc. cit.); (4) the Assembly refused to take first things first and determine if "there is a platform of Government for the Churches, under the Gospel, laid down in the Scriptures" (Ibid., p.5); (5) the Assembly refused to debate the central point of the government controversy, i.e. the entire power in a particular church (loc. cit.); (6) the Assembly refused to debate any of the seven propositions the Independents brought in to the sub-committee on accommodation (ibid., p.5f.); (7) the Assembly finally appointed the Independents to a committee for the purpose of bringing in their model of government...but only after most of the main parts of Presbytery had already been voted, such as ordination, one presbytery over many churches, and subordination of synods (ibid., p.6); (8) the Assembly refused to say what it would do with the Independent model when it was finished (ibid., p.7), Beville, in a letter of April 25, 1645, Letters, op. cit., p.266f., II, admitted that the sederunt never intended to do anything with the platform of church government penned by Thomas Goodwin: "the Assembly purposes not to take it into publick debate, but to give it to some committee, that they may frame an answer to it, if so it be found convenient."); (9) the Assembly refused to accept any part of the Independent model unless it was presented in its entirety (loc. cit.). No document has come to light which has shown the Westminster Presbyterian procedure in a more unfavorable light than this one.

Some of the disputes in the Assembly, however, could have been avoided without doing violence to anyone's conscience. Several times, there were instances where
both sides refused to give the other the benefit of the doubt. Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., p.34, tell us that on March 5, 1644, "The Independents alleged that the Assembly did not understand what they voted out of Acts xii:5; xv:4". In other words, it was an accusation of ignorance. One of the chief contributing factors in the debates was that divines often read too much into the proposals of the other side. For instance, on March 14th, 1644, Goodwin said that he feared a "snare" in one Presbyterian proposition. ... but he wasn't sure what it was. Vide Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p.215. Again, on May 1, 1644, the Independents evidently agreed with the Westminster Assembly's proposals, but debated them on the grounds that they suspected a hidden meaning which was opposed to Independency and in favor of Presbyterianism. Ibid., p.257. And the Presbyterians were also guilty of mistrust. On Nov. 14, 1644, the Independents brought in their Reasons against the Presbyterian system and the Presbyterians themselves attempted to read between the lines of their opponents' arguments: "Then did the seven dissenters, the Independents, give in their reasons, of some eight sheets of paper; and it was blotted in divers places, which was soon observed by the Assembly, and it was scrupled whether these obliterations might not in time be laid to the Assembly's charge: whereupon it was ordered, that an exact account of all blotting should be taken, and their own hands subscribed to the number of them." Ibid., p.330. Mutual mistrust only inflamed the controversy and all too often each side saw the other in the worst possible light, but any charge of discrimination must be more the fault of the majority than of the minority and few Presbyterian historians of the Assembly have admitted the fact. S.W. Carruthers, Everyday Work, op. cit., p.1 is the only one we have found who admits that "the Independents had been... somewhat hardly treated by their fellow members and by subsequent writers."

As already indicated in the catalogue of debates, supra, Thomas Goodwin possibly spoke more often than any other single divine in the Assembly. His contributions range over a wide gamut of subjects from marriage to having a doctor as well as a pastor in each local congregation. He presented four of the five first arguments against Presbytery to the sederunt. Cf. Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., pp.10 (Feb. 5, 1644), 15 (Feb. 12, 1644), 16 (Feb. 14, 1644), 20 (Feb. 15, 1644). Jeremiah Burroughs presented the second argument on Feb. 8, 1644 (ibid., p.14), but evidently with less success than our venerable Goodwin. Consequently, he undertook the rest of the arguments himself. Later, in the same year, it was Goodwin who produced the five arguments against subordination on Sept. 23 (ibid., p.79f.). Baillie's Letters, op. cit., refer often to Goodwin's proficiency in debate. In an undated letter to Scotland, 1643, Goodwin "assayed to turn all upside down" in the debate over directories (p. 123, II). Another letter to William Spang, dated June 26, 1644, reports: "This day we were vexed also in the Assembly" by Thomas Goodwin over the issue of posture at the Lord's Table (p.199, II).

Goodwin's special aptitude was his ability to state the opposition's views carefully and to answer all possible objections to his own...sometimes even ad nauseam. He son said of him: "He had been much exercised in the controversies that had been agitated in the age he lived in having a piercing understanding, able to find out where the pinch and stress of controversies lay, when he stated them in his own heart from Scripture and experience, and had a peculiar faculty to bring them down to ordinary capacities in Scripture language, without hard and pedantic terms." Vide the Life, prefixed to vol. V (Works: 1696 ed.), p.xxx. Sometimes, he was criticized by the Assembly, but often only because they were unable to answer his logic. Baillie, in an undated letter to Scotland, 1643, once remarked that "there fell in betwixt Goodwin and Burgess hotter words than were expected from Goodwin." Letters, op. cit., p.122, II. It was a polite admission that the leader of the Dissenting Brethren was not usually rancorous in debate. On Feb. 12, 1644, Lightfoot recorded that Goodwin...
"went on so obscurely that the Assembly called for more plainness, and a syllogism." 

Journal, op. cit., p.144. But it must be pointed out that Lightfoot was no friend of Independency and also that he was able to take very copious notes of all of Goodwin's arguments (even though they may have been obscure). Cf. ibid., p.143, Feb. 13, 1644. At least one criticism of Goodwin resulted from one of his favorite (and difficult to answer) practices, i.e. accusing the Presbyterians of using an Episcopalian argument concerning the Jerusalem Church. Vide Lightfoot, p.172, Feb. 22, 1644. He was adept at pointing out the similarities between discredited Anglicanism and Scottish Presbyterianism; it is not surprising that the Assembly sharply criticized him. In the debate of March 13, 1644, Goodwin supposedly "for a while could not satisfy the Assembly that he was speaking to the proposition before us", according to Lightfoot, p.212, ibid. Undoubtedly, some of these accusations against Goodwin's departure at the famous sedentum are based on fact, but it must not be forgotten that they all came from the pen of one man, who himself had a violent dislike of Goodwin and all he stood for. Goodwin's impact on the Assembly is measurably more than Lightfoot's and a feeling of jealousy probably dictated many of the former's attacks.

Other Independents were also called to account, however, and so Goodwin had company in his troubles. On Feb. 21, 1644, Gillespie discovered that Philip Nye's Assembly statements did not agree with his statements in the Narration. Consistency in argument was not always his practice. Vide Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., p.27. And on Feb. 12, 1644/5, sess.379, Minutes, op. cit., p.56, Sydrach Simpson had to admit that he had blundered into logical error in his argument about appeals.

We have already seen how much Goodwin spoke at the Assembly in comparison to other divines. Now we point up some of the results of his much speaking. In the debate over the use of a "doctor" in particular congregations, Goodwin had favored their institution against many of the Presbyterians and the Scots. His appeal was convincing enough that Hodges, Walker, and Bridge championed his views. Vide Lightfoot's Journal, p.51, Nov. 14, 1643. In the debate over ruling elders, Thomas Goodwin proposed a compromise which would have brought the English and Scottish Presbyterians together, had it been adopted. Palmer was taken with the proposal and it evidently gained some support, even from Alexander Henderson. Vide Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p.75, Dec. 7, 1643. In another exchange, John Lightfoot grudgingly complimented Goodwin because the latter had so ably confuted Dr. Smith "in every particular". Ibid., p.91, Dec. 22, 1643. At least once, Seanan desired that Goodwin state the proposition in dispute (i.e. on ordination) rather than any other. Vide ibid., pp.127, 129, Jan. 29, 1644. On another occasion, the Assembly refused to debate a certain issue because Goodwin was absent; it did not matter that there were several other Independents present who might have defended their position. Ibid., p.135, Feb. 7, 1644. The day before (Feb. 6, 1644, ibid., p.132), Hoyle, Vines and George Gillespie had all attempted unsuccessfully to overthrow one of Goodwin's arguments. The Presbyterian argument from the Jerusalem Church was violently attacked by Goodwin in his Feb. 22, 1644, speech linking Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism (cf. Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p.172) for which he was criticized (vide supra); but evidently his viewpoint found receptive ears in Dr. Temple. The said Doctor expressed doubts about the validity of the Presbyterian claims: "He saw no proof for a greater number of Christians than might meet in one place, at least might meet in the temple at several times of the day, and as might be all one congregation." Vide Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., p.27. This unexpected help for the Independents was probably the direct result of Goodwin's proficiency in debate. Nor can it be denied that Stephen Marshall became, as time passed, more and more associated with Independent thinking. For instance, in an Assembly address of Marshall's, Sept. 30, 1644
(ibid., p.32) there is no doubt that he had been more than a little influenced by Goodwin's presentation of the five arguments on Sept. 23 (vide supra). On Jan. 2, 1645 (Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., p.99), because he objected to the wording of a proposition in that it seemed to favor one man rule in churches, the Assembly respected his views and evidently changed their wording. In the debate on marriage, Goodwin's peculiar view that it was primarily a civil contract found unexpected support from Calamy who seemed to have imbued some of the former's reasoning. Vide the Minutes, op. cit., p.12, sess.330, Nov. 28, 1644. The directory for excommunication occasioned some hard debating in the Assembly and Goodwin was the first one to champion the proposal which was later adopted by Parliament: "It is worth our debate to consider what sins they are that must be the object of excommunication." ibid., p.24, sess.349, Dec. 30, 1644. In the debate over Goodwin's proposed list of heinous sins, Charles Kerle practically agreed with the Independent position although he did not see the need for such a list. Marshall had presented a paper on church censures which was so close to Goodwin's Independent view that Henderson thought it had been copied out of Goodwin's edition of John Cotton's Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Loc. cit. Marshall's views so closely approximated the Independents' that he was the first to propose a compromise between them and the Presbyterians, on the issue, Jan. 7, 1644/5, sess.355 (ibid., p.30). Stephen Marshall's defection to the Independent position on excommunication in particular charges was noted with disfavor by Robert Baillie in a letter to Dickson, Sept. 16, 1644, Letters, op. cit., p.250, II. The day following the Goodwin list of sins debate, Wilson, too, almost agreed with Goodwin's views on excommunication. Vide Minutes, p.27, sess. 350, Dec. 31, 1644. And on Jan. 1, 1644/5, sess. 351, ibid., p.27, Goodwin finally won his point and a memorandum passed the Assembly: "That something be considered of to set out what sins are to be taken cognizance of by the eldership for Church censures."

Some of these arguments against various Presbyterian propositions must have been formidable to answer on the spur of the moment and many (if not the greatest share) of Gillespie's refutations seem to have been inserted in his Notes subsequent to the actual debates. My reason for this assertion is that many of Gillespie's rebuttals of Goodwin are not found in Lightfoot's Journal nor seemingly in the unpublished Minutes. Gillespie's Notes give evidence of a more considered judgment on the part of the author than is ordinarily possible in the heat of debate and we do not mean to detract from the youthful Scot. Our judgment of him is far more complimentary than W.M. Campbell's in his recent Triumph of Presbyterianism, given elsewhere in this thesis.

Many of the speeches of the Independents in the sederunt are missing and no doubt these lacunae would reveal even more evidence to support our contentions given supra. Philip Nye was cut off in the debate over the directory for excommunication, sess. 349, Dec. 30, 1644, (Minutes, op. cit., p.24). His remarks were not even recorded by the Assembly scribe. Another of Nye's speeches is not recorded on January 7, 1644/5, sess. 355 (ibid., p.32) and one wonders whether the Assembly made it a practice not to record unacceptable debate. There is also a blank space where one of Thomas Goodwin's speeches should be in sess. 379, Feb. 12, 1644/5 (ibid., p.56).

An accurate assessment of what Thomas Goodwin really accomplished at the Westminster Assembly can never be made, but historians have generally agreed that the debates in that famous series of meetings attracted much attention to the Congregational system. All over the country, intelligent and devout persons were impressed with the moderation and effectiveness of the Dissenting Brethren against almost insuperable odds. Cf. R.W. Dale, History of English Congregationalism (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), p.372. W.B. Selbie, Nonconformity: Its Origin and Progress (London: Williams and Norgate), p.86, suggests that Cromwell and Milton were both
partly converted to Independency as a result of the Westminster Assembly debates. And from the contemporary Presbyterian viewpoint, it would be difficult to overstate the importance of the recalcitrant Apologists who single-handedly kept affairs in a state of indecision for nearly five years. Thomas Edwards wrote in his *Antapologia*, p.269: "I am confident, had it not been for you five, and a few more, the Reformation intended had been in a far fairer way then it is. Brethren, there are many complaints, and that by your dear friends, of the retarding the Works of Reformation by your means. You are the Remora to the Ship under Sailes, you are the Spokes in the Wheels of the Chariot of Reformation. Parliament complains, Assembly, City, Country, all complain of the Worke retarded, and all is resolved into you five principally. I could tell you many particular passages, but you know what I mean: In a word, all the Prelates and the Papists cannot nor doe not hinder so much the work of Reformation, as you five members of the Assembly", as cited by Baillie's *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time* (London: 1646), p.94.

Section (b): Did the Erastians and the Independents unite in the Westminster Assembly against the Presbyterians?

The affirmative has been alleged by many historians. *Vide e.g.* W.K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England 1640-1660 (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1936), p.69, III; Carruthers, *op. cit.*, p.129; Robert Low Orr, Alexander Henderson Churchman and Statesman (London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), p.361; et Hetherington, *op. cit.*, p.258f. *Cf.* Dwight Chichester Smith, "Robert Browne (1550?-1633) As Churchman and Theologian", unpublished thesis at New College, University of Edinburgh (1956), p.352, who develops the idea that Browne actually was an Erastian-Independent. Such views have been so often expressed that it becomes important that we point out their fallacy from a study of the original records of the Assembly.

The first evidence against the assertion is the fact that every Erastian in the Assembly spoke out against the Independent proposals. On April 4, 1644, Palmer favored an accomodation with the Independents on the subject of ordination, but his motion was defeated primarily because John Lightfoot (the Erastian leader in the sedemunt) opposed it. *Vide Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit.*, p.241. Earlier in the year, on March 11, 1644 (*ibid.*, p.207), Lightfoot had spoken of a rapprochement "betwixt us and the Independents" as though he considered himself an orthodox Presbyterian in contradistinction to the Congregationalists in the Assembly. Furthermore, Lightfoot and Thomas Goodwin often locked horns in debate (*e.g.* on Nov. 1, 1643, *ibid.*, p.33). Thomas Coleman, another of the Westminster Assembly Erastians, argued for Prebytery against Independency on Feb. 14, 1644, also on Mar. 3, 1644/5, sess.390 (Minutes, *op. cit.*, p.67). *Vide Gillespie's Notes, op. cit.*, p.18. On the 22nd of Feb., 1644 (*ibid.*, p.28), Gillespie records a similar argument of Lightfoot's against the Congregationalists.

Actually, the tie-up between the Erastians and the Independents was never in the Assembly, but in the Parliament. That is why it was so out of character for the Erastian Selden to disagree with the Presbyterians and to join with the Independents against a paper presented to the Assembly by the Scottish commissioners, on Jan. 25, 1644. *Vide Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit.*, p.120. The Erastian divines would never have done such a thing. Even Robert Baillie once admitted that this alliance was confined to the Parliament although his remarks have been the principal reason for subsequent historical misunderstanding. *Cf.* Baillie's *Letters, op. cit.*, p.360, letter to Dickson, dated March 17, 1646, II.

The second bit of evidence supporting our contention is the fact that
individual Independents joined with the Presbyterians against the Erastians in the Assembly debates. Philip Nye once argued against Coleman over the issue of Erastianism, March 9, 1645/6, sess. 601, Minutes, op. cit., p.194. And Thomas Goodwin was appointed to serve on a committee to prove the Assembly's concept of Church government in opposition to the Erastian claims. Ibid., p.218, April 13, 1646, sess.620.

Thirdly, the names of Thomas Goodwin, Carter, Nye, Simpson, and Carrill appear among the names of the Presbyterians in the letter's answers to the Nine Queries of Parliament concerning Erastianism. Ibid., p.252, July 7, 1646, sess.652. On a subsequent vote concerning a related proposition, Philip Nye dissented to the Presbyterian statement along with the Erastians, but on the following day, he again voted with his Independent brethren attacking the claims of Erastus. Ibid., p.253, July 8, 1646, sess.653. The only time when the Independents did not vote with their Presbyterian brethren against the Erastians was on July 17th, 1646, sess. 676 (?), Ibid., p.297, when Goodwin, Burroughs, and Carter declined to vote on the issue of just divinum until "they see the scope of it". Even here, however, the Independent leaders did not necessarily reject the proposition, but only wanted more time to study it. Furthermore, the fact that the Independents did not fundamentally disagree with the proposal is evident from the fact that Joseph Carrill did actually vote with the Presbyterians. Loc. cit. Robert Baillie, on. cit., p.378, in a letter to Glasgow, July 14, 1646, reported, too, that the Independents had signed the Assembly answer to the Nine Queries of Parliament. Cf. A History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines and Biographical Sketches of its Most ConspicuousMembers (Philadelphia: published by the Presbyterian Board of Publications, 1841), p.154, which notes the significance of this vote.

Section (c): The Scottish Commissioners and the Westminster Assembly Independents

There were no stronger and more effective opponents of the Independents at the Westminster Assembly than the four or five Scottish Commissioners. In many respects, the Scots and the Dissenting Brethren were the principal actors on the brilliantly-lit stage of the 1643-1648 era. Each group desperately attempted to influence English public opinion in favor of its party and quite naturally the two were in frequent and violent antithesis in the Westminster Assembly.

Not only did the Scots and the Brethren serve together on several key committees (e.g. the sub-committee for the Directory of Public Worship and the sub-committee on Accommodation), but the Scots were busily engaged in writing against their opponents. They saw fit to answer the Apologeticall Narration "For the vindication of our church", according to Baillie's Letters, op. cit., p.150, in a letter to W. Spang, dated Feb. 13, 1644. Baillie was busy writing his various pieces such as the Dissuasive. Rutherford, too, published numerous books on the subject. Cf. Baillie's Letters, op. cit., p.124, II, letter to Scotland, 1643, commending one of Rutherford's works against the Independents. The year following, Rutherford seems to have enlarged this earlier book. Ibid., p.159, II, letter to Blair, March 26, 1644. Robert Blair, himself, was delegated in 1641 to write against Independency. Vide W.M. Campbell, The Triumph of Presbyterianism (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1958), p.79. In addition to their own productions, Baillie (if not other Scots) was busily engaged sending Independent literature abroad soliciting foreign divines to answer it. Cf. e.g. Baillie's Letters, op. cit., p.144, II, letter to Spang, March 10, 1644; p.181, to Spang, undated letter, 1644; et p.291, to Spang, July 5, 1644.

In the Assembly, the Scots once were so vexed by Thomas Goodwin's debating...
skill that they invited him to dinner in the hope of ameliorating some of their
differences. Ibid., p.123, II, letter to Scotland, 1643. And Goodwin evidently
reciprocated this feeling of antipathy toward the Scottish Commissioners whom he
felt were exceeding their authority in England. Of. his Of the Constitution, Order,
and Discipline, of the Churches of Christ (London: 1696), p.2264 "If a Noble Man
comes from one Kingdom to another, as the Nobles of Scotland, as Commissioners into
England, they are to be Respected and Regarded as Nobles, according to their Place
State with another; but still they are no way to be regarded, as having Jurisdiction;
or exercising the Office of Nobles, where they come, as the Nobles of England do." This
illustration was used by Goodwin against the Presbyterian claim that each elder
is in fact an elder to the universal church on earth.

Besides the committees and the pamphleteering, the main field of conflict
between the Scots and the Dissenting Brethren was the Westminster Assembly Debates.
Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., tell us, for instance, that he and Thomas Goodwin
evidently spent most of the year 1644 engaged in personal debate in the sedent. Goodwin
brought in the first argument against presbytery on Feb. 5, 1644. Ibid., p.10. On the following day, Feb. 6, 1644, he was answered by George Gillespie
(ibid., p.11) who denied Goodwin's premises and attempted (unsuccessfully) to
prove that Goodwin had made the logical error of "denying the consequent" (ibid.,
p.13). On Feb. 13, 1644, the two debated against each other again (ibid., p.17),
and again on March 1 (ibid., p.32), March 6 (ibid., p.36), March 7 (p.36), March
8 (p.37), April 5 (p.40), April 12 (p.50), April 15 (p.51), and on April 17th,
Goodwin accused Rutherford of having abrogated Episcopal ordination (ibid., p.52),
no doubt a subtle move by the Independent leader to alienate many of the English
Presbyterians from their Scottish friends. On April 26 (p.55), Gillespie and Good-
win were still arguing, as on May 3 (p.60), May 9 (p.61), May 14 (p.64), Sept. 16
(p.72), Sept. 17 (p.74), and Sept. 30 (p.82). On this last date, Gillespie sought to
show, by way of a lengthy comparison, how much different Thomas Goodwin's views
were from John Cotton's on the subject of "standing synods"... and he was certainly
right. They did not agree at all! On Oct. 1 (p.83), Gillespie pointed out
that Goodwin was further away from Cotton on the use of the magistrate in ecclesiasti-
cal affairs. On Oct. 2 (p.86), the personal feud continued in the Assembly, but on
September 30th, there had also been an encounter between the two in the Committee
on Accommodation (vide p.105, Ibid.). It was in this committee, on Oct. 18 (ibid.,
p.107) that Sir Henry Vane made the observation that the whole issue over church
government boiled down to a dispute between the Scots and the Independents. This
of course, was hotly denied by Gillespie (loc. cit.), but Vane had probably never
spoken truer words. Their debates continued the next year also. Vide the Minutes,
op. cit., p.82, sess. 19, April 17, 1645. William Campbell, in his unpublished
thesis at New College, University of Edinburgh (1937), "Samuel Rutherford, Propa-
gandist and Exponent of Scottish Presbyterianism etc.", p.225, believes that
without Rutherford and Gillespie, Thomas Goodwin and Philip RIe would have swayed
the entire Assembly. It is significant that he often speaks of Goodwin and Ruther-
ford in debate (ibid., pp.116, 120, 122 et passim).

But in spite of Gillespie's many debates with the leader of the Dissenting
Brethren, there is much evidence that he was essentially a moderate whose views
might have been a mutual meeting point for both sides had he not met an early
and untimely death. For instance, on March 8, 1644, Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit.,
p.203, records the interesting fact that both Gillespie and Goodwin had agreed on
one proposition. The same phenomenon occurred on May 23, 1644, Ibid., p.276.
And on March 21, Goodwin worded a proposition on the people's rights to elect their
own minister which was almost identical to an earlier one made by the young Scot, ibid., p. 231. On May 1, 1644, Gillespie cited several examples from the reformed churches to support a limited power to each particular congregation. Vide his Notes, op. cit., p. 56. This view was in the direction of Congregationalist claims and in opposition to the extreme Presbyterians. Campbell, Triumph, op. cit., p. 103, says that the Scots were much influenced by the Westminster Independents.

Section (d): How many Independents were at the Westminster Assembly?

An accurate census of the various parties in the Westminster Assembly has never been attempted, and most historians have been content to make wild guesses on the subject. The assembly divines were originally chosen by two being suggested by members of Parliament from each county, the Welsh counties separate, one each from Oxford, Cambridge and London. The first bill was passed on May 9th, 1642, a second bill in October, 1642, and a third in January, 1642/3. Since the king refused to sign any of these, in early summer, 1643, Parliament determined to call the Westminster Assembly without the king's consent. The ordinance was passed June 12th, 1643 and with very few exceptions, the same 120 divines chosen the previous year were again approved and invited to attend. Vide R. H. Dale, History of English Congregationalism (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), p. 261. Actually, the roll included 151 members (121 divines and 30 laymen). The laymen were composed of 10 Lords and 20 Commoners. Cf. Robert Low Orr, Alexander Henderson, Churchman and Historian (London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), p. 340. And of the clergyman invited, nearly sixty did not attend, according to J. May Colligan, The Westminster Assembly—and After (Lancaster: 1925), p. 3. After the signing of the Covenant and Charles forbidding them to attend, the Episcopalians withdrew, leaving only the Independents and the Presbyterians (discounting the so-called Christian party, vide infra).

We do not know for certain what criterion was adopted by Parliament in their original choice of divines. Salamy's Continuation said that Philip Nye had "a great concern in choosing the members of the Assembly of Divines who were summoned from all parts", ibid in John Stoughton's History of Religion in England (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931), p. 269, I], but this is extremely doubtful when we realize how many Presbyterians were asked and how few of Nye's own party. There seems to have been several attempts to get more Independents into the Assembly. On Nov. 2, 1643, the Lords and Commons agreed to admit John Dury in place of the deceased Giliellus Down. At the same time, the Lords nominated John Goodwin, Dr. Hones of Wood Street, and J.R. Horton, Divinity lecturer at Cresham College, but the House of Commons appears to have refused to act on these proposals. Vide David Nason's Life of Milton, etc. (London: Laumillen and Co., 1894-1902), p. 392, II. Nason, depending on Wood, says that Nathaniel Holmes (Hones) was an Independent and thinks that Horton was also inclined toward their way. John Cotton, Thomas Hooker, and John Davenport were all invited back to England in Sept. 1642 to help in "the settling and composing the affairs of the church" according to a letter signed by five years and thirty-four others including Oliver Cromwell. It is a pity that none came. Vide Nason, op. cit., p. 605, II. There seems to have been some ill feeling on the part of many Presbyterians at being left off the membership rolls of the celebrated assembly. Richard Baxter bemoaned the fact that he was "not worthy to be one of them". Vide A. P. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1863), p. 113. Thomas Edwards appeared to resent the choice of the five apologists, when he himself was overlooked. Cf. his Antependia; etc. (London: 1643), p. 68. Likewise, Adam Steuart, in his Some Observations and Annotations Upon the Apologetical Narration, etc. (London: 1643), p. 2, et passim in the epistle, kept referring to the honor of having been chosen a member of the assembly as though he were slightly jealous that he was not one.
But the question which vitally concerns us, is the number of Congregationalists who sat in the sederunt. Many mistakes have been reported concerning the issue. David Nason, The Life of John Milton, op. cit., p.605, II, classed Caryl among "the most active Presbyterians" in the Westminster Assembly, which is surely an error. E.A. Payne, Free Church Tradition in the Life of England (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1944), p.50, names Owen (who never sat in the assembly) as "one of the five dissenting brethren". J. Minton Batten, John Dury Advocate of Christian Reunion (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p.130, calls Greenhill, Carter, and Adoniram Syfield Presbyterians and the first two (if not also the third) were all Independents. Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain etc. (London: Thomas Tegg and Son, 1837), p.446, III, classed both Carters, and Joseph Caryl among the Westminster Assembly Presbyterian party.

Only five men signed the Apologetically Narration, Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sydrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, and William Bridge. This may mean that the other Independents who later appeared in the Assembly, were converted to Congregationalism after the assembly began, or it could mean that the other Independents were more moderate than the five apologists, or it could mean (and this is the best possibility) that the others did not agree with their leaders about the gathering of churches. All of the Independents in the sederunt didn't sign the agreement relinquishing the right to gather churches. At any rate, there were several more Independents in the Assembly than the five Apologists. W.K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England 1640-1660 (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1938), p.355, asserts that there were 8-11 Independents in the Assembly, without attempting to be more specific. Albert Peel, The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order, 1658 (London: Independent Press, 1939), p.8, numbered eleven, but failed to name them individually. Louis Du Moulin, The Conformity of the Discipline and Government of those who are commonly called Independents to that of the Ancient Primitive Christians (London: 1680), p.36, believed that there were 8-10 Independents in the sederunt. William Walker, The Credes and Platforms of Congregationalism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), p.342, listed Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Jeremiah Burroughs, Sydrach Simpson, Carter, Caryl, Green, Greenhill, Sterry, Bond, and Anthony Burgess (a total of eleven). David Laing (ed.) The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, etc. (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841), p.119, II, letter to William Spang, Dec. 7, 1643, named Joseph Caryl, William Carter of London, John Phillips, and Peter Sterry, along with the Apologists, but stated that there were "ten or eleven" total. W.M. Hetherington, History of the Westminster Assembly (ed. by Robert Williamson, Edinburgh: James Gemell, 1878, fourth edition), p.153 depending on Daniel Neal, p.275, 360, II, added the names of Anthony Burgess and William Greenhill to the usual list (as given by Baillie). According to our catalogue of dissents, the only ones who ever dissented on Independent grounds, were the following: Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Simpson, Burroughs, Francis Woodcooke, William Carter, Greenhill, Carroll, and Bond.

Besides the hard core of Apologists, therefore, there were several others who either were Congregationalist at the start or became so later on in the debates. For instance, William Carter and William Greenhill did not sign the Narration, but did sign the Copy of a Remonstrance, with the original five. Bernd Gustafsson, The Five Dissenting Brethren etc. (Lund: O.W.K. Gleerup, 1955), p.94, refers to Anthony Burgess as an Independent. Another, who became an independent sometime after the opening of the Assembly, was Francis Rous. Vide Geoffrey F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), p.73. We know that Rous was head of the parliamentary committee which supported the first group of Visitors sent to Oxford for reforming the university. Vide Montagu Burrows, (ed.), "The Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658",...
The ecclesiastical alliances of John Dury are also worth noting. Usually he is classed along with the orthodox Presbyterians. William Fartlet, in his *A Model of the Primitive Congregational Way* etc. (London: 1647), p. 96, described him as "a learned Presbyterian." But, in 1660, Dury claimed that he was a member of neither the Presbyterian nor the Independent parties. *Vide* J. Minton Batten, *John Dury Advocate of Christian Reunion*, op. cit., p. 94n. Nevertheless, there are several things about Dury which might tend to show that he was very sympathetic to Independency. (1) He was educated at Leyden where he had an chance to observe all the different streams of Dutch theological thought including John Robinson's Puritan principles. *Cf.* Batten, op. cit., p. 7. A familiarity with Holland in the seventeenth century was very often a prelude to later Congregational overtures. (2) He was an early friend of Thomas Goodwin. *Vide* e.g. *A Epistolary Discourse Written by Mr. John Dury to Mr. Tho. Goodwin*, etc. (London: 1644), written on June 24, 1642 from the Hague. This correspondence is very friendly in tone and there seems little doubt that Dury and Goodwin were at this time on the best terms. *Cf.* Batten, op. cit., p. 7. Goodwin, Nye, Marshall and Sibbes once subscribed to one of Dury's papers on union. *Ibid.* p. 26. (3) In 1645, some of Dury's friends evidently expected him to come out boldly in favor of toleration of the Independents. *Vide* G. H. Turnbull, *Fartlet*, *Dury*, and *Comenius* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947), p. 224. The fact that he didn't do not subtract from the general impression Dury had left with his contemporaries. (4) Although a Scot by birth (Edinburgh, 1596), Dury does not seem to have always been compatible with his fellow countrymen. Samuel Rutherford distrusted him because in a letter (1637), it was revealed that Dury accepted re-ordination at the hands of the bishops. *Vide* Batten, op. cit., p. 59. And although Baillie defended some of Dury's proposals at the General Assembly held at St. Andrews, 1641 [ibid., p. 88], yet the Glasgow Principal was criticised by Dury in a letter from the Hague dated Jan. 27, 1641. *Vide* Turnbull, op. cit., p. 219. The object of this criticism was Baillie's Canturians Self-Conviction and this is probably one of the main reasons why Baillie and Dury do not seem to have been on friendly terms afterwards. S.W. Carruthers, *Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly* (Philadelphia: published by the Presbyterian Historical societies of both England and America, 1943), p. 187, points out that Baillie was not keen on Dury because of the latter's connections with John Milton. *Cf.* Mitchell, op. cit., p. 287, in this regard. When Dury was reputed to be headed for the Westminster Assembly, Baillie wrote to his cousin, Speng, on April 19th, 1644, and spoke out against his coming to London. *Vide* Batten, op. cit., p. 99n. Carruthers, op. cit., p. 187, points out that Baillie's letter must have done some good, because Dury...
did not take his seat until August 12, 1645, nearly a year and a half later. (5) During the period of the Commonwealth, the Independent leaders often favored Dury and made use of his services. Cf. Batten, op. cit., p.118. There was a ten member committee set up by Parliament under Cromwell to confer on religious toleration. Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, in his Visible Saints (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), p.4, classifies this committee as composed entirely of Independents excepting Dury and Byfield, but there is a strong likelihood that both men were at least half Independents at this time. Cf. R.W. Dale, History of English Congregationalism (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), p.314, on Dury's and Byfield's signing the Propagand of the Gospel Proposals along with Owen, Goodwin, and other Independents. (6) At least once, during the Westminster Assembly debates, Dury is listed with the Dissenting Brethren as a member of the Committee on Accommodation revived by Parliament, November 6th, 1645. Vide Daniel Neal, History of the Puritans (London: Thomas Tegg and Son, 1837), p.378, II. Batten, op. cit., p.106, also mentions that Dury served on this committee but fails to note that his name occurs among the Independents...not among the Presbyterians. This interesting phenomenon cannot be passed off as a mistake in the light of the other facts given supra. Dury lived in Holland, was a personal friend of several leading Independent divines, was mistrusted by the Scots although one himself, was much honored under Cromwell, was thought by many of his friends to favor toleration of Independents, and at least once, was actually listed with the Dissenting Brethren in the Assembly.

During the controversy, Marshall often championed Independent views. Not only was he a Chilling (vide infra on eschatology), but he was diligent in procuring toleration for the Independents. Baillie was often critical of him for this. Vide Baillie's Journals, op. cit., p.260, II, letter to Spang, April 25, 1645; at on Jan. 20, 1646(?), p.343, in another letter to Spang, Baillie said that Marshall was the "most diligent agent" of all in procuring toleration for Independents. Marshall was so close to the Independents on many issues, that Clement Walker, in his Relations and Observations, Historical and Political, upon the Parliament, begun Anno Dom. 1640 Divided into II Booke: I. The Mystery of the two Junto's Presbyterian and Independent 2. The History of Independency, etc. (n.p.: 1648), p.81, Part I, accused him of having secretly been converted from Presbyterianism to Congregationalism, "and join'd interest with Mr. Nye." Nye and Marshall often were together and they journeyed to Scotland as the two ministerial representatives of the Parliament in negotiating with the Scots. Their friendship may have been more than fraternal, however. Wilcock, op. cit., p.121, says that Nye was Marshall's son-in-law and if true, it might explain why Marshall was so condescending to Independents and also how he maintained his popularity under Cromwell.

We conclude, therefore, that the number of Independents and their sympathizers were much stronger in the Westminster Assembly than has generally been admitted. These sympathizers were probably much more numerous at the end of the sederunt than at the beginning, and indicate something of the success of Goodwin and his fellows in the debates. The number of known Independents (i.e. those who can be identified by their debates and their voting) include Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sydrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughs, William Bridge, William Greenhill, Joseph Carrill, William Carter, John Bond, John Phillips, John Green, Peter Sterry, and Francis Woodcock. In addition, there were several who evidently became associated later on with Independency. We do not say that they all became staunch Congregational preachers. These include Burgess, Francis Rous, John Dury, Stephen Marshall, and Anthony Tuckney. Perhaps there were many more in this second group, but a definitive census is beyond our purpose.

Section (e): Apportionment of committee appointments in the Westminster Assembly.
Most of the work of the Westminster Assembly was done in committees and the appointment of members of these various committees was one of the principal means of Presbyterian control of the sessions and of the eventual outcome of the debates... as well as the voting. Nearly half the time of the Assembly was spent in hammering out issues in these smaller groups. Robert Baillie described a typical working day: "We sit daily from nine till near one; and after noon till night we are usually in committees." Vide his Letters, op. cit., p.244, II, public letter, dated Dec. 1, 1644.

The method of appointing these committees was of vital concern to both parties and there is much evidence that the Presbyterians were unfair to their Independent opponents in this respect. Out of a total of 65 committees mentioned in the official Minutes, op. cit., there were no Independents on 30 of them. Thomas Goodwin served on the following:

(1) a committee on the preface to the Directory, Minutes, op. cit., p.4f. Philip Nye was not appointed although he had spoken three times in the preceding debate which had occasioned the formation of such a committee. Goodwin and Burroughs were on the list, but the former had spoken only once and the latter not at all. This was the kind of calculated caprice which characterized many of these committee appointments. Sess.326, Nov. 20, 1644

(2) a committee of three (i.e. Marshall, Palmer, and Goodwin) to prepare a directory of fasting, ibid., p.16, sess. 335, Dec. 5, 1644. Goodwin was named because he "had collections to that purpose";

(3) a committee on fasting, ibid., p.20, sess.341, Dec. 13, 1644;

(4) a committee to reconsider excommunication, ibid., p.32, sess. 355, Jan. 7, 1644/5;

(5) a committee to add to the excommunication proposals, ibid., p.44, sess. 370, Jan. 30, 1644/5;

(6) a committee on suspension from the Lord's Table, ibid., p.121, sess. 484, Aug. 11, 1645;

(7) a committee to prove church government against the Erastians, ibid., p. 218, sess. 620, April 13, 1646;

(8) a committee composed of the Dissenting Brethren to consider the jux divinum propositions in the Erastian controversy, ibid., p.231, sess. 639, May 14, 1646 (the request by the Independents to be made into such a committee did not meet with immediate approval, because nearly a week went by from the date of the first request, i.e. May 8, 1646, to the eventual appointment, cf. sess. 637, p.2291);

(9) a committee on scandalous sins, ibid., p.233, sess. 642, May 19, 1646;

(10) and the last committee which names Goodwin as a member was one to re-examine an article on the law, ibid., p.273, sess.696, Sept. 1, 1646.

(11) Five other committee appointments, at least, are mentioned in the illegible unpublished minutes.

In addition to these committees, Thomas Goodwin served on a subcommittee of six to
the Grand Committee of Accommodation nominated in the Westminster Assembly under the instigation of Independents and Presbyterians in Parliament, Sept. 20, 1644, some of the affairs of which are reported by Gillespie in his Notes, op. cit. This committee was set up to bring about some sort of reconciliation between the Westminster Presbyterians and the Independents, but after sitting for five weeks, was finally dissolved under opposition from the Scots and other members of the Assembly. Robert Baillie regarded it as a "dangerous committee", because it threatened to give Independents the freedom they desired. Goodwin was the delegate nominated to report to Parliament on the agreement of the Assembly. Vide D. Barbour, Historical Memorials Relating to the Independents etc. (London: Fisher, Son, & Co., 1639-1644), pp.447,255,11. This was one of his most important appointments. He also served on the sub-committee for the Directory of Public Worship, which consisted of Marshall, Palmer, Young, Herle, Goodwin, and the Scottish commissioners. Here again, however, Goodwin seems to have been the victim of prejudice. Every member except himself was given an assignment: Herle...public prayer and sacrament, Young...reading of Scripture, Marshall...preaching of the Word, and Palmer...the catechism. Vide Mitchell, Westminster Assembly, op. cit., p.214f. The first draft of the Directory was the work of an enlarged committee, including Palmer, Herle, Marshall, Tuckney, Seaman, Vines, Gataker, Goodwin, and the Scots. Vide, op. cit., p.251. Cf. H. R. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1948), p.128, who thinks that Goodwin exercised considerable influence on this sub-committee. The confession of faith was begun on August 20, 1644 by a committee which included Gogge, Temple, Hoyle, Gataker, Arrowsmith, Burroughs, Burgess, Vines, Goodwin, and the Scots. Two weeks later, Smith, Palmer, Newcomen, Herle, Reynolds, Wilson, Tuckney, Young, Ley, and Sagewick were added. Vide Mitchell's Westminster Assembly, op. cit., p.357. This occurred on Sept. 4, 1644, and on May 12, 1645, this enlarged committee reported to the Assembly. Evidently it was dissolved and a new one appointed. The new committee was composed of Temple, Hoyle, Gataker, Harris, Burgess, Reynolds, Herle, and the Scots...no Independents. Vide number 6, infra, of the committees without Independents. We cannot be sure why the committee constituency should have been altered before its work was finished and why the Independents should have been eliminated from the third committee, unless it was because of their intransigence. And this is certainly possible since this enlarged committee was given such subjects to discuss as would be violently debated by Thomas Goodwin and Jeremiah Burroughs, the only two Independents on the committee, i.e. Christian liberty, the nature of the Church in its communion of the saints, the Sabbath, the civil magistrate, divorce and marriage, etc. Perhaps the Presbyterians felt that the only way out of the impasse was to appoint a new committee. Cf. Phillip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom with A History and Critical Notes (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1878), p.756, I, who sketches the history of the confession through its various stages. Although the final draft of the Confession heads and much work on the confession itself was done without the benefit of the Independents on this final committee, we cannot be sure how much Congregational influence was held over from the former group. There is strong indication, however, that Goodwin successfully bamstrung the first committee from August 20, 1644, till May 12, 1645, when the new one was formed...without him. Perhaps the Presbyterians felt that this was the only way to best him in debate!

Space prohibits cataloguing committee appointments of all the Independents, but a rough census is provided in our section on "participation" of the brethren in the Assembly affairs. One revealing piece of information, however, we shall include here. It is a list of the various committees which did not include the name of even one Congregationalist.
*(1) A committee to draft a letter to Scotland and the General Assembly.

(2) Committee to further the taking of the Covenant. Ibid., p.19, Oct. 1643.

*(3) Committee to treat with Scottish Commissioners. Ibid., p.27, Oct. 23, 1643.
Bridge was almost named to this committee, but was excluded after debate. Throughout the course of the Assembly, the Presbyterians effectively prevented any Independents from influencing any of the dealings with the Scots.

*(4) Committee to draft letter to Scottish General Assembly. Minutes, op. cit., p.24, sess. 349, Dec. 30, 1644 [a MS error says 1646].

*(5) Letter to Scotland. Ibid., p.77, sess.413, April 9, 1645.


(7) Committee to investigate Hanserd Knowles’s supposed antinomian preaching. Minutes, op. cit., p.96, sess. 440, May 20, 1645. Since Knowles was a leading Baptist of the time, it might have been that the Assembly feared some sort of an Independent-Baptist conspiracy if they allowed a mixed committee.

(8) Committee to consider a book that maintained God to be the author of sin. Ibid., p.111f., sess.467, July 11, 1645. Perhaps the author of this book was Goodwin’s successor as pastor of the Arnheim church and the Assembly felt that possibly the Independents might be prejudiced if they sat on the committee. Cf. Robert Baillie’s Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time (London: 1646), p.80, who accused the Independents of holding this doctrine.

*(9) Committee to draft a letter to Scotland. Minutes, op. cit., p.114, sess. 470, July 16, 1645.

(10) Committee to consider Tombes’s heresy on infant baptism. Ibid., p.173, sess.561, Dec. 25, 1645. Tombes was one of the most learned Baptists of the time and was famous for his attacks against pedo-baptism. Goodwin, of course, had disqualified himself from such a committee by his series of public lectures which Baillie stigmatized as being virtual enabaptism. Vide supra on baptism in the controversy.


*(12) Letter to the Scottish Commissioners. Ibid., p.212, sess.611, March 27, 1646.

(13) Committee to consider scandalous books against the Assembly and the Parliament. Ibid., p.218, sess.621, April 14, 1646.

(14) Committee to prevent the admission of scandalous ministers into the ministry. Ibid., p.329, sess.792, Feb. 15, 1646/7.

Committee to examine ministers from the Royalist camp. Minutes, op. cit., p. 334, sess. 802, March 3, 1646/7.


Committee to consider Mr. Hall. *Ibid.*, p.348, sess. 826, April 15, 1647.


Committee to examine all the records of money disbursed to the members of the Assembly. *Ibid.*, p.368, sess. 844, May 17, 1647. The omission of any Independent name from this committee is one of the strangest aspects of this study, because Philip Nye had served on almost every committee set up for the purpose of distributing funds. Vide e.g. the following: (a) Minutes, op. cit., p.96, sess. 441, May 23, 1645, a committee to get the revenues from the Archbishop of Canterbury's estate settled on the Assembly of divines; (b) *Ibid.*, p.116, sess. 475, July 25, 1645, a committee for the better supplying of the Assembly divines; (c) *Ibid.*, p.124, sess. 488, Aug. 15, 1645, a committee to distribute £200 among the members of the sederunt; (d) *Ibid.*, p.244, sess. 660, June 17, 1646, a committee to distribute £600 among the members.


It will be noted that in nine of the above committees (marked asterisk*), relations with Scotland were involved. There were only two instances when Independents were asked to serve on committees appointed to deal in any way with Scotland. One was on July 8, 1646, sess.673, ibid., p.254, when Marshall, Sedgwick, Perne, and Nye were designated to conduct the "Marquisse of Argile" into the Westminster Assembly in honor. Very likely, Marshall and Nye had met the man on their trip to Scotland three years previous and so were acquainted with him. The second instance was on June 2, 1648, sess.1075, ibid., p.520, when Nye served on a committee to draft a letter to Scotland. So far as we can determine, this is the only time an Independent ever helped write a letter from the Assembly to Scotland and probably reflects the changing political situation in the Commons. On Nov. 11, 1647, sess.951, p.488, ibid., the Commons had disapproved of an Assembly letter to the Northern kingdom, a letter probably written by the committee (appointed without any Independents on Sept. 13, 1647, number 27, supra). It is significant that Nye served on the last of these committees ever appointed in the sederunt.

I  It is evident in the study of these committee appointments that Independents were often the victims of prejudice. The following are indicative of our contention:
(1) As early as Jan. 3rd, 1644, Thomas Goodwin and Nye were complaining that a letter from the Westminster Assembly to the Scots not only slandered the Independents, and implied that the Church of Scotland was *jure divino*, but also made uniformity the ground of peace between the two kingdoms. Vide supra on *ius divinum* which figured in the controversy. The objections of the Independents were undoubtedly centered on the fact that already they were being excluded from any share in writing these letters... and their fears were certainly born out by subsequent Assembly procedure. Vide George Gillespie, *Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines* etc. (ed. by David Meek, Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846), p.100.
(2) On Jan. 22, 1644, the Assembly decided to choose a committee by appointing three out of each standing committee to form a small group to consider ordination. Such procedure, if followed religiously, could have been a great boon to the Presbyterians and a great detriment to the Independents, because the latter's minority views would not always have been heard in such a plan. Vide Lightfoot's *Journal, op. cit.*, p.116. (3) On Jan. 27, 1644, Vines proposed that the Independents be made into a committee to give their idea of how to supply the ministry, but the author of the proposition attached so many rules and regulations to his committee proposal that the Independents would have had no liberty of discussion even if granted the privilege. There seems to have been nothing done about Vines's idea. Vide *op. cit.*, p.126.
(4) On Jan. 7, 1644/5, Thomas Goodwin complained to the Assembly about their prejudicial committee appointments: "It had been well if you had taken in some of the other [i.e. Independents] that they also might have been consulted with in it." Vide the *Minutes, op. cit.*, p.30, sess.355. Goodwin's criticism was well founded, because Stephen Marshall admitted that the committee on excommunication (under discussion) was one-sidedly in favor of the Presbyterian party. Ibid., p.31. As a result of this exchange, perhaps, Goodwin and Nye were added to the committee to reconsider excommunication. Ibid., p.32. Cf. number 3, under Goodwin's appointments, supra. (5) Burroughs and Nye were appointed to the committee to enumerate scandalous sins, even though Thomas Goodwin had been the first to propose that they be listed. Vide *Minutes, op. cit.*, p.160, sess.526, Oct. 30, 1645. Perhaps Goodwin was absent, though, because he was appointed to a similar committee on May 19, 1646. Cf. number 7 under Goodwin's appointments. The Assembly often appointed men to committees who had not spoken at all in the preceding debate, just as they often
omitted men who had spoken the most in debate or who, by virtue of published books, would logically have been best suited to serve on a certain committee. A typical example of a Westminster Assembly committee of the last mentioned type was the one appointed on Dec. 25, 1645 (Hist. civ., p.173, sess.561) to consider the heresy of Tomes's Baptist heresy'. The members of this committee were quite surprising. They included Richard Vines, Ward (Samuel or John?), Herbert Palmer, Thomas Case, John Ley, and Stanley Govery, but did not include the names one would have expected to find. Burgess e.g. was not appointed, even though he had published a widely circulated book on the subject many years before, called, Baptist Regeneration of Elect Infants, professed by the Church of England, according to scriptures, the primitive Church, the present Reformed Churches, and many particular divines apart (Oxford: 1629). Vide James Reid, Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of those Eminent Divines who convened in the Famous Assembly at Westminster, in the Seventeenth Century (Paisley: Stephen and Andrew Young, vol. I published 1811 et vol. II published 1815), p.96. The Assembly stood opposed to baptismal regeneration, however, and this might account for their not putting Burgess on the committee. Vide S. W. Carruthers, The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly (Philadelphia; published by the Presbyterian Historical Societies of England and America, 1943), p.112, for a discussion of the Assembly's revision of article "q" of the thirty-nine articles, and how the wording was changed to eliminate any thought of baptismal regeneration. It is not said whether the Scottish Commissioners were also to serve with this committee, but the silence in the minutes indicates that they were not. Yet Robert Baillie was already working on his Anabaptists, the True Fountain of Independency, Antinomy, Brownisme, Pamilisme, and the most of the other Erors which doe trouble in the Church of England, unsealed. (London: 1646) et Samuel Rutherford had things in print which were not complimentary to the Baptists. Vide e.g., his Due Right, on cit., p.24, for a typical anti-anabaptist passage. Furthermore, the name of Stephen Marshall is strangely absent even though he had preached (and later published) his famous sermon called A sermon on the Baptizing of Infants preached at Westminster Aug. 22, 1644. (London: 1644). The fact of Marshall's not being appointed to this committee raises the question of why he seemed to be involved with Tomes in subsequent times. For Marshall later published his A Defence of Infant Baptism in answer to two Treatises by Mr. Jo. Tomes. (London: 1646). This book seems to have been the official Westminster Assembly answer to the encroachments of this learned Baptist. Another member of the Assembly who had published material against the Baptists was Daniel Featley. He brought out his The Vipers Fisht, or the Anabaptists duck'd and plunged over head and ears at a Disputation in Southwark. (London: 1645). Featley, however, was a moderate Anglican and appears not to have sat at the Assembly long. Probably he was gone by Dec. 1645. Two other members also published pamphlets on this subject although they appeared several years after this committee was formed in the Assembly and could therefore not have had any bearing on their appointment. They were Daniel Cavdry who engaged in a controversy with Giles Firmin with his A Sober Answer to a Serious Question pronounced by G. Firmin, viz., Whether the Ministers of England are bound by the Word of God to Baptize the Children of all such Parents, which say they believe in Jesus Christ. (London: 1652) et William Lyford, who issued his An Apologie for our Publick Ministerie and Infant Baptism. (London: 1653). Thus, although no Independents were appointed to this committee, not one Presbyterian was appointed who had any literary interest in the question either. Perhaps this is one of history's unanswerable conundrums. (6) On May 8, 1646, the Dissenting Brethren asked to be made into a committee to discuss the Erastian proposals of jus divinum. The Assembly only reluctantly granted their wish after six days of delay. Vide, p.229, sess.657. (7) That the Independents were not treated fairly respecting committee membership is also evident from their publication, A Copy of a Remonstrance Lately Delivered in to the Assembly By Thomas Goodwin etc. (London: 1645), p.4, where they say that the Assembly
has wronged them in refusing to allow private members of Independent persuasion to present papers in the Assembly on the grounds that they were not a duly constituted committee: "And so we were prevented of doing the like for time to come". It is this fact which Hetherington fails to mention in his criticism of the Westminster Independents for never again (after the rejection of their ordination proposals) submitting anything to the Assembly in writing. Cf. Hetherington, op. cit., p. 169.

By not allowing any members to present papers unless they were a committee and by refusing to appoint Independents to committees, the Presbyterians effectively stifled the voices of their opponents whose only recourse was to debate and delay... a strategy which consumed eight years of time and eventually thwarted Presbyterianism in England.

Our catalogue of "participation" [given supra] shows definitely, that at least three leading Presbyterians [i.e. Marshall, Gouge, and Reynolds] were given committee appointments roughly in the ratio of three to one over Thomas Goodwin, the leader of the Independents. This was one of the reasons why the Independents were forced to monopolize the floor in debate so often. It was the only place where their views were allowed to be aired.
APPENDIX D: THE PROBLEM OF DISSENT IN THE PRESBYTERIAN-INDEPENDENT CONTROVERSY

Nothing disturbed the Presbyterian mind more completely than the fear of dissent. Truth was one and any deviation from that should not be tolerated, much less encouraged. Dissent and schism were synonymous terms to a seventeenth century synodical divine. In the Westminster Assembly, the Presbyterian dread of dissent exhibited itself repeatedly.

Only a few months after the Assembly convened, the debate over ruling elders grew so hot that Thomas Goodwin proposed an accommodation to bring the Scottish and English Presbyterians closer together. Vide John Rogers Pitman (ed.), The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, etc. (London: 1824), p.75, Dec. 7, 1643, vol. XIII, containing The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines: From January 1, 1643, to December 31, 1644, etc. Palmer at first agreed to Goodwin's proposal, but the next day he reversed his position and was joined by Ley, and Stanton. All three complained that "accommodation is but a toleration, and a political act, fit for the Parliament, not for us; and that it will leave all posterity in the dark, and that it will not conduce to peace but distraction!" Ibid., p.76, Dec. 8, 1643. To them, there was no room for a dissenting voice in matters of eternal truths. The Word was one, the Spirit who wrote the Word was one, and the interpretation by the latter of the former should also be one. Dissent was out of place.

Early the following year, 1644, the debates over government began to bring the full force of dissent into prominence. On February 9th, 1644, the Assembly voted to prolong the discussions in order to allow the Independents full freedom of debate. Ibid., p.143. Again, such a vote is recorded on February 12th. Ibid., p.147. Westminster Presbyterians refused to steam-roll the Independents with a vote. W.M. Hetherington, in his History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (ed. by Robert Williamson, Edinburgh: James Gemmell, fourth edition, 1878), p.197. Hetherington tried to use this fact to prove that the Dissenting Brethren were treated with tolerance by Westminster Presbyterians. The truth is that the latter were not so much moved by tolerance, as by the fear of dissent. ...and anyway, there was always the outside chance that they could convert some of the Independents in debate!

The full Presbyterian viewpoint was aired in the Assembly on April 10th, 1644, and recorded by John Lightfoot. Journal, op. cit., p.244. On that day, he writes:

"The Independents still opposed, threatening to put in their dissenting reasons: this much moved the Assembly, as unwilling of such a business. But I again urged that this was more sorrowful than terrible; for that we being so many brought up in study, it was no unexpected thing for us to dissent in judgment. Nowbeit, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Herle, and others, moved for an accommodation in this business. I interposed again, whether it be fit to delay time to see whether we could give four or five content, which was uncertain, and to neglect to give four hundred thousand or five hundred thousand content, which we should certainly do in transmitting these votes to answer some expectation! Yet was it swayed for a committee to be chosen for accommodation, which was done."

According to Lightfoot, scholars are expected to disagree. He saw the Independents as a minor clique of obstructionists, unimportant people in relation to the kingdom as a whole. Robert Baillie also reported this incident in a letter to William Spang, dated April 26th, 1644.
"To prevent a present rupture with the Independents, we were content not to give in our propositions of Presbyteries and Congregations, that we might not necessitate them to give in their remonstrance against our conclusions, which they are peremptor to doe when we come on that matter." Vide David Laing (ed.), The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, etc. (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1641), p.169, III.

Again and again in the Assembly, fear of impending dissent unnerved the Presbyterian divines. In September, 1644, it was debated whether or not to suppress certain "hersies". At the end of the debate, the Independents "offered to give in contrary reasons to the Parliament" opined Baillie. Vide ibid., p.228, Public Letter, Sept. 16, 1644. A few days earlier, George Gillespie reported that the Assembly had delayed sending in their causes of humiliation to Parliament, because the Independents had threatened to give in their reasons of dissent. Vide his Notes of the Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster, February 1644 to January 1645 (ed. by David Meek, Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846), p.76, Sept. 10, 1644. Of all the Presbyterians in the Assembly, George Gillespie probably had one of the most moderate viewpoints concerning dissent, however. In his An Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, etc. (Edinburgh: 1641), p.151, he writes that

"A Synod must ever put a difference betwixt those who out of a real scruple of conscience, doe in a modest and peaceable way, refuse obedience to their ordinances... and those who contemptuously or factiously disobey the same labouring with all their might to strengthen themselves in their error, and to perwade others to be of their mind."

Dissent was permissible to him, providing it was genuinely a matter of conscience... and providing that it did not attempt to proselytize. It must ever be a silent dissent.

The unnerving spectre of dissent also crept across the scene in the debate over marriage. On November 22nd, 1644, Thomas Goodwin threatened to give in his contrary vote. This so upset the session that a new proposition was sought and at last "worded to all content." Vide Lightfoot's Journal, p.337. A vote nemine contradicente was very rare. Vide infra on the results of dissent at the Assembly.

Rule number "7" on the procedure to be followed by the Westminster Assembly as given by Parliament provided for dissent and minority opinions:

"No man to be denied to enter his dissent from the Assembly, and his reasons for it, in any point, after it hath been first debated in the Assembly, and thence (if the dissenting party desire it) to be sent to the Houses of Parliament by the Assembly, not by any particular man or men, in a private way, when either House shall require." Lightfoot's Journal, p.4, July 6, 1643, also given in J. W. Carruthers, The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly (The Presbyterian Historical Societies of America and England: 1943), p.47

Trouble ensued over the interpretation of this rule, because it was not realized
how much dissent there would be in the course of the deliberations. Rule number
6" also gave difficulty:

"All things agreed on and prepared for the Parliament, to
be openly read and allowed in the Assembly, and then offered
as the judgment of the Assembly, if the major part assent.
Provided that the opinion of any persons dissenting, and
the reasons urged for it, be annexed thereunto, if the
dissenters require it, together with the solutions, if any
were given to the Assembly, to these reasons." Lightfoot's
Journal, p.4, July 6, 1643.

There is ample evidence that both of these rules were frequently violated.

Soon after the Assembly convened, it was evident that Presbyterians did not
understand the rule on dissent. On August 30th, 1643, Burges desired to dissent
to a section of the Covenant. Lightfoot tells us that,

"he desired liberty that he might put in the reasons of his
dissent; which being granted, he farther desired, that
our resolutions might not be brought in till he had prepared
his reasons. This was judged, and that justly, to be in-
tolerable impudence, that the great affairs of two dying
kingdoms, should be thought fit by him to stay and wait
upon his captiousness." Journal, p.11.

Burges was acting according to the rules given the Assembly by Parliament, but it
occasioned much difficulty and ill feeling for him. When he received no satisfaction
from the Assembly, Lightfoot goes on,

"our turbulent doctor, put in a petition to the House of
Commons, that he might have liberty to bring in his
exceptions against the Covenant. Thus would he retard
there, if he can, as he had done in our Assembly: a
wretch, that [should] be branded to all posterity, who
seeks for some devilish end, either of his own or others,
or both, to hinder so great a good of the two nations." Ibid., p.12.

Thus Burges became the first (but by no means the last) Westminster divine to hit
the snag connected with dissent. He suffered much maligning while endeavoring to
abide by the rules of the Assembly. On September 1, 1643, Lightfoot is still
wrestful with Burges and speaks of the "pretended tenderness of conscience which
caused their dissent from us." Loc. cit. The next day the Assembly voted to
suspend both Burges and Price until they would apologize for the furor created
over the question of dissent to the Solemn League and Covenant. Ibid., p.13, Sept.
2, 1643. Lightfoot's Journal reflects the bitterness of the entire Assembly:

"We heard nothing as yet from Dr. Burges, neither can we
tell, what to expect concerning him; his heart is so stub-
born, that it is a weighing viz. whether he can digest his

A week late, Palmer moved that Burges be restored and the motion was debated.
Loc. cit., Sept. 13, 1643. But Lightfoot seems to have temporarily blocked the
Burges was certainly not the only one to discover the Presbyterian innate antipathy to dissent. On September 5th, 1644, the Independents dissented to a resolution suppressing Anabaptism and this dissent prompted a discussion of the procedure to be followed in registering contrary votes in the Assembly. Vide Gillespie's Notes, op. cit., p. 65. During the confusion surrounding this debate, Philip Nye accused the sederunt of denying liberty of dissent. Ibid., p. 66. And in the vote which followed as to whether or not the Independents could bring in their reasons of dissent, several influential members refused to vote, Marshall, Herle, Calamy, Corbet, and Wilkinson. Loc. cit. Vide infra on the refusal of some to vote.

Tender consciences and dissent were held in extremely low estimates by some in the Assembly. On December 10th, 1644, Carter scrupled at the wording of part of the proposition for government. The debate which followed reveals the Presbyterian standpoint at its worst:

"the Assembly thought fit to spend time upon the scruples of one that will dissent from every thing that crosseth his opinion: and so we voted the title." Lightfoot, Journal, op. cit., p. 341.

John Ley was refused the right to dissent to a part of the Directory for the Sabbath Day on an extremely far fetched technicality. Vide Lightfoot's Journal, p. 334, Nov. 20, 1644.

Thomas Goodwin also discovered that it was extremely hazardous to risk a dissent in the Assembly. On December 11th, 1644, he complained to the Assembly that the Independents had been wronged in their dissent against certain propositions of Presbyterianism. He did not approve the procedure in such matters and wished to know how he could redress himself. Gillespie, Notes, op. cit., p. 98. Two days later, he again spoke on the subject and accused the Assembly of having misunderstood his dissent. Ibid., p. 99, Jan. 2, 1645.

The question of dissent came up often in the Assembly. It is obvious that many divines did know how they should proceed in dealing with the subject. Three months after Goodwin's experience a paper on dissent was brought in and read. Unfortunately, whose it was or what it said is unknown. Vide Alexander F. Mitchell et John Struthers (eds.), Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines etc. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1874), sess. 404, March 27, 1645, p. 72. One of the saddest commentaries on the Westminster Assembly is the debate over Erastianism. On March 9th, 1645/6, the minutes tell us that Coleman wished to debate and dissent from the proposition that Civil and Ecclesiastical jurisdictions are separate. But he was reluctant to do so:

"Before I enter [in] to any argument [I wish to know] if I dispute against this proposition whether I might without breach of Covenant and charge of perjury make such a dispute."

Minutes, op. cit., p. 193, sess. 601, March 9, 1645/6.

The experiences of earlier dissenting divines had caused some trepidation in Coleman's thinking. He knew, by now, that his brethren in the Assembly took a very serious view of contrary votes. It can scarcely be denied that there was not always liberty of dissent in the Westminster Assembly.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of seventeenth century Independency
was the preference for small churches as opposed to huge overgrown parish churches. Vide supra on National Churches in the controversy. Robert Baillie once accused them of being satisfied with four or fifty. Vide his A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time (London: 1646), p.176. In 1629, however, Robinson's church is known to have had 350 members, according to A. E. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1883), p.87. Baillie also sarcastically remarked that he had never heard of any member of any Reformed Church ever having become associated with an Independent church. They were always too small! Ibid., p.75. Cf. Lewis (Louis) Du Moulin, The Conformity of the Discipline and Government of those who are commonly called Independents to that of the Ancient Primitive Christians. (London: 1680), p.25, who placed the number of an ideal church membership at twenty-five or thirty. The Frenchmen contended that with such a small body it was easier to bring in an "ideal order, and to bring those who are of it unto the practice of good manners and life, than in . . . great Churches. . . wherein Ambition, Envy, Fractions, Avarice, . . . and corruptions reign, and cannot but do so." William Ames, too, in his The Mirror of Sacred Divinity, Drawn Out of the holy Scriptures, and the Interpreters thereof, and brought into Light (London: n.d.), p.177 favored small churches at Geoffrey F. Hutchall, in his Visible Saints (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), speaks of the advantages to be gained in smaller memberships and the closer bonds of fellowship in these small Independent churches. Not only were their churches small, however, but the total number of such churches was also small. Robert Baillie in his Journala, op. cit., p.271, a Public Letter, dated April 25, 1645, rejoiced that out of 121 London ministers, there were not three Independents among them. Cf. Horton Davies, The English Free Churches (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), who speaks of the small number of Independent Churches in 1658. They were a decided minority in England and this gave rise to a crucial difficulty regarding the Presbyterian treatment of dissent. A large minority might be understood, but never such a small one. Nearly every Presbyterian apologist of the period suggested that since the Independents were so numerically insignificant, they should give in to the synodical brethren. E.g. John Dury, A Epistolary Discourse Written . . . to Mr. Tho. Goodwin, at al. (London: 1644), p.22: "These men are but few, and their difference, as they say themselves, is but small, and ought not to disturb the Publick Peace; Therefore they ought to joyn with their Brethren, and we ought not to allow them the liberty of a separation, lest a Schisme arise from thence in the Church..." Cf. Thomas Edwards, Reasons against the Independent Government of Particular Conversions: (London: 1641), p.17, who writes in his Reason "VII" that Independents ought to submit since they believe in synods already; et William Frye, Twelve Considerable Serious Questions touching Church Government, etc. (London: 1644), p.6, question "10", p.8. The London ministers also testified to this fact:

"how few are those that have engaged themselves in the independent way, in comparison to the multitude of precious ministers and people inferior to them neither in parts, learning, piety, nor any other spiritual gift, who are for the presbyteral way of church government?" The Divine Right of Church Government (Fainsley edition, 1739), preface, p.9., mispaged

Adam Steuart, too, in his Some Observations and Annotations Upon the Apologetical Narration etc. (London: 1643), epistle "To the Right Reverend, and Learned Divines, The Authors of the Apologetical Narration," unpaged, accused his opponents of being outnumbered by thousands to one in their opinions and should therefore submit to the majority. Again and again, he refers to the Apologists as "but five men". Vide p. 12, e.g. The inconsistency of all this was that Presbyterians generally deprecated
democratic processes in ecclesiastical affairs. Vide supra on Democracy. Yet they wished to apply them in order to exclude the Independents by an overwhelming caucus.

We have already seen that dissent caused the Westminster Assembly much difficulty. It now remains to be seen who the dissenters in that Assembly really were. The greatest injustice has been done to the small band of Independents who were labeled "Dissenting Brethren" by their contemporaries and subsequent historians. The truth is that there were several Presbyterians who dissolved to various sundry propositions more often than many of the Independents. The following is a catalogue of registered dissenters in the primary documents relating to the Assembly:

Thomas Goodwin (Indep.): number of dissents. .5 [Minutes, op. cit., pp.17, 18, 46*, 156*, 244, 267 (i.e. sessions 337, 372, 523, 659, 668)].


Jeremiah Burroughs (Indep.): number of dissents. .3 [Minutes, op. cit., pp.17, 46, 297 (i.e. sessions 337, 372, 731)].

William Bridge (Indep.): number of dissents. .2 [Minutes, op. cit., pp.17, 46 (i.e. sessions 337, 372)].

Francis Woodcock (Indep.): number of dissents. .1 [Minutes, op. cit., p.112 (i.e. session 468)].


Note: There were two Carters in the Assembly, William and Thomas. The younger was sympathetic to the cause of the Independents, but it is not always easy to discover when the minutes refer to one and when to the other, but in all of the following instances we believe that they are references to the younger.

William Greenhill (Indep.): number of dissents. .5 [Minutes, op. cit., p.18, 297, 303*, 490, 522* (i.e. sessions 337, 731, 746, 955, 1078)].

Joseph Carrill (Indep.): number of dissents. .1 [Minutes, op. cit., p.522* (i.e. session 1078)].

John Bond (Indep.): number of dissents. .1 [Minutes, op. cit., p.522* (i.e. session 1078)].

Thomas Wilson (Presby.): number of dissents. .3 [Minutes, op. cit., p.19, 377, 490* (i.e. sessions 340, 855, 955)].
William Raynor (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., pp. 377, 490* (i.e. sessions 355, 955)].

Joshua Hoyle (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 377 (i.e. session 355)].

Thomas Valentine (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 490* (i.e. sessions 955)].

William Gouge (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 516 (i.e. session 1063)].

Stanley Cooper (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 522* (i.e. session 1078)].

Robert Johnston (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 522* (i.e. session 1078)].

Arthur Sallawy or Humphrey Salloway (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., pp. 289, 516 (i.e. sessions 716, 1065)].

John Greene (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 522 (i.e. session 1078)].

Herbert Palmer (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 69, 74, 193, 254, 261, 284, 312, 384 (i.e. sessions 392, 405, 601, 674, 680, 710, 758, 863)].

Reynolds, either Edward or/ Robert (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 193 (i.e. session 601)].

Jeremiah Whitaker (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., pp. 289, 516 (i.e. sessions 716, 1063)].

Antony Tuckney (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 193 (i.e. session 601)].

Obadiah Sedgewick (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., p. 242* (i.e. session 656)].

George Walker (Presby.): number of dissents . . . [Minutes, op. cit., pp. 284, 288 (i.e. sessions 710, 714)].

Charles Herle (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., pp. 284, 100 (i.e. sessions 710, 447)].

Lazarus Seaman (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Minutes, op. cit., pp. 19, 68, 80, 193, 238, 255, 272*, 516, 520*, 522* (i.e. sessions 340, 392, 416, 601, 649, 674, 696, 1005, 1074, 1078)].

John Lightfoot (Presby.): number of dissents. . . [Lightfoot, Journal, op. cit., p. 113; Minutes, op. cit., pp. 100, 119, 177, 234, 252 (i.e. sessions Jan. 16, 1644, 447, 481, 568, 672)].
Cornelius Burges (Presby.): number of dissents...15[Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p. 11; Minutes, op. cit., pp. 98, 100, 128, 234, 235, 242, 308, 491, 516, 520, 520* 273 (i.e. sessions August 30, 1643, 443, 444, 447, 497, 643, 644, 656, 752, 958, 1063, 1073, 1074, 697)].

Thomas Hodges (Presby.): number of dissents...2[Minutes, op. cit., pp. 520, 331 (i.e. sessions 1074, 796)].

William Price (Presby.): number of dissents...2[Lightfoot's Journal, op. cit., p. 13; Minutes, op. cit., p. 520 (i.e. sessions Sept. 2, 1643, 1074)].

Thomas Temple (Presby.): number of dissents...1[Minutes, op. cit., p. 520 (i.e. session 1074)].

Richard Vines (Presby.): number of dissents...1[Minutes, op. cit., p. 520, (i.e. session 1074)].

A complete list of dissents in the assembly is impossible to achieve, because any such list is subject to the usual errors inherent in the task of tabulation. There are undoubtedly many errors of omission and commission in the one given above. It is only projected as a general introduction to a more exhaustive catalogue by a future more exacting scholar. Secondly, it is impossible because of the illegibility of the portion of the official minutes now in the William's Library in London. This section deals with the first year of the Assembly and much of the debating over church government. Gillespie's Notes record several dissents by the Independents which are excluded from the available Minutes. E.g. on March 20, 1644 (p. 44), the Independents dissented to a letter to the Earl of Manchester "desiring more pity and favour to those that scruple the validity of their ordination by bishops." Again, on p. 65, Sept. 5, 1644, the Independents dissented to a proposition suppressing Anabaptism, which prompted a lengthy discussion of dissent in the Assembly.

Further handicaps to tabulation are evident in the fact that several dissents are too generally mentioned to allow accuracy in classification. Gillespie records that on Oct. 11, 1644, p. 94, two divines dissented to a proposition on excommunication but they are unnamed. The Minutes also refer to several dissents by unnamed persons. Vide e.g. p. 57, sess. 523, Oct. 23, 1645, where one dissented to a petition to Parliament over the sacrament; at p. 188, sess. 591, Feb. 17, 1645/6, where eight dissented from a resolution to allow the stationers of London to print Bibles instead of some printers produced by Philip Nye who were willing to print them at much more reasonable prices. It is difficult to understand this defense of Westminster Divines of a vested interest, unless it was personal antipathy toward Nye.

The fact that Westminster Presbyterians did not appreciate dissenting votes also contributed to the difficulty of tabulating them. On many occasions, divines withheld their votes rather than register a dissent. John Lightfoot was one of the most frequent offenders. Vide the following instances: (1) Journal, p. 76, Dec. 8, 1645, refused to vote on issue of ruling elders; (2) Journal, p. 219, March 18, 1644, admits suspending vote on many propositions; (3) Journal, p. 267, May 16, 1644, did not vote on ordination debate; (4) Journal, p. 292, July 3, 1644, refused to ballot on point of liberty at the Lord's Table; (5) Minutes, p. 252, sess. 672, July 7, 1646, would not even vote on the Erastian proposals when he was the only Erastian left in the Assembly. The practice of withholding votes did not escape the notice of George Gillespie who commends the Independents for being willing to vote on all issues...even if they...
voted against what he was championing. Vide his Notes, p. 38, March 12, 1644. The young Scot had little sympathy for those who would not even cast their ballot. Cf. p. 51, April 15, 1644. It may have been that this lack of voting strength was due to apathy among the divines as the debates wore on, but more than likely, there was the thought that no vote was better than a negative one.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this catalogue of dissent: (1) Presbyterians disliked dissenting voices and did not know how to treat them in such solemn surroundings as the Westminster Assembly; (2) Dissents rarely accomplished anything, but there are instances of accommodations having been made as the result of minority reports or of dissenting votes which are indicated supra by asterisks (*); Cf. Alexander F. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1885), p. 156, for the influence of a minority report by Gataker on a change in the confession of faith; (3) The term "Dissenting Brethren" as applied to the handful of Independents and more particularly to the signers of the Apologetical Narration is one of the most misleading practices of contemporary and succeeding observers. The implication has always been that the five "Dissenting Brethren" were the main sources of contrariness at Westminster, but the truth is that several Presbyterians registered more dissent than Goodwin, Burroughs, or William Bridge. Herbert Palmer, Lazarus Seaman, John Lightfoot, and Cornelius Burges deserve more to be called "Dissenting Brethren" than the forementioned three. Goodwin's vote against a few propositions concerning Presbyterianism amongst his opponents that they falsely attributed to him the name of "Dissenter" in other great issues of the time. Thomas Goodwin once described it this way:

"I have found by trial of things, that there is some Truth on all sides. I have found Holiness where you would little think it, and so likewise Truth; and I have learned this Principle, which I hope I shall never lay down till I am swallowed up of Immortality: and that is that which I said before, To acknowledge every good Thing, and hold Communion with it, in Men, in Churches, or whatsoever else... My Brethren, this Rule that I have now mentioned, (which I profess I have lived by, and shall do while I live) I know I shall never please Men in it. Why? it is plain, For this is the nature and condition of all Mankind; if a Man dissent from others in one thing, he loseth them in all the rest; and therefore if a Man do take what is good of all sides, he is apt to lose them all, but he pleaseth Christ by it, and so will I for this particular." Cited in The Lawfulness of Hearing the Public Ministers of the Church of England, Proved By Mr. Nye, and Mr. John Robinson, Two Eminent Congregational Divines. Together with the Judgment of Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Owen, and other Independents, as well Ancient as Modern, Concerning Forms of Prayer, Parish-Churches, and Communion with them: And the Judgment of other Non-conformists about Kneeling at the Sacrament. (London: 1652), p. 37, italics mine.
APPENDIX E: KEY SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES IN THE PRESBYTERIAN-INDEPENDENT CONTROVERSY

The different politics of Presbyterians and Independents in the seventeenth century were due to a number of factors, but especially to diverse exegetical results in a very small number of scriptural passages. A careful perusal of the respective interpretations of these few texts reveals the main issues between the two groups.

(1) Acts 15: Presbyterians claimed that this was a synod of churches represented by the apostles, its judgment was binding on all Christians (hence, an infallible decree), and therefore a pattern for all synods in the Christian Church in all ages. This was the most important text in the controversy and few writers on either side neglected to give it a lengthy treatment. In the Assembly, there were long and involved debates over the meaning of the Jerusalem meeting. On March 13, 1644, Thomas Goodwin brought a long argument against the Presbyterian position on Acts 15: Vide George Gillespie, Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster, etc. (Ed. by David Meek, Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver and Boyd, 1846), p.40. Goodwin took the words of the text literally and insisted that there were only two churches represented there, Jerusalem and Antioch (March 14, ibid., p.42). Cf. Thomas Goodwin, Of the Constitution, Order and Discipline of the Churches of Christ (Works, 1646 ed.), p.219, 220, IV. But in spite of Independent opposition, the Westminster Assembly voted Acts 15 as the only text necessary to prove Chap. XXXI, "Of Synods and Councils", Sect.I, of their Confession of Faith: Vide S.W. Carruthers, The Westminster Confession of Faith (Manchester: R. Aikman and Son, 1957), p.153.

For the typical English Presbyterian interpretation of the passage, vide the following: The Divine Right of Church Government, by Sundry Ministers of Christ within the City of London (London: 1646), p.256. (I have used a Faisley edition of 1799); Charles Herle, The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches; etc. (London: 1643), p.19ff, who admits that his is only an argument ex silentio, because no commissioners are named excepting those from Antioch and Jerusalem (p.20); William Prince, Twelve Considerable Serious Questions touching Church Government, etc. (London: 1644), p.5, question number "9"; and John Paget, A Defense of Church-Government Exercised in Presbyterial, Classical, et Synodall Assemblies, according to the practice of the Reformed Churches, etc. (London: 1641), p.61ff., Chap. VI, "The Third Argument, taken from the practice of the primitive Churches, in the Apostles times," (Acts 15 is discussed in this section).

For the typical Scottish Presbyterian interpretation of the passage, vide the following: Samuel Rutherford, A Peaceable and Temperate Plea For Paul's Presbyterian In Scotland, etc. (London: 1642), proposition number "14" is about Acts 15; cf. Rutherford's The Due Right of Presbyteries (London: 1644), pp.337, 355, 378; Robert Baillie, A Dissection from the Errors of the Time (London: 1646), pp.203, 207; and George Gillespie, An Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, etc. (London: 1641), who averred that the multitude spoken of in Acts 15 was the Apostles and elders rather than the people of the Church of Jerusalem (no democracy for Gillespie), p.118.

Independents had an entirely different notion of Acts 15. To them, it was a meeting of two churches only, the resulting decree was recommended (not forced) to the other churches concerned, the presence of the apostles gave it a note of infallibility which could not be duplicated in any subsequent synod, and the "multitude" (Acts 15:13) meant that the whole congregation of the Church was present at the council (hence, it was not a representative assembly).
The publication of John Cotton's The Key of the Kingdom of Heaven, And Power thereof according to the Word of God, etc. (London: 1644), by Thomas Goodwin and Philip Saffy caused a curious development in the controversy over Acts 15. Difficulties arose, when Cotton appeared to sponsor the Presbyterian interpretation of the text. He admitted that it was a synod (p.26), which many Independents denied. He admitted that it was "a precedent and pattern of due Church proceedings in case of dissension," (p.42 of a Boston reprint edition of 1643, by Tappan and Dennet) which also was denied by many other Independents. Cotton's heterodoxy was so pronounced that Thomas Goodwin, writing in the preface, takes issue with Cotton on this and other disputed points (p.9 ff, reprint edition). Distinguishing between Goodwin's view and Cotton's view did not go unnoticed by Presbyterian apologists anxious to catch the Independent brethren in contradictory arguments. In the Assembly, Lazarus Davenant quoted the Keys as an example of a Presbyterian synod: Vide Gillespie's Notes of Debates, op. cit., p.72, Sept. 16, 1644. Both Rutherford and Baillie poked fun at the difference of opinion between Goodwin and Cotton over the synod in Acts 15; Vide Baillie, Discourses, op. cit., p.142, 143; and Samuel Rutherford, A Survey of the Rightful Anti-christ. Opening the secrets of Fanaticism and Antinomianism, etc. (London: 1648), "Epistle", unpagd. Samuel Husbands, in his The Essence and Unity of the Church Catholike Visible, and the Prioritites thereof in regard of Particular Churches Discussed (London: 1645), p8, also quotes the Keys in order to prove Presbyterian claims on Acts 15. Cf. Richard Baxter, Church Concord, etc. (London: 1691), p.34, who cites the preface to the Keys on the use of synods; and William Nicholson, An Apology For the Discipline of the Ancient Church: Intended especially for that of our Lether The Church of England; In answer to the Admonitory Letter Lately Published (London: 1659), who often quotes from the Keys, e.g. pp.1, 44, 56. All indications point to the fact that John Cotton's Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven did much damage to the Independent cause, and it is doubtful whether or not Thomas Goodwin would have published it had he foreseen the repercussions which were to arise.

(2) Matthew 18: Ranking along with Acts 15 in importance, this text of scripture was one of the most important in the Presbyterian-Independent Controversy. Debates in the Assembly concerning it persisted for years. Sallen said, on Feb. 20, 1644, that the text referred to the Jewish "saalphabetn" vide John Lightfoot, The Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines; etc. (Vol. XIII, Works, ed. by John Rogers Pitman (London: 1824), p.165. On April 2, 1644, Robert Baillie wrote in a "Publick Letter" concerning the Assembly debates, that Philip Saffy was using the Presbyterian view of Matthew 18, to show that their system was inconsistent with the civil state: Vide David Laing (ed.), The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, etc. (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841), p.145, II. George Gillespie argued in favor of appeala from one synod to a higher synod on the basis of Matthew 18: Vide Notes of Debates, op. cit., p.91, Sept. 27, 1644. But at last, on Oct. 2, 1644, Gillespie reported a vote "That Matt.XVIII,
holding forth the subordination of an offending brother to a particular church, it
doeth also, by a parity of reason, prove a subordination of a congregation to superior
assemblies." Vide Notes on Debates, op. cit., p.86. But the vote did not end
discussion of the text. On Feb. 10, 1645, Seaman and Bridge were still having exchanges
in the Assembly over the question of whether or not Matthew 18 was an assembly of
officers. Vide Alexander F. Mitchell at John Struthers (eds.), Minutes of the Session
of the Westminster Assembly of Divines etc. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons,
1874), p.59, Sess. 377. Charles Herle finally admitted the strength of Bridge's argu-
ment (loc. cit.). The next day, Palmer tried to settle the argument by appealing to
the Septuagint (Ibid., p.52, Sess. 378, Feb. 11, 1645). Nearly a month later, the
question of a meeting of officers was still being bandied about. (Ibid., p.67, Sess.
390, Mar. 3, 1645). The passage reappeared in the Assembly on March 15, 1646, when
Seaman remarked that "it is considerable how this text hath been interpreted in all
generations." (Ibid., p.200, Sess. 603) Palmer was still discussing it on April 15, 1646.
(Ibid., Sess. 622, p.445).

The Presbyterians held that Matthew 18 referred to a church of churches, a
representative church composed of delegates from several particular congregations
meeting in a Presbytery and that there was implied a right of appeal to a higher and
higher court of jurisdiction in matters of discipline. A cross section of Scottish
opinion concerning the passage is revealed in the following works: Samuel Rutherford,
Due Right, op. cit., pp.310, 311, 74, 77; Rutherford, A Peaceable Pick, op. cit.,
Proposition number 8' deals with Matthew 18; Baillie, Dissuasive, op. cit., p.216;
Gillespie, An Assertion, op. cit., p.29ff., "The Second Argument [i.e. for Pres-
bytery] taken from Matthew 18:17"; (cf. p.120, Ibid.).

English Presbyterians generally agreed with the Scots. Vide The Divine Right of
Church Government (Falsley edition of 1799), op. cit.; Charles Herle, Independency
on Scriptures, op. cit., pp.9,17, points out that if Matthew 18 taught that a particular
church could consist of so few as two members (as the Independents asserted), then if
one be the offender and the other the offended, then there would be no church to tell
it to on independent principles (which was a shrewd evaluation and well nigh unanswerable);
Argument [i.e. for Presbytery] taken from the words of Christ, Matthew 18:15-20". George
Gillespie, in An Assertion, op. cit., p.200, also vehemently denied that a church could
have so few as two or three members in it.

Independents tended to take Matthew 18 much more literally than their Presbyterian
contemporaries. Vide John Cotton Keys, op. cit., p.87; John Cook, What The Independents
Would Have, etc. (London: 1647), p.11; at Richard Mather, Church-Government and Church-
Covenant Discussed, In an Answer of the Elders of the several Churches in New England
to declare their judgments therein, etc. (London: 1643), p.43. John Milton even thought
that a church could consist of a single member! Vide A.S.P. Woodhouse, Puritaniert and

Chapter 18 of Matthew's Gospel presented formidable obstacles to agreement amongst
the various Puritan parties. Its interpretation by Presbyterians and Independents
alike differed from the Erastians who believed that appeals should be referred to the
civil magistrate. Vide Burton's Vindication, op. cit., p.65, who discusses William
Prynne's Erastian views. A Puritan's whole concept of the Church was more or less de-
pendent on his understanding of this passage of Scripture.

(3) 1 Cor. 5: Next to the two aforementioned most controversial scriptures, there
were other key passages which divided the Presbyterians and Independents. I Cor. 5 was one of these. Presbyterians argued that the congregation could not excommunicate by itself but that it must be done by a presbytery with the right of appeal; Independents insisted that a particular congregation has the authority to cast an offending brother out. At Westminster, there were many squabbles over the meaning of this text. Vide Lightfoot's Journals, op. cit., p.140ff., Feb. 9, 1644; Mitchell and Struthers, Minutes, op. cit., p.53, Sess. 378, Feb. 11, 1645; et Baillie's Dissuasive op. cit., p.192. Cf. Hetherington, op. cit., p.196.
APPENDIX P: PURITAN PREACHERS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Puritan proclivity to turn to the Old Testament is apparent in a study of the Parliamentary sermons, 1640-1650. One of the finest collections of these is in the New College Library, University of Edinburgh.

(a) Total number of sermons from January 25, 1645 to Dec. 30, 1646 (excepting a brief period at the beginning of 1646 (Jan. to the end of March) . . . 161.

(b) Total number of Presbyterian preachers . . . 66.

(c) Total number of Independent preachers . . . 10.

(d) The favorite preacher of the Presbyterian party was Stephen Marshall who preached eight times; the favorite Independent was Joseph Carrill, who preached six times.

(e) Total number of sermons preached from the Old Testament . . . 126. Of these, Presbyterians were responsible for 108 of them and Independents only 18.

(f) Total number of sermons from the New Testament . . . 35. Presbyterians responsible for 22 and the Independents 13.

(g) The three favorite books of the Old Testament were the Psalms (27 sermons), Isaiah (21 sermons), and Jeremiah (8 sermons). Presbyterians preached 24 of the sermons from the Psalms and Independents 3, but both parties gave clear indication that this book was their favorite.

(h) There are five instances of preachers having used the same text of scripture:

(1) I Sam. 2:30, Woodcocks, July 30, 1645; Dan Evance, Jan. 28, 1645.

(2) Haggai 2:7, Whittaker, Jan. 25, 1643; Raynor, Aug. 28, 1644.

(3) Zachariah 3:2, Gillespie, Aug. 27, 1645; Baillie, Feb. 28, 1644; Pickering, Nov. 27, 1644.

(4) Zachariah 1:18-21, Wilkinson, October 25, 1643; Bridge, November 29, 1643.

(5) James 4:8, Caryl, Jan. 28, 1645; Vines, Jan. 28, 1645.

In numbers 1, 4, and 5 the two sermons were by members of different parties and it would be of interest to compare the treatment of identical texts by the different preachers in order to see whether or not the Independents and Presbyterians agreed in methods of exegesis. We have already compared Thomas Goodwin with young Simon Ford in this particular. Vide supra.

In the New Testament, it is not surprising in the light of our chapter on
eschatology, that the Book of the Revelation was second (5 sermons) only to Matthew (with 6).

APPENDIX G: RICHARD BAXTER AND PRESBYTERIANISM

Throughout this study, we have more or less consistently cited Richard Baxter's various opinions always in connection with the Presbyterian party. Conceivably, such a practice could be criticized although many historians would favor such a policy.

The problem cannot conclusively be settled by appealing to Baxter's own statements. Sometimes, he seemed to speak as an Anglican, sometimes as a Presbyterian, and sometimes as a "mere catholic". He was a warm personal friend of the great Archbishop Ussher and shared many of the latter's moderate Episcopalian ideas. Vide Thomas, op. cit., p.96. Baxter did not refuse episcopacy when he wrote these words: "Yet we are not presuming to consume all superior episcopacy...let able, faithful men be the overseers and I am resolved never to contend with such about the business of superiority, but cheerfully to obey in all things lawful." (Cited from Thomas, p.70n.) Furthermore, Baxter freely admitted his difference with many Presbyterians: "For my own part, as highly as I honour the men [of the Presbyterian viewpoint], I am not of their mind in every point of the government which they would have set up." (Cited from Thomas, p.72)

On the other hand, he sometimes spoke as a Presbyterian. In his Christian Conform; etc. (London: 1653), p.31, he wrote "those of us that are for the Classical Government" evidently including himself in the Presbyterian party. And in his Autobiography (by Sylvester), p.131, he discusses the Independents as though he were a Presbyterian: "But, in a word, grant us but as much, and take us but in, as we granted to, and took in, the Independents, and we are content. Take this agreement, and all is ended; we desire no more of you. We never denied the Independents the liberty of preaching lectures, as often as they would, nor yet the liberty of taking parish churches. They commonly had presentations, and the public maintenance; and no subscriptions, declaration, liturgy, or ceremonies, were imposed on them. Again, I say, I ask from you no more liberty than was given the Independents by their brethren called Presbyterians." (Italics mine).

On other occasions, Baxter was content to refer to himself as a "mere catholic". Vide his A Third Defence of the Cause of Peace, 1681, Part I, p.110, as cited by Geoffrey F. Nuttall, "Presbyterians and Independents: Some Movements for Unity 300 years ago," The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, Vol.X (May, 1952), No. 1, p.19, "You could not (except a Catholic Christian) have truer called me, than an Episcopal-Presbyterian-Independent."

Although Baxter usually spoke in behalf of the Presbyterian party, he was certainly not universally trusted by Presbyterians. Some of his heterodox theological notions embarrassed his brethren who might otherwise have jubilantly claimed him as their champion. In a letter to Simeon Ashe, dated November 29, 1658, Robert Baillie writes: "My maine purpose to you at this time is, to let you know that Mr. Baxter does us more harme than all your Sectaries. The man's pietie and parts make us still honour, pitie, and spare him; but his intolerable boldness, after his avowed Amiralismo, to follow and goe beyond miserable John Goodin, in confounding the great head of Justification with such a flood of new and unsound notions, does vex us." Vide David Laing (ed.), The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, etc. (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841), p. 391, III. Nor were the Scottish Presbyterians the only ones to criticize Baxter from a Presbyterian standpoint. In Lancashire, where Presbyterianism was next to London for strength, and where the system was introduced soon after it was in the capital, several of the libraries banned Baxter's books as being unfit for general reading. Vide Richard Copley Christie, "The Old Church and School Libraries of Lancashire, ...
But at least he was in good company. Thomas Goodwin topped the list of unacceptable authors! It can hardly be overemphasized how important a testimony this is in determining how a typical Presbyterian community felt about Baxter. To them, he was no asset.

In spite of conflicting modern writers, conflicting testimony from Baxter himself, and conflicting evidence from contemporaries, the fact still remains that Independents (at least those in the post Restoration era) considered Richard Baxter a leader of their rival Puritan party. Vide e.g. The Lawfulness of Hearing the Publick Ministers of the Church of England, Proved by Mr. Philip Nye, and Mr. John Robinson, Two Eminent Congregational Divines. Together with the Judgment of Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Owen, and other Independents, as well Ancient as Modern, Concerning Forms of Prayer, Parish-Churches, and Communion with them! And the Judgment of other Non-conformists about Kneeling at the Sacrament. (London: 1683), p.39, where Baxter is quoted as being a leader of the Presbyterians.

We conclude, therefore, that the whole question of Baxter's ecclesiastical preference is somewhat fogged by the facts if they are considered in their totality. Baxter said he was an Anglican, yet spoke as a Presbyterian. Some Presbyterians considered him unorthodox and repudiated him; yet many (if not most) Puritans in the post-Restoration era considered him a leader of the Presbyterian party. Little wonder that modern scholars have not agreed on this point. Our only contention in all this, is to show that Baxter's views (as cited in this thesis) were characteristically those of Presbyterianism. Our purpose is not to show that Baxter was or was not a Presbyterian at any given point in his career. Probably that question could only be solved by some kind of an historical development of Baxter's ecclesiological views, because in his later life, the emphasis seemed more and more to rest on the ecumenical approach.
Section I: Primary Sources


---, *The Harrow of Sacred Divinity* (London, printed by Edward Griffin for John Rothwell at the Sun in Paul's Church-yard: n.d.).


---, *Certayne Additionall Reasons To those presented in A Letter By the Ministers of London to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, 1 Jan. 1645* (London: 1645). This is an ironical satire on the London Ministers' letter intended to discredit it.

---, *Certayne Considerations to Dis-swaide Men from Further Gathering of Churches in this present juncture of Time* (London: 1644?). Imprimatur, December 23, 1643. John Goodwin is obviously a misprint for Thomas Goodwin. The former did not sit in the Assembly.

---, *A Cool Conference Betwene the Scottish Commissioners, Cleared Reformation, and the Holland Ministers Apologetical Narration, brought together by a well-willer to both* (n.p.: 1644).

---, *Christ on His Throne* (n.p.: 1640).

---, [By a Friend to the Parliament, Army, and Congregational Churches], *One Blow More at Babylon* (London: Printed by I.M. for Lodowick Lloyd, and Henry Cripps, and are to be sold at their shop in Pope's-head Alley. 1650).


---, *Early Independents* (London: 1893).

---, Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers In and about London: Formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational (London: 1691). In some respects, the publication of this pamphlet marked the end of the Presbyterian-Independent controversy insofar as the Puritans are concerned.

---, *A Brief History of Presbytery and Independency, From their first Original, to this Time* (London: 1691).


Religions, Sects, Societies, and Factions, of the Cavaliers now in Armes against Parliament. (n.p.: 1644).

Tolleration Justified, and Persecution condemn'd. . . . etc. (London: 1646).

The Answer of the Assembly of Divines to the Reasons of the Dissenting Brother Against the Proposition concerning the Subordination of Congregational, Classical, Provinciall, and National Assemblies, for the Government of the Church. (London, 1648).

The Aisignment of Mr. Persecution . . . . etc. (n.p.: 1645).

The humble advice of the assembly of divines now by authority of parliament . . . concerning a larger catechism (London: 1647).


["By an earnest well-wisher to the Truth"], Vindiciae Clavium: . . . etc. (London: 1645).

Apollonii, Guilielmus, A Consideration of Certain Controversies at this time agitated in the Kingdome of England, Concerning the Government of the Church of God. Written at the command and appointment of the Walachrian Classis. October 16, 1644. (London, printed by G.W. for Tho. Underhill at the Bible in Woodstreet, 1645). The original edition was in Latin entitled Consideratio Quarundam Controversiarum ad Regimen Ecclesiae Dei Spectantium, quae in Angliae Regno hodie Agitantur. This is an important reformed church view of the Presbyterian-Independent Controversy.


Arrowsmith, John, A great Wonder in Heaven: or a lively Picture of the Militant Church, Drawn by a divine Pencill. . . . etc. (London: 1647).

Atkinson, Christopher, The Sword of the Lord Drawn and furbished against the man of sin: . . . . etc. (n.p.: 1654). This is an answer to "The Principles of Faith" published by Thomas Goodwin et. al.
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