



The Blue Banner

A Publication of First Presbyterian Church, Rowlett, Texas / Vol 5 #3-6 March / June 1996

A WESTMINSTER BIBLIOGRAPHY PARTS FOUR & FIVE

4. Epistemological Background

Epistemology, or the theory of knowledge, is that branch of philosophy which is concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge, its presuppositions and basis, and the general reliability of claims to knowledge.¹ The Puritans realized that thought, intelligent conversation, and the proper conveying of truth requires more than proper nouns. They therefore rejected nominalism and were what might be called "biblical realists."² The Puritans had a revelational view of truth. They maintained that God revealed certain truth about himself, his creation, his providence, and mankind via the propositions of Scripture. The Westminster divines therefore believed that the proper method or procedure for systematizing beliefs concerning God, science, immortality, etc., would be to arrange in a systematic way the information revealed in the inspired writings. The first statement in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* is thus a complex epistemological statement by which all the documents produced by the Assembly must be interpreted:

¹D. W. Hamlyn, "History of Epistemology," *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (8 vols. in 4; New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1972 reprint of 1967), III, 8-9.

²Nominalism maintains that only individual sense objects can be known. Realism maintains that the "X" that is immediately in the mind is the real object of knowledge. The Puritans followed a sort of scholastic realism with respect to the imagination. Therefore they *did* regard the "content" of the imagination (or fancy as they often referred to it) as significant. They thus concluded that just as one can have an *adulterous* imagination, he can also have an *idolatrous* imagination. *WLC* 109 contends that it is possible, though forbidden, for men to make a representation of God "either inwardly in our mind, or outwardly in any kind of image or likeness of any creature whatsoever." See John K. LaShell, "Imagination and Idol: A Puritan Tension" in *WTJ* XLIX (Fall 1987), 305-334.

Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of his will, which is necessary unto salvation: therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the holy scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased.³

The quoted statement intimates the sufficiency of Scripture by noting the insufficiency of everything else. The *Confession* without question states that Scripture is *necessary* to a salvific knowledge of God's will. The *Confession* proceeds, after listing the sixty-six accepted books of the Protestant canon, to state, "All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the *rule of faith* and life."⁴

The *Confession of Faith* might have started with a statement about who God is, who man is, or some combination of those. Instead, it began with a statement concerning Scripture. The reason for that is easily understood: the Westminster divines regarded the Scripture alone [*sola Scriptura*] to be the *basis* of their epistemology. The term "*sola Scriptura*" is often used to denote the adherence to Holy Scriptures as the *solitary rule of faith and practice*. This epistemology exists whenever one accepts Scripture at face value and

³*WCF*, I:i.

⁴*Ibid.*, I:ii, (emphasis added).

interprets it according to a grammatical-historical method.⁵

The divines could not properly speak of either God or man (or anything else for that matter) without first determining what counted as evidence or proof for their assertions. The first statement quoted above demonstrates that the Westminster divines did *not* consider unaided reason a sufficient guide for such assertions. Man cannot know God sufficiently to know his will apart from Scripture. Scripture, the divines maintained, is therefore *necessary to a knowledge of the will of God*.

The same chapter of the *Confession* asserts that the Scriptures are not only necessary; they are also sufficient:

The *whole* counsel of God, concerning *all* things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from scripture: *unto which nothing at any time is to be added*, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.⁶

The Assembly intended to make true assertions about the Trinity, the Ten Commandments, the nature of the mediatorship of Christ, etc. But upon what basis could they hope to begin? Is *anything* so sure and certain that even sensory distortions or Cartesian demons could not overthrow it?⁷ Is there any truth so basic or any propositions that are self-authenticating? The men of the Westminster Assembly, following the lead of Augustine, maintained that a given proposition cannot be both true and untrue at the same time and in the same way. They presupposed that the statements of Scripture are sufficiently clear that a person can learn all he needs to know for salvation. They also maintained that Scripture is a coherent whole such that one place of Scripture will not truly contradict another place in Scripture.⁸

⁵See *infra*, section on Hermeneutics.

⁶*Ibid.*, I:vi, (emphasis added).

⁷Rene DesCartes claimed that sensory data were subject to distortion and therefore unreliable (for instance, when a stick enters the water it appears to bend but for some reason I do not believe it really bent). But any proposition could be deceptive if there were a demon that spent all his time in an effort to deceive DesCartes. He finally concluded that the only thing of which he could be certain was that even if he were deceived he must still be thinking in order to be deceived. But if he was thinking then he must exist. Thus his famous dictum "Cogito ergo sum" or "I think, therefore I am."

⁸"[Scripture] is to be received, *because* it is the Word of God," (*WCF*, I:iv); "Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts," (*WCF*, I:v); "those things that are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them," (*WCF*, I:vii); "The infallible rule of interpretation of scripture is the scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any scripture, (which is not manifold, but one,) it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly," (*WCF*, I:ix).

Scripture is thus self authenticating.

Because of its radical view of the competence of each believer to interpret Scripture according to his own conscience, the Independent movement conceived that the history of the church was of little value in determining the nature of the church. They viewed the church as the people of God, redeemed by Christ, who covenant together as an autonomous body to observe the ordinances, worship God, and present the gospel to those who are unregenerate and consequently outside the membership of the local assembly.

The Presbyterians, on the other hand, condemned the act of separation from the national church which was inherent in the Independent thought. Further, they rejected the Independent and Separatist interpretation of Scriptures insofar as the interpretation condoned discrimination in the admission of church members to only those willing to sign a church covenant or who could demonstrate their heart-state to the satisfaction of other private members. Because the Independents (especially Nye) condemned classes and synods as not only unnecessary, but positively evil, the Presbyterians viewed their system (or lack of a system) of church government as offering no control over heresies or abuses arising in particular congregations.⁹

It seemed to the Separatists that England's visible church "indiscriminately embraced the flagrantly wicked along with the good or sincerely repentant."¹⁰ Their conception of the church was of something quite different. To the Independent way of thinking, the church should be "gathered" by means of a church covenant. This type of a gathering would assure as nearly as possible, or so they claimed, a regenerate church membership within the local church. This practice also gave rise to the idea that an assembly should be formed by gathered saints rather than by the authority of either a bishop or a presbytery. The Independent, even when he admired Presbyterianism, was convinced that the Presbyterian system lacked the emphasis on the "experimental" or "experiential" elements of what he believed he saw in the New Testament.

This understanding of the individual conscience led the Independents to assert that there can be no authority between the believer and Christ. Although the Independents claimed that Scripture was a higher authority, they made Scripture subject to the

⁹Edward H. Bloomfield, *The Opposition to the English Separatists, 1570-1625*. (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, c. 1981), 93.

¹⁰Edmund Sears Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of A Puritan Idea*, (New York: New York University Press, 1963), 100.

interpretation of every believer's conscience. Synods and classes might advise, but they could not command. In fact, the Independents were finally forced by events to admit that a multiplicity of sects must necessarily result from the variability of human judgment and the supposed obligation of worshipping God according to the dictates of the conscience rather than the dictates of God's Word. Freedom to worship God as *he* pleased became license to worship God in any way the believer saw fit.¹¹

We will discuss the Millenarianism of the Independents in some detail in Part 5, but it would be well to clarify at this point the necessary affinity between the Congregational (Independent) vision concerning the immediacy of Christ's relationship to the church and the Millennial Age in which his universal reign would be manifested. The Independent form of the Church sought to anticipate in its policy of gathered churches the state of the Church in that coming Thousand Years. The Independents' withdrawal from established Churches was dictated by the strategic hope that a broader reformation of the entire Church would necessarily follow in an apocalyptic fashion. The Presbyterian Puritans, although they also looked toward a purer age of the Church in which Christ would exercise his authority through established synods, were not committed to the "New Testament only" or apocalyptic view of the Church which was required in order to sustain the Independent view.

The Assembly set forth its understanding of the puritan principle of worship in Chapter 21 of the *Confession of Faith*. We read in §21.1,

But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture.

The puritan assembly believed that their philosophy of worship came by good and necessary consequence from their basic epistemology of *sola Scriptura*. The Westminster divines regarded the inscripturated Word as both necessary *and sufficient* to inform man how God should be worshipped. *WCF* §1.6 states,

The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added,

whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.

The article goes on to clarify that the Assembly was not claiming that Scripture speaks directly to the details of every man's calling. Rather, the divines explained that they wrote regarding "the worship of God, and government of the church;" the areas to which the three neglected documents speak.

The Assembly touched the issues of the polity and discipline of the church in several places of the *Confession*. Chapter 20 refers generally to those who may "be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the church." *WCF* §25.3 states,

...unto this catholick visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

Further, in article 6 of the same chapter, the *Confession* informs us that there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ. The *Confession's* final consideration of church polity is in chapter 31, regarding synods and councils.

The Westminster Confession of Faith gives some foundational insight into the Assembly's basic philosophy of worship and church polity, but explains very little by way of detail. The reason for the omission is that most of the details are contained in the three neglected documents. In those documents we find a wealth of information regarding how the Assembly thought their basic *sola Scriptura* epistemology would work itself out in the details of public and private worship and the form of church government.

The Westminster Assembly clearly viewed the church as subject to the Scriptures and not as authoritative over the Scriptures. Yet the necessity remains for men to interpret the Scriptures. What principle or principles should be paramount when determining which Scriptures to bring to bear on a particular subject? How does one view the relationship of Scripture and history? Obviously, affirming that the church is subject to the Scriptures will mean little without agreement on what the Scriptures teach. There were, in fact, some foundational disagreements over interpretive principles in the assembly and those disagreements led to differences that affected the Westminster documents themselves. Those differences, especially as they impinged upon the view of history that undergirded church polity, will be taken up in part 5 of *A Westminster Bibliography*.

¹¹Henry William Clark, *History of English Nonconformity from Wiclif to the Close of the Nineteenth Century*. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1965 reprint of 1911), I, 337.

5. HERMENEUTICAL BACKGROUND

It is relatively important that we understand the basic philosophical or epistemological differences of the Westminster Assembly of divines. Nevertheless, the largest disagreements that arose within the puritan movement in the seventeenth century were not primarily philosophical differences, but differences of hermeneutics. Both Presbyterians and Independents were the philosophical heirs of Peter Ramus, Walter Travers, Thomas Cartwright and William Ames, but their hermeneutical principles had quite different origins.

It is also clear that the differences between the Presbyterians and Independents were not simply differences on the one issue of church government. As Dr. John F. Wilson of Princeton University has demonstrated,

...the questions of church polity, those issues within Stuart Puritanism which denominationally minded historians have interpreted in mundane terms, were derivative and secondary. The real intra-Puritan disputes concerned the Millennium and the character of Christ's rule in his church during that age. Differences of 'polity' rested on prior issues.¹

The thesis that Independent church polity was dependent upon millenarianism may seem at first glance somewhat obscure. But the evidence is formidable that there was a strong millenarian — even utopian — element in the hermeneutics of the radical Reformation from early in the sixteenth century and continuing into the Fifth Monarchy movement of the 1640's and 1650's. The Independents in the Westminster Assembly were firmly in that line of thinking. As Geoffrey F. Nuttall pointed out in *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way 1640-1660*,

By its very nature, moreover, the restoration was precluded from becoming antiquarian: for upon themselves, they believed, as upon the first Christians, the ends of the age were come and the Lord was at hand.... The combination of the 'now' and the 'not yet' which characterizes the Christian *Weltanschauung* was a daily reality to them.²

James Holstun confirms the extent to which millenarian eschatology can influence the entirety of one's views.³ Holstun tells of a certain Vasco de Quiroga who was sent to New Spain in 1531. There he saw the possibility of a reformed [Catholic] church

among the Indians. Quiroga claimed, "[It] seems certain to me that I see...in the new primitive and reborn church of this new world, a reflection and an outline of the primitive church in our known world in the age of the apostles."⁴ There is a strain of utopian thinking that extends from that period, via Johann Alsted into England, and from the Elizabethan puritans through Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede (alt. Meade) to such Westminster luminaries as Thomas Goodwin, Jeremiah Burroughs and William Twisse.⁵

The Civil War which raged at the very time the Westminster Assembly convened had further opened the door for all manner of revolutionaries and utopians to enter the religious debates of the day. Several of the proposals of Henry Barrow, Robert Browne, John Greenwood and other earlier Separatists were being accepted by many in the lower classes of society, as well as in the ranks of the New Model Army. The rise to power of Oliver Cromwell especially horrified the middle and upper classes. The millenarian utopians of the day proposed changing the legal system, extending voting rights and either closing or greatly changing the universities. William Walwyn, the Leveller, "attacked the Universities for holding on to the study of Hebrew, Greek and Latin at a time when the Bible was readily available in English. For him the arguments for a 'learned ministry' were in essence little more than 'the learned... defending their copyhold.'"⁶

The contemporary Presbyterian writer Thomas Edwards gave a summary of the religious situation of his day in a book entitled *Gangraena*, which he dedicated to the two Houses of Parliament. He listed the evils that had broken out in England from 1642 to 1646:

Things every day grow worse and worse; you can hardly imagine them so bad as they are. No kind of blaspheming, heresie, disorder, and confusion, but 'tis found among us, or coming in upon us. For we, instead of reformation, are grown from one extreme to another, fallen from Scylla to Charybdis; from popish innovations, superstitions, and prelatical tyranny, to damnable heresies, horrid blasphemies, libertinism, and fearful anarchy....; the worst of the prelates, in the midst of many popish Arminian tenets and popish innovations, held many sound doctrines and had many commendable practices; yea, the very papists hold and keep to many articles of faith and truths of God, have some order among them, encourage learning, have certain fixed principles of truth, with practices of devotion and good works; but many of the sects and sectaries of our days

¹John F. Wilson, "A Glimpse of Syon's Glory" *CH*, XXXI (March, 1962), 72-73.

²Geoffrey F. Nuttall. *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way 1640-1660*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), 157. Hereafter *Visible Saints*.

³James Holstun. *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth Century England and America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

⁴*Ibid.*, 4-6

⁵Robert G. Clouse, "Johann Heinrich Alsted and English Millennialism" in *HTR*, 62 (1969), 203-204.

⁶Peter Toon in a lecture given at Concordia Lutheran College on December 3, 1971.

deny all principle of religion, are enemies to all holy duties, order, learning, overthrowing all.... What swarms are there of all sorts of illiterate mechanic preachers, yea, of women and boy preachers!.... These sectaries have been growing upon us ever since the first year of our sitting, and have every year increased more and more.⁷

William Hetherington's description of 1640's London is also instructive. In his *A History of the Westminster Assembly*, Hetherington described the times,

As King Charles plundered the countryside, many sectaries of various beliefs were forced into London (1643-44). The sectaries knew that no rule of ordination had yet been made. They procured ordination from other sectaries and applied for the ministerial relief. When refused, they began to draw parties after them. The Assembly complained to Parliament about the liberties being taken. Nye objected [to the Assembly's complaint]. Independents began to align themselves with the sectaries.⁸

Some may consider at this point that this paper has strayed some distance from the subject of the documents concerning doctrine, worship and church polity as set forth by the Westminster Assembly. However, this writer is in agreement with Nuttall when he states, "For an understanding of Puritan piety which is more than superficial few aids are, in fact, more needed than a fresh presentation of the developing millenarian argument, with its manifold attractions and effects."⁹ Secular historians have been more likely than most sacred chroniclers to recognize the extent to which the radical millennial views of the Independents affected both their understanding of church polity and worship as well as their radical political views in support of Oliver Cromwell and the New Model Army.

Johann Alsted argued that from 1603 to 1642 the world would sustain considerable mutations because the period of "the seventh revolution of the planets" would be completed during those forty years. The numbers he found in the books of Daniel and Revelation seemed to him to confirm 1642 as a momentous year. Alsted derived his astronomy from the pioneer astronomer Tycho Brahe (1546-1601).¹⁰

Tycho believed the seventh revolution pointed to a kind of sabbatism: to the seventh millennium occurring at the end of history.¹¹ Another contemporary

astronomer, Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), famous for Kepler's three laws of planetary motion, predicted that a supernova which appeared in the constellation "Serpenta" from October 1604 to late 1605 foreshadowed the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and the complete and final restoration of the church.¹²

John Napier, the brilliant Scot who invented logarithms, extended his numerical skills to the numbers of the beast of Revelation chapter 13. His book first appeared in 1593 and contained a number of propositions in the style of Ramist logic. His tenth proposition claimed to demonstrate, "The last trumpet and vial beginneth *anno Christi* 1541 and should end in *anno Christi* 1786.... The day of God's judgment appears to fall betwixt the years of Christ 1688 and 1700."¹³

In spite of the seeming "scientific nature" of such schemes, however, the Presbyterians in the Assembly were having none of it. Thus Alexander Henderson declared in a sermon preached on December 27, 1643, "Men need not... trouble themselves with the intricate numbers of Plato, predictions of astrologers [i.e., astronomers] or particular prophesies."¹⁴

Early puritan Reformers used apocalyptic language and metaphor when writing of the Reformation and Rome. Later writers, however, transformed the earlier international outlook into one more narrowly nationalistic and British — what Haller called "the elect nation."¹⁵ Thomas Brightman, a transitional figure whose *Commentary on Revelation* significantly influenced Goodwin and Burroughs, regarded the binding of Satan to have taken place in the church's fourth century triumph over paganism under the emperor Constantine.¹⁶ Brightman considered the first resurrection to have been fulfilled in the work and preaching of John Wyclif and he regarded the second resurrection as taking place with the conversion of the Jews, which he taught would be in the year 1650.¹⁷

Ironically, John Field, who earlier had been the moving force behind the attempt to create a presbyterian organization within the Church of England in Queen

¹²*Ibid.*, 43.

¹³Cited in Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions From the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War*. (Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, c. 1978), 97-98. Hereafter *Reformers and Babylon*.

¹⁴Alexander Henderson, "A Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons, at Their Late Solemn Fast," Wednesday, December 27, 1643, in *An Anthology of Presbyterian and Reformed Literature, Vol. I, No. 1*, (Dallas: Naphtali Press, 1988), 13.

¹⁵*Reformers and Babylon*, 41.

¹⁶Alfred Cohen, "The Kingdom of God in Puritan Thought: A Study of the English Puritan Quest for the Fifth Monarchy" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1961), 52. Hereafter *Cohen*.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 52-55.

⁷Cutts, op. cit., 264. Cutts is not really sympathetic to the Presbyterians, but quotes *Gangræna* as though Edwards were saying the Presbyterians were overrun by such Sectaries. Of course what Edwards meant was that London was overrun with them.

⁸Hetherington, 144-45.

⁹Nuttall, *Visible Saints*, 157.

¹⁰F. S. Plotkin, *Sighs from Zion*. (NY: Columbia U., 1966), 42.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 42-43.

Elizabeth's day, may have been the very one who opened the door for the unusual millennial interpretations of Brightman, Mede, and eventually the Independents in the Westminster Assembly. He, together with Thomas Wilcox, penned *An Admonition to the Parliament* in 1572. In their *Admonition*, Field and Wilcox used apocalyptic language to deride the episcopal government. In using this language, Field and Wilcox seem to have opened the way to a more radical puritan view and, more importantly, publicly opened a road to separation.¹⁸ Subsequently, such men as Henry Barrow, Robert Browne and Henry Jacob developed the language of Field and Wilcox into an apology for Separatism. Ecclesiastical Separation seemed to them the only sure way to avoid the impending judgment on the "church of the Antichrist."¹⁹ The non-separating Puritans agreed that the established church contained antichristian elements, but for them it remained a true church. For Barrow and the Separatists, anyone who would not follow the evidence to its logical conclusion and fully condemn the English church as false deserved a place on the side of perdition.²⁰ Plotkin thus concludes that the English millenaries were "revolutionary reformers.... For the English millenary, fundamental iniquities called for fundamental reforms.... England would ensure Christ's victory over history...."²¹

Thomas Brightman followed the language of the Separatists in his *Commentary on Revelation*. Brightman was very much concerned with seeing reform in the English church and viewed that reform taking place as part of the "latter-day glory" of the church in his *Commentary*.²²

A Separatist in the line of Henry Jacob and Henry Barrow with respect to radical ecclesiology and with a remarkable agreement with Brightman's eschatology was Robert Parker. Parker shared Brightman's conviction that the advancing eschaton was intimately bound up with the issue of ecclesiology and the struggle for reform in England. The millennium would arrive in its full maturity, he believed, carried victorious on the shoulders of the church polity advocated by the more radical Puritans, while the English episcopacy would be spewed out like the Laodicean church.²³ Parker thought that the destruction of the Antichrist was close at hand and

would occur "at the Jews' conversion, whereunto we come near."²⁴ Joseph Mede of Cambridge followed the same reasoning and language and also seems to have been aware of Alsted's predictions.²⁵ W. M. Lamont points out that even Nathaniel Holmes, preaching to the House of Commons in 1641 looked forward to the formation of the "new and glorious church" on a definite congregational basis and "he makes liberal use of the prophecies of Thomas Brightman to support his claim that this reformation was near at hand; he makes clear the theocratic implications of his doctrines."²⁶

Anabaptists in Holland, Robert Browne, John Robinson and the Independents who ministered in Rotterdam and Arnheim had more in common than mere proximity. Each of those groups and individuals had a common foundation in their view of church polity. All denied any authority to human tradition, but equally important all based their view of church polity on the ideal of the church as a society of the regenerate. Such an ideal required a radical discontinuity between the church of the Old Testament and the church of the New Testament. The Presbyterians saw much of the Old Testament concept of church polity as useful and binding on the present-day church. Thus a Presbyterian's view of church membership, church polity, and the relationship of the church to civil government was conditioned by what he found in the Old Testament. The dissenter, on the other hand, sensed that such a scheme could never meet the New Testament ideal and preferred to limit the authoritative pattern of Scripture to the New Testament only.

It is one thing to establish that millenary eschatology had fruit in a radical ecclesiology; it is something different to demonstrate that the link existed with the Independents in the Westminster Assembly. Yet that hermeneutical link is what this paper proposes. A decade after the Westminster Assembly completed its work, in 1658, the Independents formulated a confession of their own. Of the leading Independents at the Westminster Assembly, only Burroughs and Simpson were absent from the later assembly of Independents at Savoy. Burroughs died in 1646 while the Westminster Assembly still sat²⁷ and Simpson died in 1658.²⁸ The drafting committee at Savoy consisted of Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, William Bridge, Joseph Caryl, William Greenhill and John Owen. Only Owen was not

¹⁸*Reformers and Babylon*, 54-57.

¹⁹Stephen Brachlow, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology 1570-1625* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 87-88. Hereafter *Brachlow*.

²⁰*Reformers and Babylon*, 89.

²¹Plotkin, *op. cit.*, 21.

²²Peter Toon, "The Latter Day Glory," in *Puritans, The Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600-1660: A Collection of Essays*. Edited by Peter Toon. (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970), 28-30.

²³*Brachlow*, 93-94.

²⁴Cited in *Brachlow*, 93.

²⁵*Cohen*, 57-58.

²⁶W. M. Lamont, "Episcopacy and a Godly Discipline, 1641-6," in *JEH*, X (April 1959), 78.

²⁷James Reid, *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1982 reprint of 1811), I, 174.

²⁸*Ibid.*, II, 147.

present as a dissenter at Westminster.²⁹ Clearly the *Savoy Confession* is a measure of the beliefs of the "dissenting brethren" of the Westminster Assembly. Significantly, the designers of the *Savoy Confession* placed their most salient eschatological statement in the section dealing with the church.

As the Lord in his care and love towards the church hath in his infinite wise providence exercised it with great variety in all ages, for the good of them that love him, and his own glory: so according to his promise, we expect in the latter days, Antichrist being destroyed, the Jews called, and the adversaries of the kingdom of his dear Son broken, the churches of Christ being enlarged, and edified through a free and plentiful communication of light and grace, shall enjoy in this world a more quiet, peaceable and glorious condition than they have enjoyed.³⁰

John Owen was obviously influenced in the same way and by the same sources as the Independents in the Assembly.³¹ The relationship that Owen saw existing between eschatology and ecclesiology can be discovered in three sermons he preached before Parliament 1649-1652.³² Owen viewed the rule of Antichrist (Rome) as coming to an end with the continuing reformation of the church.³³ The Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was, according to Owen, "the coming of the Lord Christ to recover his people from antichristian idolatry and oppression."³⁴ The nature of the kingdom is both personal and internal as the Spirit rules in the hearts of believers³⁵ and external as Christ rules by his gospel ordinances in the visible church.³⁶ Owen believed the kingdom of Christ would continue to increase until the "restoration of all things" spoken of in Acts 3:21,³⁷ which would consist of the calling of the Jews and the overthrow of Antichrist.³⁸ Finally, at the last day would come the universal judgment of all men by Christ.³⁹

This eschatological scenario may sound like the

mainstream historic "postmillennialism"⁴⁰ of the Presbyterians, but Owen subscribed to the elect nation theory of the Independents as well. "Nay, the reformation of England shall be more glorious than of any nation in the world, being carried on neither by might, nor power, but only by the Spirit of the Lord of Host."⁴¹ Owen was thus convinced along with other leading Independents of military and political victories for Cromwell, the Protectorate, and "the good old cause." Therefore, Peter Toon could write that Owen thought "the victories of the New Model Army were inspired and even predestined by God."⁴² Toon criticizes Owen's judgment:

...perhaps the young divine went too far in his claim that one could see in recent history a clear imprint or reflection of the eternal counsel of God....

...he understood everything in terms of God's judgment, chastisement or deliverance of his saints here on earth. He did not think it important to consider what we may term "secondary causes" — excessive taxation, patriotism and fear of the future.⁴³

The impact such millenarianism had on the ecclesiology of the Independents was significant. For Goodwin and the other millenarians the Kingdom of Christ was a rule of Christ in his church which could not be separated logically from his soon-to-be rule in his millennium. Goodwin was convinced "[Christ] shall reign with his saints in a glorious manner, and the church shall be so raised in the world outwardly as to be above all the men of the world in outward glory."⁴⁴ The significance of Goodwin's sermon, "A Glimpse of Syon's Glory," has long been recognized by modern secular historians.⁴⁵ In the spectrum of Puritan thought, Goodwin is generally placed by historians in the "orthodox" center. It is therefore only with recent scholarship that Goodwin has been confirmed as the

⁴⁰The modern distinctions of "premillennial, amillennial and postmillennial" are anachronistic and should be applied only with considerable care to seventeenth century millenary schemes.

⁴¹Owen, *op. cit.*, VIII, 27. It would be interesting to hear Owen's response to questions regarding Pride's purge of the Parliament in 1648 or Cromwell's execution of Charles I. It is unclear how Owen thought the Independent movement succeeded "neither by might, nor power" when it was swept into ascendancy with Cromwell's New Model Army.

⁴²Peter Toon, *God's Statesman: The Life and Work of John Owen* (Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1971), 20.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 21; 32.

⁴⁴Thomas Goodwin, "A Glimpse of Syon's Glory" in *Works*, XII, 71. Hereafter "Glimpse."

⁴⁵See Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660*. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 1-28. Hereafter *Discord.*; Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1961), 168 ff.; Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1965), 290 ff. See also Sidney A. Burrell, "Calvinism, Capitalism, and the Middle Classes: Some Afterthoughts on an Old Problem," *JMH*, XXXII, (1960), 129-41.

²⁹Peter Toon, "The Westminster and Savoy Confessions: A Brief Comparison," in *JETS*, XV (1972), 154.

³⁰Quoted in *ibid.*, 155. Emphasis added.

³¹Owen claimed that he had been converted from Presbyterianism to Independency by John Cotton's *Keys to the Kingdom*, which in turn relied very heavily upon Brightman and Mede.

³²The sermons were, "The Shaking and Translating of Heaven and Earth" (Owen's *Works*, VIII, 243-279), "The Advantage of the Kingdom of Christ" (*ibid.*, 311-339), and "Christ's Kingdom and the Magistrate's Power" (*ibid.*, 365-395).

³³"Shaking and Translating," 260.

³⁴"Advantage," 322.

³⁵"Shaking and Translating," 258-59.

³⁶"Christ's Kingdom," 370-73.

³⁷"Shaking and Translating," 259.

³⁸"Christ's Kingdom," 375-76

³⁹*Ibid.*, 373.

author of "Glimpse."⁴⁶ As Dr. Tai Liu points out,

Historians now understand that millenarianism was not merely the fantasy of the alienated who had no command of the reality of society but also a dynamic force in the minds of men who were totally involved in the reconstruction of the world.... It has been recognized as a formative influence upon religious thought in general in the first half of the seventeenth century.⁴⁷

Millenary vision colored the aspirations of many English Puritans and in the early stages of the revolution the vision was not limited to the radical sects. As Doctor Wilson of Princeton demonstrates regarding the monthly Fast-Day Sermons before the Long Parliament, eschatological symbolism was the very imagery which the Puritans used in outlining their plans for both the nation and the church.⁴⁸ With such a broader understanding of Puritan millenarianism, Goodwin's "Glimpse" takes on a greater significance for both an understanding of Puritan politics as well as the issue of church polity in the Assembly. Tai Liu thus referred to "Glimpse" as the "original Independent manifesto," and further explained,

They [the Independents in the Assembly] allowed the voice of the people, or, more strictly speaking, God's people, the saints, in the gathered churches to draw them farther and farther towards religious and political radicalism until the early 1650's, when the millenarian movement threatened the social structure. As a consequence, the Independent divines drew back from it.⁴⁹

However, it may not have been the radicalism of the Fifth Monarchy movement that caused the Independents to draw back so much as their own disappointment at their eschatological schemes not reaching fruition in 1650 and again in 1655/56. The Savoy Platform of 1658 continues to contain the eschatological (apocalyptic) interpretation of ecclesiology that is evident in Goodwin's "Glimpse."⁵⁰

The arguments that Goodwin set forth in "Glimpse" in defense of gathered churches and gathered saints were the very arguments that were echoed repeatedly in the sermons and pamphlets favoring Independency

throughout the Civil War years. There would be a great conversion of both Jews and Gentiles to the Independent way; rulers would become convinced "of the excellency of God's people" and the gathered saints would be recognized as "the strength of the Lord of Hosts," and as a result would be seen as "the strength in a kingdom" as well. Goodwin insisted, "The inhabitants of Jerusalem, that is, the saints of God gathered together in a church, are the best commonwealth men."⁵¹ Further, since there would be such a presence of Christ among the saints, Goodwin thought perhaps human laws would no longer be needed, "at least in the way that now there is." Above all, Goodwin expected a change in men, in civil government and in the outward conditions of the church such that, "then shall be fulfilled that promise, 'There shall be new heavens and a new earth.'"⁵² As Tai Liu points out, "We see herein the seeds of religious radicalism in the fundamental precepts of Independency, which were to haunt the relations of the Independent divines and other Puritan groups in the future."⁵³ Nowhere was that relation more strained than in the deliberations of the Westminster Assembly concerning the questions of ecclesiastical polity.

The most important aspect of Goodwin's "Glimpse" for the purposes of this study was his virtual identification of the Independent form of church polity with the beginning of the Kingdom of Christ. Goodwin claimed, for example, "And, my brethren, if the Kingdom of Christ had been kept in congregations, in that way that we and some other churches are in, it had been impossible that antichrist should have got ahead."⁵⁴ Now that the glorious millennium was drawing near what church should Goodwin expect to be God's choice in founding Zion? "Certainly," Goodwin was so bold to claim, "the communion of saints and Independency of congregations God will honour."⁵⁵

This claim goes far in explanation of the Independents' opposition to Presbytery. Robert Baillie noted it,⁵⁶ but historians — especially church historians — have typically oversimplified or ignored the hermeneutical and historiographical issues involved. It was not, as John Bastwick simplistically asserted, merely a quarrel between Presbyterianism dependent and Presbyterianism independent.⁵⁷ It was the difference between a

⁴⁶For a compelling case for Goodwin's authorship of "Glimpse" see Anthony Dallison, "The Latter-day Glory in the Thought of Thomas Goodwin," *EQ*, LVIII (January, 1986), 53-86; David Walker, "Thomas Goodwin and the debate on Church Government," *JEH*, XXXIV (1983), 85-99; and Prof. Dr. John F. Wilson, "A Glimpse of Syon's Glory," *CH*, XXXI (March 1962), 66-73.

⁴⁷*Discord*, 3.

⁴⁸John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640-48*, (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1969), 189-96. Hereafter *Wilson*.

⁴⁹*Discord*, 4-5.

⁵⁰See Dallison, "Latter-day Glory," 53-54.

⁵¹"Glimpse," 73-74, 76.

⁵²*Ibid.*, 74-77. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, though generally friendly toward the Independents, has pointed out the relationship that existed between their incipient dispensationalism and their radical ecclesiology. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1946), 107-108.

⁵³*Discord*, 6.

⁵⁴"Glimpse," 69.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 79.

⁵⁶*Dissuasive*, 80,86.

⁵⁷C. G. Bolam and Jeremy Goring, "English Presbyterian Beginnings," in Bolam et al. *The English Presbyterians* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), 43.

reformation view of history versus an apocalyptic view of history (or, as Professor Wilson states it — a prophetic versus an apocalyptic view of history).⁵⁸ Independency had its own eschatological — even apocalyptic — presuppositions regarding the church and the world, the kingdom of God, man and even history.⁵⁹ In this apocalyptic sense Independency was not simply a plea for toleration, but an application of the millenary view of the Kingdom of Christ.

It is in this light of apocalyptic millenarianism that Goodwin's *Apologetical Narration* should be understood.⁶⁰ The *Apologetical Narration* explained what the Independents did not want to see imposed, but "Glimpse" forms a manifesto of what the Independents hoped to see done regarding church polity.⁶¹ This was not lost on the publisher William Kiffin. In his foreword to "A Glimpse of Syon's Glory," "An Epistle to the Reader," Kiffin wrote, "that Christ hath given his power to his church, not to a hierarchy, neither to a national presbytery, but to a company of saints in a congregational way."⁶² In light of such contemporary remarks as Kiffin's and Baillie's, the present-day historian must see the later alignment of the Independents and Sectaries, not in terms of accidental or necessary events, but due to the fact that there was *no substantial difference* in the hermeneutical and historical views of the orthodox and radical Independents.⁶³

Church historians have generally assumed that there was not much difference between the Independents and the Presbyterians until the question of church polity finally came before the Westminster Assembly. Further, many today would regard even the differences that surfaced during the controversy between the Presbyterians and Independents to be over minor or insubstantial points. The Puritans themselves, however, were very much aware of their foundational differences. Baillie claimed simply, "[We] have to get determined to our mutuall satisfaction, if we were ridd of Bishop, and till then, we have agreed to speak nothing of anything wherein we differ."⁶⁴ The agreement was generally honored by both, yet the Independents were quite effective in preaching their millenarian designs before Parliament. What began as a conflict between King and Parliament over the despotism of Charles I was

gradually turned into a holy war against Antichrist.⁶⁵ E. W. Kirby explains the importance of the sermons preached to Parliament on monthly Fast Days:

Their sermons help to explain why the Westminster Assembly and the Parliament were to find it difficult to agree upon a form of church government to replace Episcopacy, and, more important, they help to reproduce the atmosphere of the very significant months in which England was drifting from limited [?] monarchy into revolution.⁶⁶

Another of the Independent Dissenters, William Bridge, preached a similar view to that contained in Goodwin's "Glimpse." In a sermon preached before the Commons in 1640,⁶⁷ Bridge told the Members of Parliament that by the word "Babylon" they should understand not merely the Church of Rome but parties in other kingdoms as well who "symbolize with her" in their teaching and practice.⁶⁸ When the sermon was eventually published, Bridge added in an epistle to the reader, "I shall not prophesie if I say, The sword is drawn, whose anger shall not be pacified till *Babylon* be downe, and *Sion* raised."⁶⁹ Bridge thus announced the Independent plan for civil war nearly a year before the fact when he called for a policy of "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, burning for burning ... and blood for blood."⁷⁰

Jeremiah Burroughs told the House that 1641 was a *mirabilis annus* for the English nation. Strafford was executed and Laud was in the Tower. The Court of the Star Chamber was abolished; so also was the Court of the High Commission. Parliament passed the Triennial Act to guarantee frequent Parliaments in the future and another to protect itself from improper dissolution.⁷¹ Burroughs was not satisfied with such accomplishments however. Burroughs explained to the Members of Parliament, "Many are affected with the peace of the State, who little minde Jerusalem, they are good States men, wise, judicious, faithful in their kinde, but care little what becomes of Jerusalem, the true worship of God."⁷² Burroughs' apocalyptic vision comes through when he instructs the legislators,

You have the advantage of the time, for this is the time for God to doe great things for his churches; time was

⁵⁸Shaw, I chapter 2 and II chapter 3. See also George Yule, "Independents: Decentralized Calvinism in 17th Century England," *RTR*, XV (June 1956), 38-49 and "English Presbyterianism and the Westminster Assembly," *RTR*, XXXIII (1974), 33-34. For a similar discussion see C. G. Bolam et al., *The English Presbyterians* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), 38-45.

⁵⁹*Discord*, 7-8.

⁶⁰See part 7.

⁶¹*Discord*, 8.

⁶²"Glimpse," 63.

⁶³*Discord*, 8.

⁶⁴Baillie, I, 311 and *Dissuasive*, 130-31.

⁶⁵H. R. Trevor-Roper, "The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament," in *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 306. and Wilson, 227-30.

⁶⁶Ethyn W. Kirby, "Sermons Before the Commons, 1640-42," *AHR*, XLIV (1939), 547-48.

⁶⁷"Babylon's Downfall" (London, 1641.)

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 6.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, "to the reader."

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 11.

⁷¹See part 1.

⁷²Jeremiah Burroughs, "Sions Joy," (London, 1641), 5-6.

when God stirred up his servants to stand against the wayes of *Antichrist*, only to give testimony to this truth... but *now* God calls you to appeare against him, and his waies; At this time God intends to ruin him. You come at the time of his downfall, when he is falling....⁷³

Burroughs also attached a warning to the House in the event they did not utterly abolish prelacy: "God forbid that any of you should now give in; if any draw back, *my soule shall have no pleasure in him saith the Lord.*"⁷⁴

The Westminster Independent Joseph Caryl preached before the Lord Mayor of London in March 1643 (four months before the opening of the Assembly) and proclaimed, "Now at this day there is a great cry for peace," and asked, "who weepes not to see the wounds of this Nation?" Yet he went on to say that until religion was fully reformed the *cause* of the Civil War would remain. Considerations of state, how important soever they might be, were as nothing compared to the righteousness of God.⁷⁵ On another occasion, April 23, 1644, Caryl spoke before Parliament on the text Revelation 11:16-17. The essential point of the exhortation was the immediacy of Christ's reign:

We may answer all Querists about the raigne of Christ, consider of the things which ye heare and see [John 10:24f]. The spiritually blind begin to have their eyes unscaled and receive their sight, many lamed in prisons walke abroad at liberty, many who were deafe at the voice of truth, now heare it: some who were civilly dead under oppressions and persecutions are raised up, and thousand of poore soules have the Gospel preached unto them. Proud ones are abased, they are scattered in the imaginations of their own hearts; mighty ones are put from their seats, and they of low degree are exalted. Errours are discountenanc'd, truth is enquired after, ceremonies and superstitions are cast out, monuments of Popery and Paganisme are cast downe; the beautie of Idols is stained, and the coverings of graven images are defiled. May we not argue from all these, for this enthronization of Christ, as they did for his incarnation, Joh. 7:31.⁷⁶

Professor Wilson summarizes:

It is clear that the Independents were, in apocalyptic fashion, reading their program out of their frankly Millenarian convictions. Their Presbyterian rivals, on the contrary, were attempting to structure the Church in terms of a full Protestant Reformation. In this sense the Independents believed that time was literally on their side. Their tactics in the Westminster Assembly were a series of protracted delays, proposals and counter-

proposals, all designed to render impossible that Presbyterian reformation in the expectation of an apocalypse which they alone comprehended.⁷⁷

The difference in hermeneutic outlined in this section formed the basis for the disagreements between the Presbyterians and the Independents in the Westminster Assembly. The Presbyterians set forth the presence and authority of Christ mediated and exercised by courts and temporal officers in the visible church. The Presbyterian Gaspar Hicckes expressed this doctrine, "the Lord doth highly dignifie and blesse a people by setting over them religious and righteous Magistrates and Rulers."⁷⁸ By contrast Thomas Goodwin maintained that the visible saints are the "Privy Counselours to the great King of Kings, who governs all the States and Kingdomes in the World; and God doth give these Saints a Commission to set up and pull down by their prayers and intercessions."⁷⁹

The Independents in the Westminster Assembly could therefore not be expected to view higher courts in the church as biblical. From their hermeneutical perspective, there was no higher court than private conscience interpreting Scripture in a way that seemed right to the individual. From such an atomistic approach to biblical hermeneutics it was inevitable that they would regard virtually all church authority as an infringement upon the highly personal relationship between a believer and his God.

The Presbyterians, on the other hand, viewed the problems of prelacy as an abuse of church power. The problems lay not in the exercise of authority, but in its wrongful exercise. The church erred not in making judgments, but in making wrong judgments. The church should be concerned not with a repudiation of church authority, but with its rectification.

This fundamental hermeneutical difference between the Presbyterians and the Independents in the Westminster Assembly would ultimately prove to be the primary cause of the Assembly's failure to establish in the minds of the Members of Parliament that there is a *jus divinum* of church government and discipline.Ω

⁷³*Ibid.*, 62

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 61.

⁷⁵Joseph Caryl, "David's Prayer for Solomon," (London, 1643), 24-25.

⁷⁶Joseph Caryl, "The Saintes Thankfull Acclamation at Christ's Presumption of His Great Power and the Initials of His Kingdome," (London, 1644), 34f.

⁷⁷John F. Wilson, "Studies in Puritan Millenarianism Under the Early Stuarts," (Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Union Seminary of New York City, 1962), 136.

⁷⁸Gaspar Hicckes, "The Glory and Beauty of Gods Portion," (London, 1644), 33.

⁷⁹Thomas Goodwin, "The Great Interest of States and Kingdomes," (London, 1646), *Works*, XI, 42.

Four Objections to Exclusive Psalmody Answered

The following are taken from ten sum "summary answers to arguments for the use of hymns, and to objections to the use of the Psalms in worship, are taken from a condensed summary on the subject of Psalmody annexed to Rev. R. J. Dodd's Reply to Morton." *The True Psalmody*, Naphtali Press Anthology volume 4, pp. 311-313. Reprinted by permission. Two other objections and answers from this article were published in *The Blue Banner*, vol 1 #5, "Review of Exclusive Psalmody."

It is objected: 4. 'That we are allowed to compose our own prayers, and, by parity of reason, ought to be allowed to compose our own songs of praise.'

Answer. (1.) Right or wrong, it is a matter of fact, that most worshippers neither do nor can compose their own songs of praise. (2.) God has given us, in the Bible, a book of Psalms, but no book of Prayers; and promised to the church a Spirit of prayer, but not a Spirit of psalmody. (3.) In prayer we express our own wants; in praise we declare God's glory. If we can frame a form of words, suitable for the former purpose, it by no means follows that we are equally competent to compose a form of words for the latter purpose. (4.) The ordinances of prayer and praise differ in this, that in the former the thoughts suggest the words; and we should therefore use the words which they do suggest; whereas, in the latter the words are designed to suggest the thoughts, and therefore we should use words, if such we can obtain, which can suggest none but appropriate thoughts. (5.) Our wants are always changing; and therefore, our prayers should vary: but the glory of God is ever the same; and therefore the same collection of songs will serve for the expression of his praise, from age to age.

5. 'That there is, in the New Testament, authority for singing songs composed by men.' First: we are referred to the fact that Christ and his disciples sang a hymn, Matt. 26:30. Answer. — (1.) Let it be proved that the hymn sung by our Savior and the disciples was not one or more of the Psalms of David. It is supposed by the best commentators to have been the great hallel, consisting of the Psalms from the 113th to the 118th inclusive. (2.) Our Savior was better qualified, and had a better right to compose hymns than Dr. Watts, John Wesley, Philip Doddridge, etc. Second: It is argued that Paul enjoins the use of uninspired psalmody when he says, Col. 3:16, 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs; singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.' Some argue from the first clause of the verse, 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom;' explaining the phrase, 'the word of Christ,' to mean either the whole Bible, or the New Testament; and alleging that the apostle enjoins the use of songs drawn from the whole word of God, or from the New Testament in particular. Answer. — (1.) Let it be proved that this expression means either the whole Bible, or the New Testament, and not simply, the principle of the gospel. (2.) Let it be proved that the Apostle enjoins upon the Church to compose songs,

drawing the matter of them from what he denominates 'the word of Christ.'

Others reason from the use of the three terms, 'psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs' in the latter clause of the verse. Answer. — (1.) No good reason can be assigned, why any one of the psalms of inspiration might not, in reference to different aspects under which it may be viewed, be denominated a 'psalm, hymn, and spiritual song.' Such a use of language is not uncommon. God says, Ex. 34:7, 'forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin.' (2.) If these three terms designate three distinct kinds of devotional poetry, let it be proved that the Book of Psalms does not comprise songs of these three different kinds. (3.) The Jews applied the terms psalms, hymns, and songs, indiscriminately to the Book of Psalms. — See Josephus, Philo, etc.; and the same may have been done by Paul and the primitive Christians. (4.) In the Septuagint, which was the translation of the Old Testament in use in the days of Paul, some of the psalms are, in their titles, designated psalmos — a psalm; others, ode — a song; and others, alleluia; which last is a word borrowed from the Hebrew, and when used as a noun in the Greek language, is equivalent to hymnos — a hymn. Why may we not suppose the Apostle has allusion, in this verse, to these three terms used in the Septuagint version, as titles of different psalms?

Third: it is inferred from 1 Cor. 14:26 that the Corinthians brought to their assemblies psalms composed by themselves, under a supernatural impulse of the Spirit, and of course not contained in the book of Psalms. Answer. — Let it be proved that the Psalms, by the unseasonable utterance of which they disturbed their assemblies, were composed by themselves under an impulse of the Spirit, and not selected from the Book of Psalms.

7. 'That the Psalms are not adapted to New Testament worship.'

Answer. — (1.) God never changes, and of course his praise is always the same. (2.) The Spirit of God was better able, in the days of David, to prepare songs suited to New Testament worship, than men are now. (3.) The Psalms everywhere speak most clearly of Christ and his mediatorial work, kingdom and glory; and are, by the Apostles, copiously quoted in illustration of the way of salvation. (4.) They make less reference to the peculiarities of the old dispensation, than some books of the New Testament do. (5.) We have no Book of Psalms in the New Testament, and no command to prepare one.

9. 'That the Psalms are not sufficiently copious to furnish a complete system of psalmody.'

Answer. — (1.) God is no more glorious now than he was in Old Testament times; and if the Psalms were sufficient then for the expression of his praise, they are still sufficient. (2.) It is too much for any man to take upon himself to decide how copious a system of psalmody ought to be. (3.) The Book of Psalms actually contains an incomparably greater abundance and variety of matter than all the hymns which were ever composed by men. Ω

The Blue Banner

Blue Banner publications are not self-supporting, but are a ministry of FPCR. If you would like to give a gift to support the publishing efforts of First Presbyterian, please make checks payable to FPCR (Blue Banner Ministries). Any gift is greatly appreciated. Please specify if you will need a receipt.

The Blue Banner is published by The First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett, Texas (RPC). It is published under the oversight of the FPCR session. This work is supported by gifts. The cost to produce and mail a subscription is about \$15.00 per year. If you are able, please consider giving a gift of \$30.00 to support your subscription and one other.

All material in this issue Copyright © 1996 by *The Blue Banner*, a ministry of First Presbyterian Church Rowlett, unless otherwise noted. ♦

The First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett

First Presbyterian Rowlett, TX is a member church of the Reformation Presbyterian Church (RPC), a new Presbyterian denomination begun in 1994 by several churches in the United States and Canada. The subordinate standards of the RPC are the “whole doctrine contained in the *Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms* as approved by Acts of General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland in 1647 and 1648 respectively.” The Worship of the RPC is that authorized in the *Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God*, and all elements of worship are limited to those described in *Westminster Confession* chapter 21. Officers of the RPC subscribe fully and strictly to the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*.

Session: Pastor Richard Bacon. Elder David Seekamp.
The Blue Banner Editor: Christopher Coldwell. ♦

The Blue Banner

P O Box 141084

Dallas, TX 75214

800-484-9377 ext. 3727

Email: bluebanr@airmail.net

<http://web2.airmail.net/bluebanr/>

The Blue Banner

A Publication of First Presbyterian Church Rowlett

P O Box 141084

Dallas, TX 75214

Return Postage Guaranteed

CONTENTS

Westminster Bibliography Part 4, p. 1.



Westminster Bibliography Part 5, p. 4.



Blue Banner Catalog, See 4 page Insert.



**Four Objections to Exclusive Psalmody
Answered, p. 11.**



Subscription Information, p. 12.



• *A Westminster Bibliography Parts 4 & 5.
Blue Banner Catalog Insert. New Videos*