

tion." To all which, says Mr. Neal, it was replied that the assembly were not conscious they had done them any injustice; and as for the rest, they were the proper judges of their own methods of proceeding. So these matters were carried in the Westminster Assembly. But the Erastians reserved themselves for the House of Commons, where they were sure to be joined in opposing these decisions of the assembly by all the patrons of the Independents. For it mattered not what was decided by the assembly—it was neither divine nor orthodox until sanctioned by the parliament. The English and Scots commissioners were very solicitous about the fate of this dogma of the divines in the House of Commons, and were determined to carry the point by stratagem. The scheme was, to carry the question before the house should be full. "They gave their friends notice to be early in their places; but Mr. Glyn, perceiving their intentions, spoke an hour to the points of *jus divinum*; and after him Mr. Whitelocke stood up and enlarged upon the same argument till the house was full; when the question being put, it was carried in the negative, and that the proposition of the assembly should stand thus, *that it is lawful and agreeable to the word of God, that the church be governed by congregational, classical, and synodical assemblies.*"

Because the House of Commons would not go the whole length with the Assembly in establishing the *jus divinum* of presbytery, the Scots commissioners and the high Presbyterians in England alarmed the citizens with the danger of the church, and prevailed with the common council to petition the parliament (November 15) "that the Presbyterian discipline shall be established as the discipline of Jesus Christ." But the commons answered with a frown. Not yet discouraged, they prevailed with the city ministers to petition, who, when they came to the house, were told by the Speaker they "need not wait for an answer, but go home and look to the charge of their congregation."

"The Presbyterian ministers, despairing of success with the Commons, instead of yielding to the times, resolved to apply to the House of Lords, who received them civilly and promised to take their request into consideration; but no advances were made for two months, and they became impatient, and determined to renew their application;" and to give it the greater weight prevailed with the lord mayor and court of aldermen to join them in presenting an address, which they did June 16—"for a speedy settlement of church government according to the covenant, and that no toleration might be given to popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, profaneness, or any thing contrary to sound doctrine, and that all private assemblies might be restrained." But it was all in vain. The House of Commons would not be moved by their disagreeable importunity. "However, adds Mr. Neal, this laid the foundation of those jealousies and misunderstandings between the city and parliament, which in the end proved the ruin of the Presbyterian cause."

The next and fiercest controversy between the parliament and the assembly was upon the power of the keys. But upon this we cannot now speak particularly.

It would be tedious, though, perhaps, very profitable to go into the