

nation was divided—one part for the king and the other for the parliament. It were tedious to go farther into a detail of the causes of this civil war, which brought so many calamities on the nation and the king to the scaffold, and it is unnecessary to our present object.

The king, in the prosecution of this war, was reduced to the necessity of accepting the service and affection of the Papists; and on the other hand the parliament took all possible care to cultivate friendship with the Scots, and to secure that nation to their interests. The king rejected a mediation, offered by the Scots, to affect a reconciliation between him and the parliament, because the Scots insisted upon the abolishing of episcopacy, and a uniformity of presbyterian government in the two nations. The members of parliament, being Erastians, as before observed, were under no conscientious scruples about a change of discipline, believing that the civil magistrates had the keys, and might establish whatever form might be conducive to the public good, readily complied with any propositions made by the Scots, readily accepted the mediation, and wrote to the Scots assembly, which was soon to meet, desiring their advice and assistance in bringing about such a reformation as was desired.

August 3, 1642, the Scots parliament wrote to the English parliament expressing their desires "for unity of religion, that there might be one confession of faith, one directory of worship, one public catechism, and one form of church government." The Scots parliament say, "that they were encouraged to enter upon these labors by the zeal of former times, when their predecessors sent a letter to England against the surplice, the tippet, and corner cap, (worn by the clergy) in the year 1566, and again 1583, and 1589. They therefore advise to begin with a uniformity of church government; for what hope can there be of one confession of faith one form of worship and catechism, till prelaey be plucked up root and branch, as a plant which God has not planted? "Indeed," add they, "the reformed kirks hold their form of government by presbyteries to be *jure divino* and perpetual, but prelaey stands by *jure humano*."

The English parliament bowed to all these overturns, as they well knew they needed the Scot's assistance in carrying on the war, and as they wished to engage them on their side against the king. Lord Clarendon observed very justly, says Mr. Neal, vol. 2, page 571, that the parliament were sensible they could not carry on the war but by the help of the Scots, which they were not to except without an alteration of the government of the church, to which that nation was violently inclined. But then to induce them, says Mr. Neal, to consent to such an alteration, it was said the Scots would not take up arms without it; so that they must lose all, and let the king return as conqueror or submit to the change. From this source sprang the Westminster Creed. The policy of war, the fears of conquest, and the hopes of victory, gave birth to the meeting of the divines. In fact the meeting of the divines at Westminster, and their proceedings, at the instance of the English and Scots parliament, was as perfect a political measure as was the queen's pledging the crown jewels on the continent in order to rise gunpowder and firearms for